By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 4209. A bill to further amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide for the relief of certain widows, children, and other dependents of servicemen who die as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggrevated by military or naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4210. A bill to provide for determination of claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration with respect to persons discharged from the armed forces because of disability, prior to the granting of such discharge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. J. Res. 235. Joint resolution authorizing a preliminary examination or survey of Cook Inlet, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors

By Mr. TALLE:

H. J. Res. 236. Joint resolution to provide for a streamlined, simplified, and coordinated Federal tax system; to authorize and direct the Joint Congressional Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to make studies and recommendations in connection therewith; and to provide for the creation of a temporary advisory council to said committee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. Res. 442. Resolution to create a committee of the House to investigate the petroleum industry and problems of petroleum supply; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 4211. A bill for the relief of Ralph J. Herrick; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. R. 4212. A bill for the relief of Robert Rowe and Mary Rowe; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4213. A bill for the relief of Karl Lungstias; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

4898. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of the Zetetic Club, of Indianola, Iowa, with 24 signers, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1161, the Murray-Wagner bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4899. By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolution of the Maplewood Ladies Aid, of Malden, Mass., regarding the abrogation of the British White Paper and the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish commonwealth; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4900. Also, petition of various and sundry persons of Malden, Mass., with reference to the abrogation of the British White Paper and the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish commonwealth; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4901. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Arthur R. Marquardt and other residents of Onondaga County, N. Y., containing approximately 600 signatures, opposing prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4902. By Mr. HILL: House Joint Memorial No. 1 of the first extraordinary session of the Thirty-fourth General Assembly, State of Colorado, urging the United Nations to take steps to find even temporary havens of refuge for homeless and hounded Jews, and requesting that Palestine be opened wide to Jewish immigration and that Palestine be reconstituted as a Jewish commonwealth; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4903. Also, House Memorial No. 2, of the House of Representatives of the first extraordinary session of the Thirty-fourth General Assembly, State of Colorado, urging the Congress of the United States to take such steps as will provide for the commissioning in the Army of the United States of licensed chiropodists in order to serve persons serving in the Army with proper foot and leg treatment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4904. Also, House Joint Memorial No. 3 of the first extraordinary session of the Thirty-fourth General Assembly, State of Colorado, urging the Congress to assume the obligations of getting to the men and women in the armed services the absent voters' ballots prepared by the States, and to return said ballots to the proper State and local officials with all due dispatch, insuring secrecy in the ballot, and requesting that the Congress not attempt to assume the right to determine the qualifications of the voters and the form and contents and time and method of casting, counting, and canvassing the ballots; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

4905. By Mr. LEFEVRE: Petition signed by 3,000 citizens of the Twenty-seventh District of New York, regarding consideration of prohibition at this session of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4906. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of the Bronx County Medical Society, Bronx, New York City, opposing the medical and hospital sections of the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4907. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition of Charles C. Hyre, Mrs. R. S. Hickman, Rev. Everett C. Zinn, Rev. B. S. Burhans, J. H. Funk, Nellie P. Boggess, and Mrs. A. B. Rohrbough, citizens of Clarksburg, W. Va., urging that Congress enact a law prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors during the duration of the war and the period of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4908. By Mr. ROLPH: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 15 of the California Legislature, relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States regarding the matter of additional legislation to end the general uncertainty under which producers of agricultural commodities are now laboring; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4909. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 16 of the California Legislature, relative to the hospitalization of veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

4910. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 14 of the California Legislature, memorializing the President, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Office of War Information, relative to the prompt release of war news; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4911. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 13 of the California Legislature, relating to termination of war contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4912. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 12 of the California Legislature, relating to the prevention of undue hardship on California industries; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4913. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 9 of the California Legislature, relative to the enactment of legislation by Congress permitting the taxation of property belonging to the United States by the States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4914. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 5 of the California Legislature, relative to memorializing Congress to enact legislation to provide for the disposal by the United States Government of certain military vehicles and other equipments suitable for civilian use to United States veterans of the present conflict, to cities, and counties, and to the State departments of education at the lowest possible price, and also to enact legislation for the financing of such purchases whenever necessary; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4915. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2 of the California Legislature, relative to memorializing Congress to enact legislation providing a bill of rights for veterans of World War No. 2; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

4916. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 1 of the California Legislature, relative to memorializing Congress to simplify the income-tax returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4917. Also, House Resolution No. 51 of the California Legislature, relating to the ceiling price on hay; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4918. Also, House Resolution No. 57 of the California Legislature, memorializing Congress to enact legislation declaring illegal all waivers of compensation or adjusted compensation by men of the armed forces upon their discharge as a condition for honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4919. Also, House Resolution No. 48 of the California Legislature, relative to prolonging the wild fowl shooting season; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4920. Also, House Resolution No. 47 of the California Legislature, relative to memorializing Congress for legislation concerning the delivery, distribution, casting, collection, and return of the absentee ballots; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

4921. Also, House Resolution No. 31 of the California Legislature, relating to commending the railroads and their personnel for the exceptionally competent performance of services throughout the Nation in this present war emergency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4922. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 17 of the California Legislature, relative to memorializing the President of the United States to exert his influence upon the Government of Great Britain to bring about the abrogation of the Chamberlain White Paper concerning Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4923. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of E. Wesley Woodruff and Isabel B. Sarver on behalf of the North Street Methodist Church, Wheeling, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4924. Also, petition of Stanley Owoc, president, Council 133, of the Polish National Alliance, having a membership of 2,500, comprising Brooke, Hancock, Marshall, and Ohio Counties, W. Va., urging the State Department to favor and foster the cause of a righteous adjustment of the integrity of the former pre-war boundaries of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

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:

Our Father God, in the abundance of Thy mercy another day is added to the record of the lengthening years. For the morrow and its needs we do not pray. For the day which now bathes us in its

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

returning light, set Thou a seal upon our lips. Plant an understanding of our brother's need in our hearts. Vouchsafe to us some revelation of Thy truth upon our darkened minds. As patriots make us worthy of the past and equal to the present. We cannot adequately serve this troubled day without some guidance from Thy wisdom to lift us out of our bewilderment, some power from Thine infinite resource to strengthen us in our need.

May Thy servants who have been called to administer the affairs of this Nation make daily choice of spiritual integrity amid the corruption that is in the world through the lust of power, that, being unafraid, they may contend for the right as Thou dost give them to see the right. Lift upon us the light of Thy countenance as we come grateful for the best traditions of the Nation whose servants we are, anxious for it to play its destined role in this great day, prayerful for our embattled sons now scattered over all the earth, eager to clear the way for an ordered society of nations that shall give substance and hope to man's dream of brotherhood. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, February 16, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1243) authorizing the construction and operations of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil, shale, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3916) to permit the construction and use of certain pipe lines for pneumatic tube transmission in the District of Columbia.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 199. An act for the relief of Robert Norheim;

S. 255. An act for the relief of Josephine M. Meichior;

S. 817. An act for the relief of George A. Rogers;

S. 921. An act for the relief of Mrs. Neola Cecile Tucker;

S. 933. An act for the relief of Lee S. Bradshaw;

S. 949. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Runnebaum;

S. 1077 An act for the relief of William A. Haag;

S. 1164. An act for the relief of Lucille Sleet;

S. 1288. An act for the relief of Luther Thomas Edens;

S. 1324. An act for the relief of the Wisconsin Electric Power Co.;

S. 1325. An act for the relief of Joseph Moret;

S. 1391. An act for the relief of W. R. Jordan and Mabel Jordan;

S. 1417. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate and convey on behalf of the United States, to Jack Henry Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, the wood-frame building, known as the Telephone and Telegraph Building, located on lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage town site; and

S. 1494. An act for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION FOR POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT RURAL DELIVERY SERVICE (S. DOC. NO. 153)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the form of an amendment to the Budget for the Post Office Department, fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, increasing the amount for Rural Delivery Service from $103,315,000 to $107,690,000 (an increase of $4,375,000), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed

SURVEY TO DETERMINE CAUSES OF CRITICAL LABOR SHORTAGE DESIGNATION OF HARTFORD (CONN.) PRODUCTION AREA

Mr. DANAHER (for himself and Mr. MALONEY), by unanimous consent, presented for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the court of common council and approved by the mayor of Hartford, Conn., which resolution was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That—

Whereas Hartford has made outstanding contributions and efforts ever since the War of Independence to fight for and preserve our democracy, and has again in this present world conflict so richly earned the designation of the arsenal of democracy; and

Whereas the manufacture of airplane motors and propellers and Colt machine guns and cannon in the Hartford area, which together with kindred other products are a vital and integral part of the Nation's war efforts in this world conflict; and

Whereas the Hartford area in this State has been declared a critical labor-shortage area, whereby through the attendant loss of contracts Hartford can lose the opportunity to continue in these war efforts; and

Whereas continuance of such a designation of critical labor-shortage area can bring upon the city of Hartford sudden extreme adverse economic circumstances: Therefore

We earnestly petition, That this board of aldermen respectfully request of the Federal Congress, through its Senators and Representatives, that the Federal Congress instruct the War Production Board, the War Manpower Commission, and such other Federal agencies involved to cooperate with representatives of the local communities involved, together with labor representatives and industrial representatives; all of whom will cooperate together in conducting a survey to determine the causes of the critical labor shortage designation and make such constructive recommendations as they deem advisable and further to publish a report of their findings and recommendations as soon as they are determined; and that copies of this petition are forwarded to each Connecticut Senator and Representative in Federal Congress and the President of the United States, and we respectfully urge that they act in unison to accomplish the purposes of this petition.

ABSORPTION OF RADIO INDUSTRY BY THE NEWSPAPER INDUSTRY

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for insertion at this point in the body of the RECORD and appropriate reference, a resolution that was "unanimously adopted by the New Haven Central Labor Council at its last regular meeting, opposing the absorbing of the radio industry by the newspaper industry"—and I am quoting from the resolution—and urging the adoption of legislation "to prevent"—what is referred to as—"the continuance of this monopolistic trend."

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the present trend in the United States of the acquiring of radio broadcasting stations by large newspapers is a threat toward the control of public opinion and the stifling of controversial issues from an unbiased point of view;

Whereas control of radio stations by newspapers tends to restrict the information offered to the public to that which serves the interest of the newspapers;

Whereas absorption of these radio stations by amalgamation or combining with newspapers is a monopolistic tendency and not in accord with the democratic principles of the United States;

Whereas a distinct threat to democracy in the newspaper-radio combine is apparent when we realize that it is operated for profit and not in the public interest when a conflict between the two arises;

Whereas control of radio by newspapers puts the public in the position of getting only such news which is not influenced by their advertisers, or in any way adverse to their interests;

Whereas control of public opinion through radio and newspapers becomes a dangerous weapon for fascism as was the case in Germany when newspapers and radio stations were combined and used for Nazi propaganda;

Whereas whenever participation by many is replaced by control of a few powerful interests any further advance in radio is apt to be blocked since it may conflict with the profits of newspapers. This will be more and more apparent as television becomes a practical reality: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the New Haven Central Labor Council goes on record as opposing the absorbing of the radio industry by the newspaper industry and that legislation be passed to prevent the continuance of this monopolistic trend. In the interests of democracy, a

free press, and a free radio, such combinations must be dissolved and prohibited in the future if we are to have unbiased, intelligent public opinion in this country which is in the last analysis the basis of all democracy; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the senatorial and congressional representatives from this district as well as a copy to Chairman Fly of the Federal Communications Commission.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1588. A bill for the relief of Charlie Holcomb; with amendments (Rept. No. 690); and

H. R. 1273. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Simon M. Myhre; without amendment (Rept. No. 691).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2772. A bill for the relief of Edwin Foley; without amendment (Rept. No. 692);

H. R. 2875. A bill for the relief of Adelard Demers; without amendment (Rept. No. 693);

H. R. 3173. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Lorraine Novak, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 694);

H. R. 3195. A bill for the relief of Willard Kerr, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 695); and

H. R. 3371. A bill for the relief of the dependents of Dr. Arthur B. Wyse, and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 696).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 248. A bill for the relief of Louis Council; with ar amendment (Rept. No. 697); and

H. R. 2385. A bill for the relief of Nadine Gorman; without amendment (Rept. No. 698).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1355. A bill for the relief of Robert C. Harris; with amendments (Rept. No. 699);

S. 1665. A bill to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer; without amendment (Rept. No. 700);

H. R. 544. A bill for the relief of Rev. C. M. McKay; with an amendment (Rept. No. 701); and

H. R. 2880. A bill for the relief of H. G. Tooley; without amendment (Rept. No. 702).

By Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1313. A bill for the relief of Delores Lewis; with an amendment (Rept. No. 703); and

H. R. 2183. A bill for the relief of Mathilde B. Meister; without amendment (Rept. No. 704).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 929. A bill for the relief of Irving L. Jones; without amendment (Rept. No. 705); and

H. R. 1062. A bill for the relief of the estate of John H. Cathcart; without amendment (Rept. No. 706).

By Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1660. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Minnesota Department of Highways and the county of Crow Wing in Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at Mill Street in Brainerd, Minn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 707).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 1006. A bill to authorize the condemnation of materials which are intended for use in process or renovated butter and which are unfit for human consumption, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 708).

INVESTIGATION OF GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES IN THE OIL INDUSTRY—PETROLEUM RESERVES CORPORATION

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am instructed by the Committee on Commerce to report Senate Resolution 253, providing for an investigation with respect to petroleum resources in relation to the national welfare, with certain amendments thereto. The original resolution provided for a committee of nine to make a complete study and investigation of the petroleum problem, and to recommend a national policy. The resolution, as amended, provides for the appointment of two members from each of four committees, in order to cover jurisdictional questions in the Senate: First, the Committee on Foreign Relations, since the committee to be appointed will deal very much in the foreign field; second, the Committee on Interstate Commerce, which is concerned with transportation; third, the Committee on Commerce, which has had rather plenary jurisdiction of petroleum production; and fourth—and this is the new committee which is introduced because of the extensive studies it has made in the petroleum field in the past 2 years—the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

So, Mr. President, the resolution as now proposed to be amended and recommended by the committee provides for the appointment of two members from each of the four committees and a ninth member to be named by the President of the Senate.

I understand that the resolution, as amended, by the Commerce Committee, will be referred, under the rule, to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report submitted by the Senator from Maine will be received, and, under the rule, the resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONTRACT TERMINATION OF MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Printing I report back Senate Resolution 241, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 241) submitted by Mr. MURRAY, on January 20, 1944, was read as follows:

Resolved, That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Subcommittee on Contract Termination of the Committee on Military Affairs be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said subcommittee during the first session, on S. 1268, a bill to facilitate the termination of war contracts; S. 1280, a bill to provide authority to the Secretary of War to use funds now or hereafter appropriated for adjustment of contracts, and for other purposes; and Senate Joint Resolution 80, a joint resolution to prohibit the use of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee system of contracting in connection with war contracts.

Mr. WHITE. Is the Senator asking for immediate consideration of the report?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator indicate what the resolution is?

Mr. HAYDEN. It authorizes the printing of hearings held before the subcommittee on contract termination of the Committee on Military Affairs. It is a very important subject.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

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

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION — AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUSHFIELD and Mr. WILLIS each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

MISSOURI RIVER PROGRAM—STATEMENT BY GOVERNORS OF MONTANA, NORTH DAKOTA, AND WYOMING

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement submitted today by the Governors of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming to the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives dealing with the development in connection with the Army engineers of an irrigation, reclamation, and power program on the Missouri River.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have listened to Colonel Reber discuss the plans of the Army engineers for the development of the waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries. The plan is too general to permit intelligent comment upon it in any great detail. We believe, however, if carried into effect it will accomplish its purpose, which is to protect the area below Sioux City from all future flood damage.

We note that to secure flood control below Sioux City the Army engineers were compelled to plan the construction of numerous storage reservoirs above Sioux City. These reservoirs have been referred to as multiple-purpose reservoirs. That is, they are to provide space to store floodwaters, which is later to be used for providing a wider and deeper navigation channel from Sioux City to St.

Louis, for irrigation and other purposes, all of which are commendable.

Back in 1902 Congress enacted the Federal Reclamation Act creating the Bureau of Reclamation and assigned to that agency the task of making the old homestead law operative throughout the 17 arid and semi-arid States of the West by providing an artificial irrigation water supply so that 160 acres of land would support a family the same there as in the more humid States of the Nation. The purpose of the homestead law was to open land to production, settle, and stabilize the country and develop it. The Reclamation Act was designed to extend the benefits of the homestead law to the arid and semiarid half of the Nation.

In view of the above it was inevitable that these two agencies of the Federal Government would come into conflict over the use of the waters of the upper Missouri River. Here were two separate Federal agencies working under entirely different basic laws, responsible to separate committees of Congress, and serving conflicting purposes; one seeking to store floodwaters to prevent flood damage and to reserve the water for later use in aid of downstream navigation, the other seeking to store the same floodwaters higher up the streams and tributaries for later use upon the land for the production of crops and the closer settlement of farm homes. To a certain extent one might say that the basic concept by the people living along the more than 2,000-mile course of the Missouri River from its headwaters to its mouth, concerning what constitutes the highest use of its water, is just as divergent as are the views of these two Federal agencies. Because of these divergent views of the people the Army engineers wisely agreed to submit their plan for the use of the waters of this river to the Bureau of Reclamation for comments looking toward a reconciliation of views, or a correlation of plans for an over-all basin-wide multiple-purpose development program which would more nearly satisfy the needs of the entire area. The Army engineers' plan, with the comments of the Bureau of Reclamation, were then wisely taken under advisement by the Bureau of the Budget while en route to this Committee of Congress on Flood Control. The Bureau of the Budget was sufficiently impressed with the comments of the Bureau of Reclamation to request the Bureau of Reclamation to rush to completion their over-all plans for the upper basin of the Missouri River and its tributaries which have been under way for several years and for which some 50 or more independent reports had previously been completed. May 1 was the date set for these two completed reports to be in the hands of the Bureau of the Budget, the administration's only available coordinating agency today.

We who represent the upper basin States of Montana, Wyoming, and North Dakota have believed that this was a fair and equitable procedure, that the two agencies guided by the administration's Budget Director as a sort of neutral referee, and with only a slight delay, could not help but come forward with a compromise that would be fair and equitable to all interests and to all sections of the basin and to the Nation.

Upon arriving in Washington we discover, however, that a third committee of Congress, established to serve another phase of the work of the Army engineers (the Rivers and Harbors Committee) has reported a bill and is seeking a rule to bring it to a vote on the floor of the House. This bill would lay claim to and establish by law such claim, as shown on page 199, paragraph 495, of House Document No. 238, 35,000 cubic second-feet of the 37,600 cubic second-feet which constitutes the total average flow for the last 14 years of the Missouri River at Kansas City, as shown by records of the United States Geological Survey (1929 to 1942, inclusive). We accept this as a coincidence but request that an effort be made to amend that bill to protect the rights of our upper-basin States to an equitable portion of the stream's flow for domestic, irrigation, mining, and industrial purposes.

The Bureau of Reclamation has indicated that there is a minimum of 4,400,000 acres of additional land in the four upper-basin States that should be irrigated, enough to provide family-size farm homes for forty to fifty thousand additional farm families, America's greatest source of strength and self-reliance. This increase of irrigated farm lands would affect our respective States as follows: In Montana it would increase our present irrigation acreage by approximately 1,300,000 acres. In Wyoming, from the upper Missouri alone (the Yellowstone and tributaries) it would increase our present irrigated acreage from 547,000 to 1,147,000 acres. In North Dakota it would increase the irrigated acreage from 17,120 to 1,517,120 acres. Four million four hundred thousand acres of new irrigated land in the upper basin of the Missouri would more than add the production of a new State to that region, but most of all it would stabilize both our population and our production for all time to come and with the incidental power which such a program would develop, considerable industrialization of the area would follow, so that eventually the area could support double, or more, the present population.

We are not opposing the use of a reasonable amount of water for navigation below Sioux City but we are emphatic that the use in perpetuity of 32,000 or 35,000 cubic feet per second out of an average annual flow of 37,600 does not constitute either the most economic or the most beneficial use of such a valuable natural resource. If there could be inserted in the river and harbor bill or this committee should insert in your flood-control bill language which guarantees a certain fair and equitable portion of Missouri River water for upstream consumptive use (an amount which might be agreed upon) and provide further a program for ultimately installing locks and dams so that as upstream demands increased the lock and dam installation program could provide the same or better water navigation with less and less water, thus releasing more and more water for upstream uses, we believe that you would be pointing in the direction of a fair and equitable solution to the problem.

It is apparent to anyone that capital cannot be attracted to the construction of docks, tugs, or barges, or to irrigation works or farm improvements, until a fair, equitable, and permanent division of the use of the Missouri River water has been determined, and we doubt that any division which is not fair and equitable will be permanent.

We urge early conferences between the chairman of the Flood Control Committee, the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. We urge that further effort be made on the part of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation to compose differences looking toward proper amendments to the river and harbor bill.

It is our present purpose to ask the proper committees of Congress to request the Bureau of Reclamation to make their basin-wide report available to the Congress at the same time that their report goes to the Bureau of the Budget, in order to expedite the consideration of the over-all Missouri River program by committees of Congress and the Missouri River States committee.

JOHN MOSES,
Governor of North Dakota.
SAM C. FORD,
Governor of Montana.
LESTER C. HUNT,
Governor of Wyoming.

REGIONAL ECONOMIES AND THE NATIONAL ECONOMY—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Regional Economies and the National Economy," delivered by the Vice President at Minneapolis, Minn., on February 14, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALSH OF MASSACHUSETTS TO LITHUANIAN MEETING AT WORCESTER, MASS.

[Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him to a Lithuanian meeting held in connection with the drive for the purchase of War bonds and the celebration of the twenty-sixth anniversary of the independence of Lithuania at Worcester, Mass., on February 13, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—ADDRESS BY JUDGE ROLAND J. STEINLE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of juvenile delinquency delivered by the Honorable Roland J. Steinle, judge, circuit court, Milwaukee County, Wis., at a meeting of the Child Welfare School Conference, Milwaukee, January 21, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUBSIDY SAVINGS—LETTER BY CHESTER BOWLES

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the subject of subsidy savings written by Hon. Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, and published in the New York Times of February 16, 1944, and an editorial from the New York Times in reply to the letter, which appear in the Appendix.]

WIN THE WAR—POEM BY JAMES PATRICK McGOVERN

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Win the War," composed by James Patrick McGovern, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TUNNELL BEFORE POLISH SOCIETIES AND CLUBS IN DELAWARE

[Mr. WALSH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator TUNNELL before the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in Delaware, at Wilmington, Del., on February 13, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

OIL FOR TOMORROW—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM PHILIP SIMMS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Oil for Tomorrow" written by William Philip Simms, which appears in the Appendix.]

STALIN MAKES THE PEACE TERMS—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY TRIBUNE

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Stalin Makes the Peace Terms" from the Chicago Daily Tribune of February 15, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in the course of yesterday's debate the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] submitted a question regarding the functions of the United Relief and Rehabilitation Administration which bore upon a thoroughly fundamental and important point in connection with it. He asked the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who had the floor at the time, whether there had been any consideration given to using the American Red Cross as the instrumentality for this service. The Senator from Iowa replied:

No such proposal was made at any time when I was present at meetings of the committee.

I think that answer is textually correct; there was no such proposal made. On the other hand, I should not want the record to stand with any implication that that phase of the matter was not at least discussed in the committee. I read from the record of the hearings two or three questions and answers so that the record may be complete, because I think the point raised by the Senator from Tennessee is thoroughly pertinent. In the course of the examination of Assistant Secretary of State Acheson I asked him this question:

Is there any conflict between U. N. R. R. A. and the traditional historical service of the Red Cross?

Assistant Secretary Acheson replied:

Mr. ACHESON. No; I should think clearly there was not. It is possible that there might be in some one phase, but there is not in the conception of this organization. The Red Cross at no time has undertaken, and I think I am correct in saying that it does not wish to undertake, large-scale relief. It is not equipped to do it, and it does not want to do it. What it is interested in is in the medical aspects of relief, the medical services, and the care of children and old people.

Senator VANDENBERG. Would there be any conflict at that point between U. N. R. R. A. and the American Red Cross?

Mr. ACHESON. No; I do not think there would. The U. N. R. R. A. agreement itself provides that any organization working in any territory shall do so with the consent and the approval of the Director General, and it is up to him therefore to get together with all these agencies and work out with each one what its appropriate job is.

Senator VANDENBERG. Has there been any sort of complaint at any time from the American Red Cross regarding the scope of U. N. R. R. A.?

Mr. ACHESON. Not that I know of.

I simply wanted to make the record complete, Mr. President, upon that thoroughly pertinent point.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I should like to ask the Senator if the M. E. R. A. was given any consideration?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator explain those letters so that I may know what he is talking about?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I refer to the Middle East Relief Association.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am unable to say.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to say that it was highly proper to make, and I am very glad that the Senator from Michigan has made, the correction as to any conclusion that might be drawn from the RECORD in my reply to the Senator from Tennessee. As suggested, I simply stated that no such discussion had taken place when I was present, which was true.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, yesterday I listened with a great deal of interest to what my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], had to say in opposition to the pending joint resolution known as House Joint Resolution 192. I say I listened to him with unusual interest because I share in his opinion and because I look upon him at this hour with a great deal of admiration and with entire inspiration, for it has been my observation that on every occasion he has evidenced and demonstrated his interest in America. In other words, I look upon him as one who is more thoroughly interested in America and its future than he is in any other country of the world.

It is refreshing to find myself in the presence of such a man, for the very reason that our Nation seems to be filled with those who are evidently more interested in saving the world than in saving America itself.

Mr. President, I wish to state at the outset, without the slightest hesitation, that I am for America first, and so long as I remain a Member of this body I shall vote the dictates of my conscience as they lead me toward the ultimate interests of this country ahead of the interests of any other country upon the face of the earth.

The Senator from Iowa stated to us yesterday that at the time the vote was taken in the Committee on Foreign Relations upon the pending joint resolution he was 1 member of the committee against 16; in other words, the ratio was 16 to 1, as he expressed it on the floor of the Senate. He was the only member of the committee who voted against reporting the joint resolution. I voted to report it, as the Senator will recall, but at the time I did so I stated to the chairman, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], in the presence of the members of the committee, that I was voting to report the joint resolution to the Senate because I wanted the American people to have the benefit of our discussion in this body in reference to the matter, and at the same time I told the chairman that I reserved the privilege of voting against the joint resolution in the Senate if I so desired.

Mr. GILLETTE. Will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad the Senator from North Carolina referred to the colloquy which took place in the room of the Committee on Foreign Relations, because it occurred just exactly as he has stated. He announced at that time that he would probably oppose the proposal on the floor of the Senate. In referring to the classic ratio of 16 to 1 yesterday I perhaps did an injustice to the eminent Senator by suggesting that he had supported the joint resolution, when he merely supported reporting it to the Senate.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator, but the Senator did not do me any injustice at all.

Mr. President, the joint resolution before the Senate calls for the expenditure of $1,350,000,000. I shall not read or discuss the entire joint resolution. I shall confine my discussion largely to the interests of our country, and to the amount of money which is sought to be appropriated in carrying forward the objectives of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution is entitled, "Joint resolution to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization," and the first paragraph reads as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President such sums, not to exceed $1,350,000,000 in the aggregate, as the Congress may determine from time to time to be appropriate for participation by the United States (including contributions in funds or otherwise and all necessary expenses related thereto) in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, established by an agreement concluded by the United Nations and Associated Governments on November 9, 1943.

Mr. President, I shall vote against the joint resolution. I shall not vote $1,350,000,000 of the money of the taxpayers of the United States of America to be used by any international organization; and this joint resolution, as explained by the able Senator from Iowa yesterday, is not a thing in the world but a measure to formulate an international organization for which, as I say, we will put up all the money.

The time has arrived, the hour has struck, when we must look after our own interests. Every person, soldier and civilian, who today sits in the galleries of the Senate, is interested in this subject, because if the joint resolution shall be enacted, whereby we by our respective votes will appropriate $1,350,000,000 to this international organization, it will mean taking $10 out of the pocket of every man, woman, and child in the United States, and that will be merely the beginning. In other words, I contend that the $1,350,000,000 will mean nothing but an ante in the jackpot.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's trend of thought, but in connection with the statement he just made of the international character of the organization, let me interpolate that the First Assistant Director General to Governor Lehman, I understand, is Sir Arthur Salter, and that the assistant to the Director General for setting up the personnel in the Bureau of Special Areas in the international field, is Mr. Metchnikov, of the Soviet Union. In connection with the statement that Sir Arthur Salter is the First Assistant, and the discussion yesterday as to where relief would stop and rehabilitation and reconstruction start, I think it would be pertinent, and I know the Senator would be interested, to put into the RECORD a brief quotation from a speech made by Sir Arthur Salter just a

few weeks ago to an American group of farmer cooperatives. I do not certify to the accuracy of this quotation because it was handed to me only this morning, but it is as follows:

Whoever relieves will rebuild. Whoever rebuilds will formulate the pattern of government.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very much indebted to the Senator. It is true that when we begin relief, we begin rehabilitation, and when we begin rehabilitation, we confront the question of financing the entire world.

As I stated a moment ago, someone has to be able to say "No." It appears that we are so accustomed to saying "Yes" to appropriations that it is difficult for some of us to say "No"; but, so far as I am concerned, I am saying "No" now. I do not propose to give away any more money that belongs to the taxpayers of this country, money which we will need, and when we make the appropriation of $1,350,000,000 we are merely voting to put the hands of the Treasury of the United States into the pocket of every taxpayer in the United States and take therefrom $10; and that is but the beginning.

Mr. President, who is going to pay for this international organization? The taxpayers of the United States of America. If we do not stop this willful, sinful waste of money which belongs to the American people, the United States will be bankrupt.

Is it true that the United States is going to pay for all of it? Let us see. It is said that 44 countries will participate in this international relief program. I wish to give the names of the 44 countries which are going to participate in it. I obtained them from the report. They are: The Commonwealth of Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, the United States of Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, the French Committee of National Liberation, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Luxemburg, the United Mexican States, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippine Commonwealth, Poland, the Union of South Africa, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Mr. President, we are called upon to pay $1,350,000,000, which is two-thirds of the entire amount to be put up by all 44 nations, and, although we are called upon to put up two-thirds of the money, we have but one-forty-fourth of the total vote in the affairs of the organization. In other words, despite the fact that we are putting up two-thirds of all the money which is to be contributed initially to this world-wide, power-politics international organization, we have but 1 vote out of 44 votes which are to be cast by the Council itself.

Mr. President, I say we are putting up more than two-thirds. Who is going to pay for it all? The United States of America is going to pay for the whole thing, just as the United States of America is paying for the whole war and for the rehabilitation of the whole world. Let us see whether that is so. We have what is called lend-lease. Last night when I left the Senate I called up the Lend-Lease Division of the State Department. I contacted a very courteous gentleman, who very kindly gave me the information I sought—Mr. East, of Lend-Lease, whose telephone number is Executive 7030, extension 707. I asked him to tell me which of the countries that are participating or about to participate in this world international organization were receiving lend-lease from us, and I found that every single one of the 44 countries which are supposed to put up one-third of the money in this international enterprise is today receiving lend-lease money from us.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator would except Canada, would he not? Canada is not receiving lend-lease from us.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am coming to that.

Mr. AIKEN. But Canada is included in the list of 44 countries.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is true. I am coming to that, I will say to the Senator. Every single country of those who are supposed to put up the one-third is receiving lend-lease from us today, with the exception of the Philippine Commonwealth and Canada. Canada, so I have been informed, pays cash for all the stuff she receives from us.

Mr. President, I asked Mr. East about Liberia, and he stated that he did not know whether or not Liberia was receiving any lend-lease, but I understand that Liberia has received several million dollars which we have poured in there by reason of her aid in the war. I therefore argue that we are not only called upon to put up $1,350,000,000 but that we are giving money, we are giving lend-lease, to every single one of the 44 countries, with the exception of Canada.

Mr. President, I am vitally interested now in saving as much as we can of Uncle Sam's money, because I am afraid that one of these days we will wake up and find ourselves a bankrupt nation. At the present time we have a national debt of approximately $300,000,000,000, and I venture to say without the slightest hesitation that within 2 years we will have a national debt of $500,000,000,000. I am anxious to save all the money we can save for ourselves, in order that we may care for our own when the time comes that we must do so, for we shall be called upon to take care of our heroes when they shall have returned from the 72 posts at which they are stationed around the world.

Mr. President, we are now in desperate financial condition. I heard the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate, state on the floor of the Senate the other day that we have not only scraped clean the bottom of the pot, but that we had scraped it clean 100 times. Today we find that all we can raise in additional taxes is a bit over $2,000,000,000, whereas the administration and the Treasury Department have called for the raising of more than $10,000,000,000 of additional taxes. Yet here we are, in the desperate straits in which we find ourselves financially, proposing to give to an international organization, over which we have no direction, 1 percent of our national income.

Mr. President, I am interested in the boys who are to be returned to the United States. Someone said the other day that when the war is over, and when the men and woman in uniform return to American shores, from every part of the world, that for the next 50 years no one will be elected to public office unless he or she has worn the uniform abroad, and that perhaps will be well for the country, since the men and women who in every part of the world are fighting and helping to keep America American, to save America for Americans, are going to make their demands upon this great Nation, and their demands will be based upon their conception of all they believe to be right and for the best interests of the United States of America.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Did I understand the Senator to say that the present national debt was $300,000,000,000?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I say the present national debt and authorizations are in excess of $300,000,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Does the Senator have a break-down of this sum?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No; I do not, but I will be very glad to obtain it for the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I wonder if the Senator would procure the break-down and place it in the RECORD in connection with his remarks?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall be very glad to do so. I refer to total appropriations and authorizations. I repeat that within 2 years perhaps, and certainly before the war shall have ended, we shall have a national debt in excess of $500,000,000,000. What I am interested in is saving something for the men who are fighting to keep America American. What I am interested in is saving something with which to care for our soldiers, sailors, and other members of the armed forces—men and women—all over the world who are fighting to save America.

Let us see, Mr. President. We talk much about the soldiers, we brag of them, we pay high tributes to them; but what I want to do is back up those tributes and back up those declarations by action. By that I mean saving something to care for the men who will be returned to this land blind, armless, legless, maimed, sick, incapacitated, and to care for the widows and the orphans this horrible war has made and will yet make. When we became engaged in this war, almost 25 years after World War No. 1, we did not have enough beds in our hospitals to provide hospitalization for the veterans of World War No. 1. In preparation for this war we have made installation, or at least have planned for the installation, of 100,000 beds in hospitals. I am told that now the program will have to be in-

creased and I surmise it will have to be increased to the extent of providing for the installation of 300,000 beds in our hospitals.

We are voting billions of dollars almost daily, and we speak of billions as we used to speak of millions, until the national debt is rising to such a point that it is becoming dangerous, insofar as perhaps it will be beyond our ability to care for those who will return from the war. Let us see. Today millions of our men and women are in uniform. It will be our duty to care for the sons, the husbands, the sisters, and the wives who are serving our country today and who are in uniform. When they come back hundreds of thousands of them will be maimed, blind, and deranged. It will be our duty to care for those veterans, and it will be our duty to care for those who are made widows and orphans by this war. If we continue spending money as we are spending it now, I wonder how we shall be able to care for men who are expecting us to be able to care for them in their physical misery, and who are expecting us to be able to care for their families when they are no longer able to earn a living for them.

Mr. President, some days ago I talked to Mr. Millard W. Rice, who formerly was legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Today he is national service director of the Disabled American Veterans. I shall read a summary of a statement he made a few days ago before a committee:

> More than 850,000 will be discharged with disabilities as the result of active service during World War No. 2, if the proportions of World War No. 1 are repeated, according to a statement made by Millard W. Rice, national service director of the Disabled American Veterans, recently before the Senate Committee on Finance, and on the basis of the same proportions, 1,250,000 World War No. 2 veterans will be in receipt of pensions for service-connected disabilities by 1970. But, the percentage of service-disabled veterans of World War No. 2 will very likely be more than out of World War No. 1, in view of the fact that World War No. 2 is a tougher and longer war, being fought on many more fronts, with the end not yet in sight. It, therefore, appears not out of reason to estimate that there might be anywhere from 1,250,000 to 2,500,000 wounded and disabled veterans out of World War 2.
>
> Their care will impose a tremendous responsibility upon the Veterans' Administration, which demands an extensive expansion of its facilities. Therefore, the Veterans' Administration ought not to be imposed with the many proposed post-war adjustments for able-bodied veterans. Since first things should be taken care of first, the Veterans' Administration should remain the one governmental agency charged primarily with the responsibility of providing governmental benefits for America's service disabled and their dependents, without also being given the responsibility of providing for the various types of post-war adjustments for able-bodied discharges.

That was a statement by Mr. Millard W. Rice, national service director of the Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. President, I have before me a statement in reference to the subject matter under discussion. I desire to bring it to the attention of the Members of this body. We are perfectly willing to provide the unfortunates of Europe or of any other part of the world with such aid as we may be able to provide. We wish to provide the starving with food; we wish to provide the ill with medicine; we wish to do all we possibly can do for the unfortunates of the world. But we have arrived at the point where it appears to me that the one nation and the one people of all the world who are doing everything for the world are the taxpayers of the United States of America. I think we have done our part; I think we are doing our part; and we have done our part, and have continued to do our part, for a long time past.

Let us see. Not so long ago there were hundreds of organizations in the United States for the purpose of providing relief for Russia, for France, for Poland, for Czechoslovakia, for almost every other country in the world. There were so many such organizations and so much money was being collected from time to time that someone in America suggested that there be organized a similar organization for the relief of Americans themselves.

Only a few days ago I read a newspaper account of a private relief organization in New York which had sent many hundreds of thousands of dollars to Russia, and tons upon tons of clothing, medicine, and other supplies. So, for years past we have been collecting money and sending it to all the other countries of the world, and I think we have done our part insofar as such relief is concerned. We have helped our allies. We are cooperating with our allies. We are bearing more than our share of the war. We are giving our sons, our daughters, and our dogs. Even before we got into the war we gave England a number of destroyers. Even before the declaration of war we sent our sons out of the Western Hemisphere. Even before we got into the war we had men in England, Iceland, and Greenland.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know whether the Senator saw the statement which was published in the newspapers the other day attributed to Mr. Sulzberger, owner and publisher of the New York Times. When the Senator was speaking of lend-lease, I was reminded of that statement. It will be recalled that Mr. Sulzberger, of the New York Times, was one of the most ardent supporters of lend-lease. It will also be recalled that those who were in favor of lend-lease were saying that lend-lease was for the purpose of keeping us out of war. That was said to be the purpose. It was not for the purpose of getting us into war. The other day, in speaking to the Red Cross, of which he is one of the officers, Mr. Sulzberger made the statement that he was one of those individuals who believed that when we enacted the lend-lease law we went to war. He further stated that that was an act of war on the part of the United States.

I should like to have the Senator recall that that was exactly the statement which I made on the floor of the Senate. I said that when we voted for lend-lease we were voting for war. Now we find some of the very persons who were the strongest advocates of lend-lease admitting what I said on the floor of the Senate, that when we voted for lend-lease we voted for war.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very much obliged to the Senator. I saw that statement in the newspapers. In that connection, I recall that when we were discussing lend-lease on the floor of the Senate, before we entered the war, it was said that the purpose of lend-lease was to help Great Britain. I heard the Senator speak on several occasions, and my recollection is that the Senator said that the passage of the Lend-Lease Act was a declaration of war.

I am speaking of aiding those across the water, to show that we have done everything we can. We are giving our sons and daughters. We are giving our blood. We are giving billions of dollars and bankrupting our Nation to help our Allies. There is nothing cheap about us; we are going the whole hog. All we want to know is how far we must follow and what we are to encounter on the road.

I recall that we were called upon to help those across the sea by lifting the arms embargo. That meant that we would be permitted to manufacture guns and place them on ships and put them in the hands of our friends across the seas so that they could kill their enemies. The able Senator from Montana voted against lifting the arms embargo. The able Senator from Montana stated at that time that if we lifted the arms embargo we would be an accessory to the crime; that we would be equally guilty, and equally involved, and that that was the first step toward war. The able Senator from Montana did not want the country to get into the war, and he voted against lifting the arms embargo.

Then came the proposal to repeal the neutrality law. We wanted to help the peoples of the world with whom we were in sympathy. A few months before we had enacted a neutrality law to keep us out of war. Then it was said, "If you will repeal the neutrality law, that will take us away from war." The Senator from Montana said that it would take us another step toward war, and the Senator from Montana voted against the proposal, because he knew that it would lead us to war.

Then came lend-lease. The Senator from Montana said:

> I will not vote for lend-lease, because it is nothing more nor less than a declaration of war. It will take us into war, and we do not want war. We do not want our sons and daughters killed.

The Senator from Montana voted against it. Others said that all those steps were taking us away from war. Well, we are in war.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator will remember Mr. Herbert Agar, who was one of the leaders in the movement in support of the foreign policy of the administration, and one of the strongest proponents of lend-lease. He was also a proponent of the repeal of the arms embargo, and other measures.

Immediately after we enacted the lend-lease law, Mr. Agar made a speech in Boston and he quoted what I had said, and what other Members of the Senate had said. He said that I was correct. Other Senators had said that it was an act of war, virtually a declaration of war. Mr. Agar said that the statement made by those who said that it was for the purpose of keeping this country out of war was wrong, and that they were misrepresenting the facts to the American people. I stated that he said they were misrepresenting the facts. He used even stronger language than that.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very much obliged to the Senator for his observations. I recall the matters to which he refers. I voted against lifting the arms embargo. I believed that such a step was a step toward war. I voted against the repeal of the neutrality law, because I knew it was a step toward war. I voted against lend-lease because I knew it would take us into war. I am glad I voted as I did. I recall that at that time the able Senator from Montana and I were both cussed from one end of the world to the other. We were called Nazis, Fascists, copperheads, appeasers, traitors, and everything else.

Why was the Senator from Montana called all those ugly names? Simply because he voted according to the dictates of his conscience, which led him to believe that those acts were steps toward war. The Senator from Montana did not want us to get into war. I mention that merely to show that we are doing all we possibly can; but we should not pauperize and bankrupt ourselves to help someone else. The time has arrived when we must start voting for the United States of America and quit trying to save the world.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. A short time ago I happened to be at a dinner where a lady said to me, "You talk like an America Firster." I replied, "What are you—an America seconder? It seems to me that you must either be for this country first, or for this country second. Whether you are for this country or for some other country, I am glad to have it said that I am for America first, rather than for America second."

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator very much.

Under the lease-lend operations we have taken from the taxpayers of America billions upon billions of dollars and given them freely to all the nations of the world. I do not hesitate to say that in my opinion we shall never get back a dollar of it. We have given billions upon billions of dollars of the people's money to other nations of the world. We are not "chinchy," we are not cheap; we are very liberal. It seems to me that sometimes we are too liberal with the taxpayers' money.

Furthermore we have put into uniform more than 10,000,000 men and women, who are now scattered throughout the entire world. They are as brave a group of men and women as the world has ever known.

Moreover, labor in this country has produced more during this war than the combined production of the Axis, or the combined production of our allies. We have done the greatest production job that any country has ever done. We have produced more than any other country in the world, or any combination of countries. We have provided ships by the millions of tons, with which to transport food, medicines, munitions, and everything else to our allies. As I stated a moment ago, hundreds of private charities are now in operation, and our generous, big-hearted people are contributing to them from time to time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, the Senator realizes that these exertions of the United States—that is to say, the billions of dollars contributed by way of lend-lease, and the billions of dollars spent by charities in buying goods, which billions of dollars have been contributed during this period, are now counted into the expanded national income in the formula set up by U. N. R. R. A. for the purpose of still further penalizing the United States.

In other words, the formula set up by U. N. R. R. A. is on the basis of a percentage of the national income of each country. Therefore, both things work against us. The expanded national income, by reason of the increased production which we have brought about to give the other countries lend-lease and charity, and also the more favorable exchange position which the United States has come to have by reason of that same operation, give an entirely fictitious national income to the United States in comparison with other nations. So it is my belief that instead of 65 percent of all the world relief, which it has been admitted the United States will bear, we shall be bearing actually somewhat in excess of 90 percent, when we consider the expansion of our national income due to lend-lease and the more favorable exchange position created by the same operation.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very much obliged for the observations of the Senator from Missouri.

As I said a moment ago, in line with what the Senator from Missouri has said, instead of paying two-thirds of the expense we shall be paying about 90 percent of it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERTON in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will permit me one further observation, we are asked to authorize an appropriation of $1,350,000,000. I think most of us realize that that is merely an initial appropriation. While the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] spoke truly yesterday when he said that it is limited by the terms of the measure under consideration to this one appropriation—nevertheless we are being asked to set our feet on a course, and we shall have to pay the whole bill.

I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that if this one initial expenditure of $1,350,000,000 were to be spent in the United States—to use one example, if it were applied to flood control in the Mississippi Valley, it would put the whole valley with all its tributaries beyond the danger of flood. The venture would pay for itself in 8 or 10 years, and render magnificent dividends in perpetuity from then on.

I believe that we owe a certain obligation to feed the desperate people of stricken countries. Nevertheless, when we talk about appropriating $1,350,000,000, and paying approximately 90 percent of the total cost, after all is said and done, we are dissipating a very considerable portion of our national assets.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator very much. I think the Senator and I see eye to eye on this matter. The time has come when we must think at least a little about the United States of America.

In addition to that, let us see what else there is. We are scattering billions of dollars over the face of the earth. The other day a Senator stated that we had put about $6,000,000,000 in Central and South America. Our armies which are now in Europe are buying up millions of tons of foodstuffs and spending millions upon millions of dollars for continued purchasing of foodstuffs for the purpose of feeding civilian populations and taking care of emergencies as they arise. As I have already stated, we now have before us a joint resolution to authorize the appropriation of $1,350,000,000. That would be merely the ante. It would be only the beginning. The next thing will be rehabilitation. The joint resolution evidently means rehabilitation, because the words "relief and rehabilitation" appear in the title.

After that we shall have a world-wide bank. We have about $21,000,000,000 in gold buried in Kentucky. It has been suggested that we organize an international bank, a world-wide bank. That suggestion has been made by many persons across the sea because they want us to set up a bank so that they can all borrow money from us. We shall be called upon to rehabilitate the whole world.

Since this war began many of the countries of Europe have called upon us to help them. Since the war began on September 3, 1939, more than 600,000 aliens from European countries have come into the United States. They have left their native countries, ignored the interests of their nations, and have come to the United States, where they can bask in the sunshine of prosperity and safety instead of staying at home and looking after the interests of their respective countries. Six hundred thousand of them have come over here while our men and women in uniform have gone to their countries to fight over

there for their national interests and the "four freedoms." We have been good to them.

In addition to all that, I read in the newspaper just the other day of the organization of another war relief agency. The Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson; the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau; and someone else constitute a committee of three. As I understand, their proposal is to bring into this country more persons from foreign countries.

In other words, we are pouring money out of our National Treasury, scraping it dry more than a hundred times, as stated by the chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the other day, skyrocketing our national debt to the point where perhaps we will not have money enough to pay pensions to widows, or care for our own armless, legless, and blind soldiers. We are giving our money away and at the same time permitting aliens from all parts of the world to come here and obtain jobs. Whether or not they come in on a temporary visa, once they get here they will never go back, and they will occupy the jobs which our soldiers and heroes of this war should have.

I again assert that the time has arrived for us to speak out in behalf of and in the interest of more than 10,000,000 of our men and women who are now in uniform, even if we do not care anything about the people who are paying the taxes. We should save American jobs for American citizens.

Before we got into this war we said in effect, "It is going to be wonderful." Many friends of mine came from North Carolina to see me. I remember one friend of mine from Greensboro, N. C., who was then with the collector of internal revenue. He called upon me and said, "Bob, I am joining up tomorrow. I will see you in a few months." I said, "How so?" He replied, "Why, we will whip the whole world in 6 months."

We have been in the war more than 2 years and we have not yet got started. We do not know where or when the war will end. We do not know how long it will take. Yet we are being asked to appropriate billions of dollars to be contributed to an international organization which is not under our control.

Consider what is happening in Italy today. After we had won northern Africa and Tunisia we were led to believe that we would sweep Italy without any difficulty whatsoever. We have been marking time there, mired down for weeks, which is attributable largely to the elements, for no braver men ever fought than our men. Consider that General MacArthur issued a statement the other day that winning the war against Japan was not a question of merely jumping from island to island right into Tokyo. We do not know how long the war is going to last; we do not know how many of our sons and daughters are going to be killed and buried beneath foreign soil, thousands upon thousands of miles away from home. We do not know how many thousands of our sons and daughters are coming back deranged, without legs or arms, and of no benefit to themselves or their families, except for their presence. Yet we propose to vote $1,350,000,000, 1 percent of our national revenue, to an international organization.

What about the international organization? I wonder how much it is going to cost. I should like to know something about the administrative expense of it. I asked the able Senator from Michigan yesterday how much Governor Lehman, the Director General, was going to get. He said he did not know and did not care. Well, I do not know, but I do care. Insofar as I am concerned, I want to save every penny we can for the rehabilitation of our boys and girls, men and women in uniform, when they come back, whether it be a year or 5 years from now. I want to have a nest egg for them, and that is why I want to save the money for them, and that is why I want to save the jobs for them.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I hold in my hand the veto message of the President of the United States, dated May 22, 1935, of a bill that was passed by the Congress of the United States, House bill 3896, to provide for the immediate payment to veterans of the face value of their adjusted-service certificates, and so forth. I should like to call the attention of the Senator, if I may, to one or two statements which were made by the President at that time. He said:

> The second "whereas" clause, which states that the payment of certificates will not create an additional debt, raises a fundamental question of sound finance. To meet a claim of one group by this deceptively easy method of payment will raise similar demands for the payment of claims of other groups. It is easy to see the ultimate result of meeting recurring demands by the issuance of Treasury notes. It invites an ultimate reckoning in uncontrollable prices and in the destruction of the value of savings that will strike most cruelly those like the veterans who seem to be temporarily benefited. The first person injured by skyrocketing prices is the man on a fixed income. Every disabled veteran on pension or allowance is on fixed income. This bill favors the able-bodied veteran at the expense of the disabled veteran.
>
> Wealth—

The President said—

> is not created, nor is it more equitably distributed by this method. A Government, like an individual, must ultimately meet legitimate obligations out of the production of wealth by the labor of human beings applied to the resources of nature.

The President of the United States never made a more direct and frank statement than that of the economics of finance.

> Wealth is not created, nor is it more equitably distributed by this method. A government, like an individual, must ultimately meet legitimate obligations out of the production of wealth by the labor of human beings applied to the resources of nature. Every country that has attempted the form of meeting its obligations which is here provided has suffered disastrous consequences.

The President in his veto message then referred to what would happen to the Treasury. He said:

> Some years ago it was well said by the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho that, "The soldier of this country cannot be aided except as the country itself is rehabilitated. The soldier cannot come back except as the people as a whole come back. The soldier cannot prosper unless the people prosper. He has now gone back and intermingled and become a part of the citizenship of the country; he is wrapped up in its welfare or in its adversity. The handing out to him of a few dollars will not benefit him under such circumstances, whereas it will greatly injure the prospects of the country and the restoration of normal conditions."

I cite that to show that at that time the President was worried about the payment of the soldiers' bonus because of the effect it would have upon inflation and the financial condition of the country.

I happened to be a Member of the Senate at that time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Did not the President veto the soldiers' bonus?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, the President vetoed it, and I am reading from the veto message which he sent to the Congress at that time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. He said we did not have sufficient money to pay it, did he not, and that it would create inflation?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; that the bill would create an inflation if enacted at that time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. What amount of money did the bonus involve?

Mr. WHEELER. About $2,000,000,000, as I recall.

I call attention to that fact because at that time we were seeking to pay a contract to the soldiers which we had agreed to pay, but to pay it to them in advance of the time when it matured. That was vetoed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator permit an interruption at that point, with the permission of the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That was justifiable on the ground that the Government had not made the contract until 5 or 6 years after the time when the money was fairly owed to the soldiers. The Government had entered into a contract to pay the bonus at maturity, the provisions of the bill which the Senator is now discussing provided for payment before maturity. If the bonus had been given to the men when they were discharged from the Army, in the first place, the time at which it was fairly owed, a large saving would have resulted.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator for his statement.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator was entirely correct as to the theory on which the President was proceeding, but the actual facts were that the measure which the President vetoed simply brought the contract to maturity at a time before it would have been brought to maturity under the terms of the contract which had been entered into. If the Government had made the contract

at the time it should have entered into it there would have been a very considerable saving.

Mr. WHEELER. I am sure the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from North Carolina will recall the statements made upon this floor and the statements made in the reactionary press of the country to the effect that the payment of the bonus at that time would wreck the country, that to pay the soldiers $2,000,000,000 would cause a tremendous inflation. That was the language used by the press and the President of the United States at that time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, what was the national debt at that time, does the Senator know? It was about $20,000,000,000, was it not?

Mr. WHEELER. As I recall, it was between twenty and thirty billion dollars.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Between twenty and thirty billion dollars?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. President, the bill which was vetoed was to pay a debt which we owed to the soldiers and which we had agreed to pay.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I voted for it, and I voted to override the President's veto.

Mr. WHEELER. So did I.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I wanted the soldiers to have some money then, and it is a good thing the Congress gave it to them then because I am afraid we will not have any left for them in this war.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; if we are going to give the resources of this country away to foreign countries. I want to say that nobody on the floor of the Senate is more in sympathy with the unfortunate people and the refugees of stricken countries than am I, and I am perfectly willing to do whatever is necessary to help rehabilitate those countries and put back on their feet their people who have been ruthlessly driven from their homes by Mr. Hitler and his group. But I say that in doing that we are the trustees of the taxpayers' money. If we give away the substance of the taxpayers and burden the Senator's children and my children, and our grandchildren for the next 150 or 200 years, we will pauperize the American people, we will have to turn to the printing press, as Mr. Roosevelt intimated we would have to do if we gave the soldiers the $2,000,000,000 bonus; or we will have to repudiate our debt, because we will not be able to service it if it keeps on rising by leaps and bounds, as it has been doing.

First, we are to give the President of the United States $1,300,000,000 to be turned over to a group of 44 different countries, to be used as they see fit, when we have only 1 vote in the body, without any strings to it whatsoever; and when they once get it they will have authority, under the proposed legislation, to make contracts and more contracts, and commitments and more commitments, and then they will come back to this country and say, "We have already made these commitments. While you have authorized only $1,300,000,000, you are morally bound, under the provisions of the act, to give us more money and more money and more money to carry out the provisions of the act which you approved."

In the first place, if we are to pass anything at all, we should limit the amount to less than $1,300,000,000, until we ascertain whether that much will be needed. Secondly, we should call on the President of the United States, to whom the money is to be turned over, to make quarterly reports to the Congress as to where the money is being spent and how it is being spent. For Congress just to turn over to any President unlimited sums of money, to be spent as he or someone else he delegates may see fit, would involve a violation of the oath of office which every Senator took to uphold the Constitution of the United States and protect the interests of the people of the United States, when they took their seats in this body.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall not violate my oath.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I call his attention to the fact that under the remarkable set-up proposed, there are managing members and contributing members, and we are to be the principal contributing member, not only the principal one, but the controlling member, in the matter of contributions. It is admitted we are supposed to contribute 65 percent of the expenses of this organization. But other nations, some of which, for very good reasons, are not expected to contribute to the expenses of the operation, are permitted, by paying a modicum of the expenses of administration, to have the same voice in the administration of the fund that we have. For instance, the Russians. I have the very deepest and heartfelt admiration for the military achievements of the Russians. They do not think they should be included as contributing members, and I think there is very much in what they say, that they have a tremendous problem of rehabilitation themselves. They have been through the treadmill, they have been through the fiery furnace, and they say they should not be expected to contribute to the rehabilitation of some of the other countries, but if they should not contribute to the rehabilitation of some of the other countries, why should they have an equal voice with the United States in the administration of the funds by the contribution of a mere million and a quarter dollars to the administrative expenses?

It does not seem to me to be right, in the first place, that all contributing members should have the same voice in the administration, without regard to the amounts they contribute. In the second place, it does not seem to be right that noncontributing members should have the same voice as we, who will probably contribute three-fourths to the whole enterprise before we get through.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very much obliged to the Senator. Of course, some of the countries are making contributions toward the administrative expenses.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think they should put up some of the administrative expenses, but the idea that the United States should have no greater voice in this matter than noncontributing nations seems to me unjustifiable. But after we once enact this proposal, Congress will have really signed off, they will not have much more to do with it, because it will be a commitment, no matter what the distinguished Senator from Michigan said yesterday. Although an American, and a very distinguished American, has been selected to be the head of the organization as an initial proposition, we are to have no more voice in the management of the concern, after contributing $1,300,000,000, than our friends the Russians, who are contributing a million and a quarter to the administrative expenses. That does not seem to me to hold together.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREEN in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I read now the contributions, by percentages, of the various governments to the total amount of $10,000,000, decided on as the necessary administrative expenses:

	Percentage
Australia	1.50
Belgium	1.00
Bolivia	.10
Brazil	1.50
Canada	3.00
Chile	.20
China	5.00
Colombia	.30
Costa Rica	.05
Cuba	.20
Czechoslovakia	1.00
Dominican Republic	.05
Ecuador	.05
Egypt	.70
El Salvador	.05
Ethiopia	.05
French Committee of National Liberation	4.00

Where are they to get the money?

	Percentage
Greece	0.50
Guatemala	.05
Haiti	.05

Haiti will have one vote the same as the United States will have.

	Percentage
Honduras	0.05
Iceland	.05
India	4.00
Iran	.10
Iraq	.10
Liberia	.05
Luxemburg	.05
Mexico	.70
Netherlands	1.50
New Zealand	.30
Nicaragua	.05
Norway	.30
Panama	.05
Paraguay	.05
Peru	.25
Philippines	.05
Poland	1.00
Union of South Africa	1.00
U. S. S. R.	15.00
United Kingdom	15.00
U. S. A.	40.00
Uruguay	.20
Venezuela	.10
Yugoslavia	.70
Total	100.00

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator from North Carolina will permit another interruption, there is nothing in the joint resolution, as I read it, or in the whole set-up, which would prevent the other governments from paying their contributions, if they desire, out of lend-lease funds. We may be paying 100 percent before we get through.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I might state to the Senator, in that connection, that I called up the State Department last night, the lend-lease division, and found that every member of the 44 nations which are supposed to make contributions to relieve the suffering of the world is getting lend-lease, except Canada and Liberia. So, as the Senator has ably stated, these other countries can pay their part out of the money we give them. So we wind up by paying it all, just as we are going to wind up in everything else.

Mr. WHEELER. The following is a provision found in article X as to voting:

> Each member government represented on the Council or on any of its committees or subcommittees shall have only one vote.

In other words we will have the same vote that Nicaragua will have, and the same vote Liberia will have.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In other words, we will have only one vote out of 44.

Mr. WHEELER. Whether we are to contribute all the money, or 40 percent or 60 percent—and I venture the assertion that we will contribute far more than 40 percent, because some of the other countries cannot contribute anything unless the money comes out of lend-lease—the other countries will have just as much to say as the United States when it comes to voting, as to where the money is to be spent, and how it is to be spent.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Absolutely, and I wish to make this further statement to the Senator in reference to the expenditure and distribution of the money: Russia will not be contributing anything in the way of money or supplies which are proposed to be distributed to the unfortunate people involved, as the Senator from Montana understands. Russia is simply aiding by way of contributing toward the administrative expenses. If the Senator will bear with me a moment, I believe I shall be able to show him that most of the money in question will go to Russia; that none of it will go to the Philippines. The Philippines are now under the direction of the Japanese. Neither is there mention of Singapore, Malaya, Java, Sumatra, Bali or China. None of those places or countries are mentioned. All the proposed aid is intended for relief in Europe. Who is going to have charge of Europe? The Senator from Montana knows who will have charge of Europe after the war is over.

Mr. WHEELER. Does anyone question who will control or dominate Europe after the war is over?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly Russia is going to dominate Europe.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Stalin is going to own all of Europe and control all of Asia. He has already said he is going to take part of Finland, part of Poland, part of Rumania, and all of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Bessarabia. We know that one of the difficulties in Italy today arises from the fighting and the intrigue which is going on between the Fascists and the Communists over who shall have control after the war. One of the great troubles we find in Yugoslavia today, according to all reports we receive, results from the fact that the Communists and the Fascists there are at outs with one another. They are now fighting over who is to control Yugoslavia after the war, the Fascists or the Communists. It will all wind up in Mr. Stalin having control of all of Europe and there will be a renewal of the revolution in Spain after Franco is knocked off. Russia will have control of all of Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Greece.

All the money it is now proposed that we provide will go to those countries. That is one danger about the matter. To whom will the money be given? It must be distributed over there. With whom will those who will distribute the money side? When it comes to dealing with Yugoslavia are those who have the matter in charge going to side with the young king's friends or with Mr. Stalin's representatives? The relief administration we are considering is one of the greatest instrumentalities of power politics we can possibly place in any one's hands.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not think we will have much to say respecting who will control Europe after the war is over. At this time it is very difficult to predict who will control Europe. But when we think of all the suffering there will be after the war is over we may reasonably conclude the chances to be that Russia will dominate Europe.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. WHEELER. I am opposed to the Fascists or the Nazis controlling Europe, but I also dislike to see the Communists run Europe. What I should like to see set up in Europe is some form of a united nations of Europe which would be based upon a democratic form of government similar to the one we have in the United States of America. I think it should be the aim of the United States to try to bring about some form of a united states of Europe, or at least something along that line, after the war is over. But I doubt whether we will have very much to say about the matter, because I think the actions of Russia heretofore have indicated both to Mr. Churchill and to the United States that Russia is going to pursue a course which she thinks is in her best interest, and that she is going to tell us in so many words that it is practically none of our business what position she takes with reference to Finland, Poland, and other countries. If that takes place, there may be some persons who will want to go to war with Russia before this thing is over; but, so far as I am concerned, I shall be just as jealous to keep our country out of war with Russia after the present war is over as I was in trying to keep the country out of the present war before we got into it. If Russia dominates Europe, which I think she will to a very large extent, there will be those in this country who will want us to go to war with Russia, but I shall not be one of them.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not know about that. I think many persons who were crying, "War, war; let us go to war," before we went into this war, have had a bellyful of it. When we get through with this war, and have hundreds of thousands of our soldiers killed, and millions of them wounded, and not enough hospitals to take care of them, and when the country has no money with which to take care of them, and when our people will be broke, as they will be, and sick at heart because of the loss of our loved ones who are buried in the cold soil of foreign countries—then, Mr. President, I think those who were yelling, "War, war; let us have war," will have had a bellyful.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I think that before we get out of the international mess in which we find ourselves the American people will come back to good old American nationalism. By that I mean that they will come back to thinking about their own soil.

We hear a great deal about rehabilitating the world, and what we are going to do after the war, and all this and that. What I should like to hear from some of the candidates for President is their pronouncement with respect to what their position is concerning world affairs. I think the candidates for President should let the people know where they stand with respect to international matters, and let the people know where we are now, and what our position is with respect to the rest of the world. Let us ask of each of the candidates, "Are you an American nationalist? Are you first for America? Are you first for your own country, or are you going to think about other countries first, and after that be for your own country?"

We ought to have a show-down between the interventionists, the internationalists, the world "globalonyists" and starry-eyed pinks, all that crowd, and the America firsters and American nationalists.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator means those who are for America first and those who are for America second?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. President, I shall conclude in a moment. I wish to read something which John Marshall said:

> When our own people are free from poverty and want and malnutrition it will be time enough to begin to plan to permanently suckle the world at the expense of American taxpayers.

He also very rightfully said:

> The power to tax is the power to destroy.

Thomas Jefferson, who lived in Virginia and about whom we hear a great

deal, but whose principles are not very widely followed or practiced, said:

It is the duty of the people to support the Government. It is not the duty of the Government to support the people. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of taking care of them, they must become happy.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Practical Help—or Sappy Sentiment?" The one who sent it to me did not say in what newspaper it was printed.

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

PRACTICAL HELP—OR SAPPY SENTIMENT?

"Hottentot Internationalism" is the apt label that William P. Witherow, chairman of the board of the National Association of Manufacturers, pinned on all those schemes to leave a bottle of milk on the doorstep of every house from northwest China to Spitzbergen.

This Hottentot internationalism, for which the American taxpayer will be asked to sweat out the money, is also the emotional base of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, which is beneficent and humane in purpose, but which will, like so many beneficent and human contraptions of squandermaniacs and professional do-goodies, in the end make millions of Europeans and Asiatics dependent on our Treasury indefinitely.

In plain English, Hottentot internationalism will tend to make what is known as bums out of millions of persons who if left to themselves after the war might learn how to scramble to their feet in the pre-New Deal American way.

THE MEANING AND DANGER

Mr. Witherow expounded the meaning and the danger of Hottentot internationalism in these words in one of the liveliest and most unusual of the speeches made before the recent second war congress of American industry of the National Association of Manufacturers:

"Our compassion for a war-torn world should not fail to draw the line between sane benevolence and maudlin sentimentalism. Beyond that line lies the policy of Hottentot internationalism.

"A perpetual policy of free hand-outs for the world is not benevolence. It is a weakness—and of a dangerous sort. Sound charity stops at the point where it ceases to strengthen the recipient and encourages indolence. He who doles out charity beyond that point is not only deceiving himself, but he is cheating the one he thinks to help. And that is equally true whether the object of spurious charity be a sidewalk panhandler, a great nation, or a Hottentot.

"There are some who cling to the theory of Hottentot internationalism as our post-war policy. Although unfair, both to the American people and to the people it would pauperize, this attitude is still evident in some places."

It is evident in a good many places in the Washington regime.

In fact, this Hottentot internationalism seems to occupy the minds of almost every bureaucrat, Treasury bagman, and world superstater in the National Capital.

It is all a part of the "mammy government" which they have partly succeeded in palming off on us in the last 10 years.

The U. N. R. R. A. is merely the N. R. A., Tugwellism, Ickesism and Hopkins' and Wallace's crackpotism played on world scale.

OUT TO REHABILITATE THE WORLD

They are out to rehabilitate the world, while it is America alone that should be the first thought of professional weepers over the pantless Hottentots.

Mr. Witherow in the following defines the difference between maudlin sentimentality and practical philanthropy:

"Practical-minded Americans can see that the answer to the problem of the Hottentot is not to deliver a quart of milk to his doorstep every morning. The real answer is to help him find the way to a better life. Don't try to give it to him. Convince him of the value of effort, of the need for gathering a few more coconuts, and then buy these coconuts from him. Establish enterprise and trade. Then he can buy a cow of his own. With his cow and a few rhythmic motions he can be his own milkman. And instead of waiting for the international milkman—Uncle Sam—he can have not only a quart a day but a gallon a day."

In a word, let us help Europe and Asia get on their feet by pointing out to them that they have feet—that is, the will to come back by their own efforts.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD an article by a well-known writer, Mr. Benjamin de Casseres, entitled "That Is an American."

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

Books, magazines, the mouths of foreign lecturers, the editorial pages of newspapers, and the radio are cluttered up telling us who the Russians, the Chinese, the Germans, the Italians, and a dozen or so other peoples are and what their particular "cultures" and political "ideologies" should mean to us. They work like riveters on our skulls.

This knowledge may have a certain value. But isn't it time for the whole world—and some millions of Americans included—to find out—

WHAT IS AN AMERICAN?

St. John de Crevecoeur, a Frenchman who settled in America in the eighteenth century, was the first man to ask—in 1782—that overwhelmingly vital question in these words:

"What, then, is the American, this new man?"

In 1782 De Crevecoeur could not answer that question definitely, or he was too near the making of that new man—the American.

But today, 161 years afterward, I will undertake to reply to De Crevecoeur's question.

The American:

He feels the emotion of mental, moral, spiritual, and physical liberty in every corpuscle and atom of his body all the days of his life—

So much so that he would rather live on one meal a day and have freedom of speech and pen than have three meals a day and be enslaved.

He feels walking about in his soul the living spirits of Washington, Jefferson, Paine, and Lincoln on the political level and Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry D. Thoreau, and Walt Whitman on the literary-philosophical level, and he partakes of their doctrine of rugged pioneer individualism with the same exaltation of spirit that those seven mighty new men announced it.

THAT IS AN AMERICAN

Knowing the immemorial crimes of the state and the crimes of a myriad of European and Asiatic rulers against the body and soul of the individual man and woman, he regards the state and all its blandishments and bribes for the purpose of absorbing him into its diabolic maw of suspicion—to say the least.

He sees in all forms of collectivism the enemy of his body and soul and of the United States, in whose traditional roots of individual liberty he lives.

In holding to his deeply grounded instincts and ideas and in clinging tenaciously to his Fourth of July emotions, he cannot be moved by sneers and epithets like "horse-and-buggy" and "reactionary."

THAT IS AN AMERICAN

He is suspicious of any political or social idea that comes from Europe, whether it is labeled Lenin, Hegel, Marx, or Beveridge, that does not give him more liberty.

He knows that no idea that will make him a freer man politically and socially ever has, or ever will, come out of Europe.

THAT IS AN AMERICAN

He believes in his own unique destiny.

He believes that the grandeur and safety of his future lie in projecting himself along the routes of his past.

He combats with voice, pen, and vote all the alien-minded forms of public parasitism that are infecting the United States, whether they are called communism, fascism, state socialism, New Dealism, technocracy, or Beveridgeism.

He knows they are strangling hands out of Europe's and Asia's million-year-old charnel houses of war, slaveries, and tortures.

He wars on them—peaceably if possible, physically if necessary.

THAT IS AN AMERICAN

He believes in tolerance. But he is intolerant of all groups—Fascist, Communist, Socialist—whose very existences depend on the extermination of all opponents.

He believes in equality before the law, but opposes tooth-and-nail all forms of artificial legalized equality created by demagogues for the purpose of pulverizing 135,000,000 persons to a common Marxian level.

THAT IS AN AMERICAN

He is the foe of New Deal bureaucracy, which he knows is a form of superconstitutional government which will, in the end, wind up in a master bureaucrat—a dictator.

He opposes with all the pride, dignity, and self-reliance of a deep-soil native of this land all doles, hand-outs, cradle-to-grave security bribes—except to the helpless, the sick, the incapacitated, and the congenital, incompetent bum.

He will never give up his right to criticize any public official, from the President down, either in war or peace.

He walks upright, fearlessly, eye-to-eye, belonging to a people that was the first on the planet to do so.

His spine was not made to crook or his knees for crawling before those in power.

He is self-made—that is, no political or ecclesiastical power molded him against his will.

THAT IS AN AMERICAN

He is for free enterprise, which is a right implied in every line of the Constitution, and is the very breath of article 1 of the Bill of Rights.

He believes in competitive business and personal rivalries, in emulation, and in contest as a spur to better and greater accomplishments. And the sharper the rivalries the better.

He believes in a reasonable protective tariff, as Jefferson and Hamilton did, to protect his high level of living against foreign coolie levels.

THAT IS AN AMERICAN

He fights and sweats out taxes today to maintain this new kind of country—a country toward which all people's hands are pathetically stretched and toward which nearly all governments have their prehensile "pickers and snatchers" moving.

He is not fighting for Russia, for China, for England, or for France.

He is not fighting to dissolve himself in a fetid international witches' cauldron called a "world state."

He is not a "citizen of the world."

He is not going to transport his American sovereignty to the Kremlin or to Downing Street or to Geneva or to Chungking.

He is for America first—always.

THAT IS AN AMERICAN

He remains seated with the founding fathers in Independence Hall and in Constitution Hall.

He remains a nationalist.

He spurns internationalism as a device to pick his pocket and to gag his mouth and paralyze his pen.

He is a self-determined, aggressive, ever-watchful being, suspicious and cynical of all that Europe and Asia promise us.

That is a United States American; that is a Yankee Doodle American.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wish to conclude by saying that I shall vote against the pending measure because it provides for an international organization, and that we shall have practically no say about the conduct of its affairs. When the proper time comes I shall submit a number of proposed amendments to the joint resolution. I propose to amend it by reducing the appropriation from $1,350,000,000 to $350,000,000.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Montana a question, with his permission.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Yesterday reference was made to resolution No. 12, on page 40 of the pamphlet entitled "First Session of the Council of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration." Paragraph 5 of resolution No. 12, which was particularly referred to, I now read:

5. It is recommended that in cases where home production exceeds home consumption, the Government or recognized national authority concerned should take all steps necessary to enable the excess of production available in a country to be put at the disposal of other liberated areas which may need such supplies to cover their deficits.

With that in mind, I should like to make an observation, and then ask a question. We are to contribute approximately 60 or 65 percent, I think, of the fund; at least our contribution is to be in the amount of $1,350,000,000. What authority will determine whether we have a surplus of production? If the authority set out in the resolution determines that we have a surplus of production, if it makes the determination in good faith, and if this particular organization constituted of 44 members, or some subcommittee thereof is the legal authority what would there be to prevent this organization from coming into the United States now, immediately after it is set up, and becoming a competing organization along with Lend-Lease and other agencies to purchase foods which we badly need in this country, especially for our armed forces?

I ask that question for the reason that the Senator from Montana made some remarks yesterday about that phase of the subject when the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] was speaking on the joint resolution. As I recall, paragraph 5 of resolution No. 12 was brought into the discussion, and the Senator from Montana made some reference to it.

The thing I am concerned about is this: We debated for several days the matter of consumer subsidies, because some felt strongly they would inflate prices. One of the organizations which has taken a great deal of our food and which has helped to inflate prices in this country has been the agency created under the Lend-Lease Act. Would not the force and effect of the creation of the agency proposed under the pending joint resolution be to place another competing agency in the field? If the new agency spent $1,350,000,000, would not that in reality reduce our agricultural program of approximately $8,000,000,000 nearly one-fourth? If that be true, it could create a hardship upon the consuming public in this country, and, in reality, we would be subsidizing the United Nations of the world, instead of helping our people at home.

If the statements I have just made throw any light on the question I should like to have the Senator from Montana answer. My question is asked in the light of the explanations made. I should like to have the Senator's reaction to the statements I have made and the questions I have asked.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, paragraph 5 of resolution No. 12 reads as follows:

5. It is recommended that in cases where home production exceeds home consumption, the Government or recognized national authority concerned should take all steps necessary to enable the excess of production available in a country to be put at the disposal of other liberated areas which may need such supplies to cover their deficits.

I assume that what is being referred to there is some liberated country which may have an overproduction or a production which exceeds its home consumption, and the thought is that such surplus should be used in other countries which do not have a surplus. It seems to me that other constructions could be put upon that language, however, since it is so broad that it could be interpreted in various ways. Nevertheless, that is the construction which I should say any reasonable body would place on it.

However, when we read paragraph 1 of resolution No. 12, on page 40, we find that it provides in part as follows:

1. Rehabilitation supplies are to consist of materials, such as raw materials, machinery, and spare parts needed to enable a recipient country to produce and transport relief supplies for its own and other liberated territories.

What does that mean? It means that the group to be formed under the joint resolution could buy machinery in one country and could set it up in other countries for use in those countries. If we examine the operations under lend-lease, the provisions of the Lend-Lease Act, and if we consider the amount of money we are furnishing through lend-lease to other countries at the present time, we find that far more of it is going for other things than for war purposes; a far greater proportion is going, not for war, but for post-war uses.

For instance, I happen to know the president of a certain company in this country. He told me that his company—I will not give the exact figures—was sending to a certain country more than three-quarters of a billion dollars worth of equipment which was to be used, not as war materials, but for post-war rehabilitation, for the building of machinery and other articles to be used after the war.

Mr. President, perhaps my view is too narrow, and perhaps I am too old-fashioned. Of course, as I said earlier today, I greatly sympathize with the poor, unfortunate people of the invaded countries who are being driven from their homes and are being persecuted. In 1936, I returned from Europe and denounced Hitler for the persecution of the Jews that was occurring in Germany. I denounced him for it on many public platforms in this country. I have denounced the persecution of the Catholics in Mexico, and I have denounced every persecution of any class of people in any country on the face of the globe. But there comes a time when there is a limit to what the United States of America can give away for charitable or other purposes without dragging the great mass of the people of the United States down to a point where they will become beggars and paupers.

In this country there are some persons who think far more of Russia than they do of the United States. There are some persons who think more of some other country than they do of the United States of America, and all they are thinking about is how to get money out of the Treasury of the United States to send it to some other country.

I say the time has come in the United States of America when the American people should demand of their representatives in the Halls of Congress that they put a stop to the wasteful and extravagant spending of money and the throwing of it away and the dumping of it across the ocean, when the result will be to ruin our own country.

Perhaps I may tell a story I heard the other day about two black-face comedians. One of them said, "You know, I have just been studying my history. You know, I just learned something about George Washington."

The other man said, "What was it?"

"Well," the first one said, "you know who George Washington was; don't you?"

"Why, of course. He was the Father of his Country."

The first man said, "Yes; and he was also the first President."

"That is right," the other one said.

"But," the first one said, "I will tell you something you didn't know." He said, "He took a silver dollar and threw it across the Rappahannock River."

The other fellow said, "Oh, that's nothing. We have got people now who have picked up the whole damn Treasury and thrown it across the Atlantic Ocean." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I intended to vote for the pending measure until it was explained yesterday by the senior Senator

from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. I think he rendered a great service to the Senate and to the people of the country when he explained the measure to the Senate. After listening to his explanation of it, I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that, so far as I am concerned, I owe a duty to the American people to vote against turning over $1,350,000,000 to an international organization over which we shall have no control and in which we shall have only one vote, although we are asked to contribute more than 60 percent of the funds which will be given to that organization, to be spent as that group, composed of representatives of the various nations who are contributing practically nothing to it, says they shall be spent.

Will we receive any credit for it? Not at all. The people of the United States will not receive the credit for it. In my judgment, when the people of this country come to their senses and realize what is being done, when they realize that we are taking out of the pockets of every man, woman, and child in the United States $10 to start with, and perhaps much more, we shall find an aroused public opinion in the United States which will condemn every Member of the Senate, which is so recklessly throwing away the money of the American people and spreading it to the four winds.

The American people are extremely sentimental. They are extremely sympathetic. In time of need they have come to the rescue of the people of every other country in the world. But, Mr. President, they have spent that money themselves. They have turned it over to the Red Cross or have given it directly and said, "Here is a gift." Never before in history have they turned money over to a group of nations without having anything to say as to where it is to be spent or how it is to be spent.

I have great respect for Governor Lehman. I think he is a great executive and a fine man. I also have great respect for our representative in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization. But I repeat that in my judgment we are taking a step which will result in every Member of the Senate who votes for it living to see the day when he will regret voting to turn $1,300,000,000 over to foreign groups to spend as they will without any control by the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the able Senator for his answer to my question. I should like to ask the Senator to answer another question.

Mr. WHEELER. I shall be glad to answer it if I can.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not hear all the discussion between the able Senator from Montana and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] yesterday afternoon; but as I have studied the joint resolution I have been interested to know what the Senator's view is with respect to the restricted authority granted in article V, subparagraph 1, on page 12. Does the Senator feel that that provision satisfactorily limits the authority granted in article I, subparagraph 1, which reads:

> The Administration shall have power to acquire, hold, and convey property, to enter into contracts and undertake obligations, to designate or create agencies and to review the activities of agencies so created, to manage undertakings and in general to perform any legal acts appropriate to its objects and purposes.

The distinguished Senator from Wyoming felt that paragraph 1 of article V on page 12 restricted the amounts which might be appropriated and the contracts which might be entered into under the provisions of article I, subparagraph 1. Does the Senator care to express an opinion on that subject?

Mr. WHEELER. I am sorry I cannot agree with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. I am giving only a curbstone opinion, because I have not looked into the question closely; but I am convinced that under that provision the R. F. C. could lend money to this organization without coming to the Congress. We have given the R. F. C. the broadest kind of power to lend money to organizations of all kinds. I call attention to the fact that Mr. Morgenthau has a stabilization fund of $2,000,000,000, which he can spend in almost any way he desires. Why it was expressed in this language I do not know; but certainly before any money is spent it ought to be expressly stated in plain language that the Administration must come to the Congress of the United States.

The Senator from Nebraska knows, as do all other Senators who have had dealings with the bureaus and departments of Government, that once we give them power in loose language, they go far beyond the intention expressed by the Congress. That is true not only of this administration but of every administration. It has been true as long as I have been a Member of the Senate. We cannot be too careful about expressly stating our intentions in the simplest language so that there can be no question whatsoever about them.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I asked the question because of the experience we have had in the payment of consumer subsidies. I cannot find anywhere in the statute books the authority for such payments. This administration pays consumer subsidies. I do not believe it has the authority to do so.

Is there any doubt that a constituted authority—whether it be the R. F. C. or some other governmental agency—may be able to circumvent Congress? Should we not make plain our intention? If there is any agency in our Government from which the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization can obtain money to fulfill a contract which it enters into, which exceeds the authorization of $1,350,000,000, it seems to me that it ought to be made clear that the only constituted authority to which it can go for an additional appropriation for an unfulfilled contract which may require more money than is allocated, is the Congress of the United States. If the administration feels that it is legal to pay consumer subsidies, as it is doing today without authority, will it not exceed the authorization of $1,350,000,000 if it chooses to do so? I do not see any difference between a United Nations subsidy and a consumer subsidy here at home. If the organization can go to some agency other than Congress and obtain money which is not appropriated by Congress, we are indirectly granting larger appropriations to the organization than the limitation in article V on page 12.

Mr. WHEELER. I invite attention to a statement which has already been mentioned today by the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. The statement was made by Sir Arthur Salter in a recent speech to the cooperatives. He said:

> Whoever relieves will rebuild, and whoever rebuilds will formulate the pattern of government.

This organization of 44 governments or authorities is to do the relieving. Russia will play a dominant part. Great Britain will play an important part, and we shall have 1 vote. If what Sir Arthur Salter says is true, that whoever relieves will formulate the pattern of government, what kind of a pattern of government will be set up in Europe after this war? Who will set up the pattern of government? I cannot believe that any Member of the Senate, under existing conditions and circumstances, can come to any other conclusion than that Russia will dominate Europe after this war is over. Some say that Russia will be so busy rehabilitating her own country that she will not be interested in other governments, and will not need to be interested in them.

With the poverty and misery which will exist in Europe after this war is over, what kind of a government will appeal to the masses of poverty-stricken people? Will they turn to the Government of the United States, or to Great Britain, which has been bombing them? Russia has not been bombing them. Or will they turn to the people who have been successful in resisting the Nazis, a people who believe in communism, which appeals to the masses of the people in their misery? Anyone in his right senses who knows anything about the psychology of the masses of the people of the world under such conditions must realize that Russia will dominate those countries. We shall probably rehabilitate them.

I am in sympathy with efforts to rehabilitate the starving people of stricken countries, whether they are to be dominated by Russia or by some other country, or some other form of government. However, I believe that the proposal before us is a blank check. My Republican friends have been out on the stump. Time and again they have criticized Democrats for giving blank checks to the President of the United States, and yet Republicans rise on the floor of the Senate and say that we ought to give a blank check, not to the President of the United States, but to a foreign group over whom we are to have no control.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have heard the Senator from Montana speak, and I did not intend to interrupt him. Like some bodies which have movement, he gets worse the farther he goes.

Mr. President, this is not a blank check to anybody. It is delimited as to amount, and it is delimited as to authority in as clear-cut language and fashion as we knew how to delimit it.

I do not care to comment especially on the other general remarks of the Senator from Montana. He has said that he is in sympathy with the liberated peoples. However, they cannot eat sympathy. Sympathy smells good, but it is not sustenance; it is not nourishment. The liberated peoples cannot eat sympathy. They cannot wear sympathy.

A little later in this debate I shall point out to Senators who are contending that we have no control over the organization, that I have a solution for that difficulty. The solution which I would suggest is merely to tell the other nations to get out of the way and let us operate the organization. We will furnish all the money and all the officers, and we will have absolute control. That is what we did in the First World War. Later in the debate I shall place in the RECORD facts showing that instead of $1,350,000,000, which it is now proposed to appropriate, in the First World War we spent $2,600,000,000, practically all of it out of our own pockets. If Senators would prefer to return to that sort of procedure and not cooperate with other nations, very well.

The value of the cooperation of other nations lies not so much in the amount they contribute as in their interest and obligation wherever they are able to do so, to rehabilitate themselves and provide relief for themselves. One of the cardinal principles of this organization is to urge and stimulate them to do so.

I did not wish to take up the Senator's time, but I could not resist the temptation at this point to express my views.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to refer to what the Senator from Montana said in his concluding remarks with respect to Republicans who are now supposed to be approving blank checks. The remark must have referred to me because I am the only Republican who has risen to discuss this matter. I should like to say to the Senator from Montana that I have spent the last 6 months on the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee in trying to make sure that this will be no blank check. If he will compare the original agreement with the agreement which is now before the Senate he will find the present net result so totally different that he will, I am sure, on reflection, be inclined to say that the Republican Senator to whom he referred had done a pretty good job in seeing to it that this is no blank check. The best proof which I can give the able Senator from Montana that it is not a blank check is the language of Assistant Secretary of State Dean Acheson himself, which I again repeat in one sentence:

> Congress would have complete power at any time to stop its contributions or to lay down the conditions as to their uses.

When I have achieved a concession from the representative of the Department of State that his power under this grant is limited as the language which I have quoted indicates, I respectfully submit to my able friend from Montana that it is no blank check which I have recommended.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know anything about the work the Senator from Michigan has done, but I am sure he has worked hard and worked sincerely. Let me say with all due respect to him—and I have a great respect for him and I am personally fond of him—that I still contend that what we are asked to do is to give a blank check to the President of the United States When the Senator says it is not a blank check, I assert that, while the amount is limited, a blank check is being given to this organization so that it may spend the money anywhere and in any way it may wish to spend it.

Does the Senator from Michigan think for one moment that the statement made by Dean Acheson is binding?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly, I do.

Mr. WHEELER. Bless my soul, I have seen many persons come to Congress from various governmental departments, as have other Senators, and have heard them make statements as to what the policies were. I can cite the Senator to statement after statement made with reference to the policies of nearly every bureau, and we have seen the bureaus do exactly the opposite of what their representatives had told us would be done.

When the question of subsidies came before Congress, and we passed a bill granting subsidies, it was stated that subsidies would be given only for—what? Only for the producer in cases where there had not been sufficient production in this country to take care of the war needs. When I contended that the money would be given to the processors, distinguished Senators stood on the floor of the Senate and said, "Oh, no, not at all; that is not the purpose of it. It is to be used solely to be paid to producers." It was said that the processors and packers would be used as the agents of the Government of the United States, and that the subsidy would be passed on to the producer and the stock grower. I submit that there is not a stock grower in the United States of America who has received the subsidy, but instead it has gone entirely to the processor.

In reference to the F. C. C. legislation and S. E. C. legislation, if the Senator from Michigan will read the record of what the representatives of those organizations stated they would do, and then will recall what they later did, he will agree that such statements were not binding on the organizations. Therefore, I contend that the statement of the representative of the State Department—with all due respect for his honesty and sincerity—is not binding on Congress.

I object to accepting as binding the statement of an individual who comes before one of the committees and agrees that his statement is what counts. What counts is what is written into the law, and how plainly it is written into it by the use of simple language, so that even the Supreme Court of the United States cannot misconstrue it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will indulge me for just a moment, the Senator from Montana does not need to waste any time in trying to prove to me that we have a slippery administration downtown.

Mr. WHEELER. It is not only true of this administration, but it was also true of the departments in Mr. Hoover's administration; it was also true in Mr. Coolidge's administration, and God knows it was true in Mr. Harding's administration, which was one of the most corrupt administrations the country has ever known.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator's precedents are now running into ancient history, which could be amplified in a bipartisan sense. The exhibits which he has presented here were all connected with the existing practice of the present administration. I could add several other exhibits to sustain and fortify the point which he has made. What I am saying to him is that that is precisely the reason why, so far as I was able to do so, I spent 6 months on the Foreign Relations Committee in trying to tie the language down in such a way that impositions on the congressional appropriating powers would not be possible under this grant.

I respectfully submit to the Senator from Montana that if he will study the entire resolution and the total hearings, and if he will contemplate the language in article V and article VI of the agreement which specifically limits our obligation not to this authorization but to the appropriations which are ultimately specifically to be made by Congress, which can be made under any limitations which Congress wishes to attach to the appropriations, he will agree that there is not even a remote parallel between the blank check he has talked about, which I as cordially condemn as does he, and what is contemplated under the present circumstances, which is not anything like a blank check.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. If I have followed the Senator from Michigan correctly, the first agreement which was submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee, or which was called to its attention, was not at all in accord with the ideas of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct; nor with the views of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then a subcommittee was appointed, was it not, to go into the matter and that subcommittee, as I understand, had a great deal to do with the present text of the agreement?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. After the text of the agreement had been worked out, did the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee then assure the President of the United States, who, I understand,

signed the agreement on behalf of the United States, that the agreement was satisfactory to the subcommittee?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I cannot speak for the whole subcommittee, but, as one member of the subcommittee, I shall regretfully have to say to the able Senator from Utah that I had no hospitality at the White House for about 10 years; I have not been in contact with the distinguished President of the United States and I can give him no information whatever on that aspect of the affair.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Senator have any information as to whether or not that information did go to the President through the chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have no information whatever on the subject. All I know is that the ultimate agreement was approved by the State Department, which speaks for the executive arm of the Government in relation to this measure, and it was approved by the subcommittee, and it was approved by the full committee by a vote of 16 to 1.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, when I took the floor I did not intend to become a referee, so to speak, between Senators in this debate, but I want to thank them all for their contributions. And now that the senior Senator from Michigan is here I should like to get some information from him.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What does the Senator mean by that? I have been on the floor continuously in this debate.

Mr. WHERRY. I mean the Senator was not here when I questioned the senior Senator from Montana. What I am interested in particularly is the limitation of authority. The able Senator from Michigan, is present on the floor, I suppose, is present as much or more than any other Senator on either side of the aisle; and I should like to have his opinion as to the limitation of authority.

I got from his very forceful presentation yesterday, which I appreciated very much, that in the final analysis the way to control the thing is to limit the appropriations. I agree with him in that respect; but, after all, I think that the incident cited by the senior Senator from Montana is a parallel case, for if we have to resort to control of appropriations, then the administration can run around the Congress of the United States, and can get the money for contracts to which they have pledged their name by coming to the constitutional body, the Congress, for the money. That is my opinion, and in that connection I cite the illustration offered by the senior Senator from Montana, there is no authority on the statute books for the administration to pay a consumer's subsidy, and yet they found some reason for paying it, and they can find it again, if Congress does not choose to give the authority. I am asking whether the senior Senator from Michigan feels that the authority proposed to be granted is restricted by article V, section 12?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am very glad to answer the question of the Senator, though I thought I had undertaken to make my opinion indubitably clear yesterday afternoon.

In the first place, let me say I recognize no analogy between this situation and the other appropriations to which the Senator has referred and other abuses of power by administrative agencies, because I repeat to the Senator that I think the language used in this agreement is the precise result of that experience in an all-out legislative effort to see to it that that sort of a tragedy shall not occur in respect to this particular administration.

I wish to give the Senator an example to prove that I think the administrative agencies are moving with a degree of good faith in respect to this adventure which I would agree has not been too evident in some of its other actions to which both the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Montana referred. I give the Senator this exhibit: The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was set up probably 4 months ago. It had been in preliminary operation I suppose for 60 or 90 days. During that time there were undoubtedly blank check appropriations particularly in respect to foreign affairs, in the hands of both the President and the State Department, which might very legitimately have been drawn upon to make a preliminary contribution to this instrumentality on the part of the United States. Instead of that, the United States has not contributed one thin dime up to this hour and the State Department has said it to us in direct testimony before the committee that it will not permit one thin dime to be dedicated to this purpose until Congress has passed this joint resolution.

That is a totally different attitude, I submit to the Senator from the administrative attitude against which he appropriately complains and against which the able Senator from Montana complains. I cannot emphasize too strongly that in the 16 years I have been in this body, the greater part of it on the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have never had an experience like the present one in its total sympathetic cooperative attitude on the part of the State Department and what appears to be the wholehearted purpose to yield itself completely to the congressional intent and will in respect to this entire affair.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the able Senator for his statement.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not contradicting the Senator from Michigan, but that is not sufficient when we are appropriating a billion three hundred and fifty million dollars to an organization over which the United States is to have no control.

The senior Senator from Texas said that while I had great sympathy for the stricken people of various countries of Europe, those people could not live on sympathy, and he wanted to know whether I and some others of us wanted to have the Government of the United States spend what it spent before—$2,600,000,000. I say "Yes" to that question. So far as I am concerned and so far, in my judgment, as the people of the United States are concerned, they would rather spend $2,000,000,000 or $3,000,000,000 or whatever may be necessary; but they want to know who is going to spend it, where it is going to be spent and how it is to be spent rather than to turn it over to a committee composed of Russia, Great Britain, Haiti, Santo Domingo, Liberia, and almost every other country on the face of the globe. Certainly the American people are generous, certainly they may be called upon to spend $2,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000; but when we spend it let us spend it in the name of the United States of America. Let us spend it in the name of the people of the United States. Let us enable the people of this country to know when we are appropriating their money that it is going to be spent under the auspices of the people and the representatives of the people of the United States, and not be turned over to an international organization over which we have no control except to the extent of 1 vote out of 44. That is the position I take.

I am not complaining that the amount is $1,350,000,000, but I say that it is time that the Congress of the United States of America begin to consider how much money will be left in the pockets of the people and how much of our resources will be left for the soldiers when they come back. We had better begin to determine whether or not we are going to reduce the people of this country to a state of poverty similar to that which prevails in Europe, China, and elsewhere in the world. We had better examine to see whether we are representing the best interests of our Government, or are representing the interests of some other government.

I appreciate that many of my colleagues do not agree with my philosophy with reference to this matter, but, so far as I am concerned, I shall not vote to turn over $1,350,000,000, or much of that sum of money, to a group, to be spent by them, if I am the only Member of the Senate to vote against it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to make a further observation, apologizing to the able Senator from Nebraska for the intrusion on his time.

With much the Senator from Montana says, in its general over-all application, I am in total agreement. In fact, that is the reason why I took 2 hours on the floor of the Senate yesterday in trying to emphasize the fact that I think the limitations upon the grants in this agreement are far more important than the grants themselves.

The Senator says that he prefers that we should spend our own money, under our own administrative responsibility. So do I. But this happens to be tied in squarely with the war effort. It is definitely and specifically and indispensably part of the war effort. It links squarely in behind the Army as it moves on from a liberated territory, and it would be

just as sensible to say that we will not have anything to do with the war itself, except as we can totally run our own Army, and totally disregard essential cooperations with the other armies of the nations of the earth.

I insist that as a peacetime operation—and I said it 50 times yesterday—I would consider it fabulous improvidence if this particular agreement were to stand as a precedent or a model or a pattern for any part of our post-war reconstruction world-wide responsibilities. It is nothing of the sort. It is definitely and specifically a part of the war effort, which cannot be avoided. If U. N. R. R. A. does not do this task, the Army itself will have to stay behind and do it. It must be done in some such partnership fashion, and I have yet to hear of a better way to do it than the one proposed.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me further?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand the Senator's position that it is part of the war effort and just as necessary as carrying on the war. I do not subscribe to that view. I think it is the wrong philosophy, and that it is not borne out by the facts.

Of course, we have to follow up and take care of and feed the people of the liberated territories, but is there any reason why we should turn this money over to 44 different countries, they to have the say as to how it shall be spent? If we are to spend it, let us turn it over to the appropriate agency of the United States and let that agency say whether they will spend it in cooperation with Great Britain, or in cooperation with Russia; but let us not turn it over completely to somebody else to say how the money is to be spent, with the United States having 1 vote out of 44, or whatever the number may be. I do not think that can be justified on the ground that it is carrying on the war. I am just as anxious to see the war carried on to a successful conclusion as is any other Member of this body, notwithstanding the fact that there are many people and many organizations which, because one who believes in the United States, and in protecting our interests, does not agree with this or does not agree with that, want to brand him as something other than an American.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is not implying any such attitude on my part?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course not, not for one moment, but I do say to the Senator, in all sincerity, while I agree with everything he has said regarding helping to feed stricken and starving people as a part of the war effort, it should be done by a Government agency, and we should let that Government agency work in cooperation with Great Britain, or let them work in cooperation with Russia, or with the other nations; but let us not turn the money over to a group of countries, many of which have little or no interest in the matter. Let Great Britain and the United States say how the money is to be spent in eastern Europe and Italy, and how it is to be spent in Yugoslavia, if we go into that country, how it is to be spent in France, in Belgium, and in Holland. Why turn it over to many other countries, and let them squabble as to how it is to be spent?

I think it is a serious mistake to have such an organization saying how the money of this country is to be spent. It cannot be justified, in my judgment. I would rather spend more money and have it controlled by some agency of this country, and have it cooperate with Great Britain, or cooperate with Russia when it relates to Russian territory, or cooperate with China when it relates to Chinese territory, than let a lot of countries, many of which have not anything in common with Great Britain or with the United States, say where and how the money is to be spent.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to state again that when I asked for the floor I did not intend to make a speech on the joint resolution, but I feel that if I have made no other contribution than to have had the senior Senator from Michigan, the senior Senator from Montana, and the senior Senator from Texas, express their views and observations, I have really done something to throw light on the measure. I once again desire to thank them all for using the time. I had only sought the floor to ask a question about some of the terms and provisions of the joint resolution.

Now that some of these most important matters have been called to my attention, and in view of some of the statements which have been made, I wish to say that certainly I am not one of the Republicans who desire to give this administration, or any other administration, a blank check. I also wish to say that, regardless of how I shall vote upon the pending joint resolution, I want it thoroughly understood that I am willing to go just as far as anyone else in providing relief for the people of the liberated countries, and, in my opinion, all Senators are agreed on that. We want to do our part, and accept our responsibility, and I shall gladly join in any appropriation necessary to effectuate that purpose.

There are, however, one or two things I do not want to see done. The senior Senator from Michigan has convinced me at least of the importance of the provision in the bill limiting the authority. The crux of the joint resolution is the limited authority attempted to be written into it, and I agree with what is proposed in that regard. If we are to approve the measure, we must provide limited authority, we must know the obligations we undertake, and we must know what is to be expected in the event the obligations, or further obligations, may be renewed.

On that account, I asked whether or not the senior Senator from Montana felt that article V, on page 12, limited the authority conferred in article I, on page 2. It seems to me that article I, on page 2, goes much further in intent than the restrictions provided in article V, on page 12. It seems to me that as the joint resolution is written, the organization of 44 nations could enter into contracts, which would not be terminated, which would not be expected to terminate, before the appropriation would become exhausted. Then the only thing the U. N. R. R. A. could do, would be to come back to some constitutional body. To what constitutional body would it come? Would it come to Congress, or to the R. F. C., or some other Government agency, and say, "Here, we spent this money; you gave us the authority, and now we want you to make good on the promise."

Mr. President, I do not want to be challenged later as giving even moral support to a promise we do not expect to fulfill.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. By any stretch of the imagination does the Senator think that the R. F. C. could be defined as an "appropriate constitutional" body?

Mr. WHERRY. I will answer that question by asking the senior Senator from Michigan this question: Does he think that the constitutional body has been defined in the measure as the Congress, or as some agency from whom the U. N. R. R. A. can obtain money when it needs it?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator cannot get me into any quarrel over charges which he makes against this administration with respect to use of funds which it may obtain contrary to the specific intention of the Congress of the United States. I wish to say again, that is the reason why this thing intrigued me from start to finish, and I tried to find if it was possible to put down in black and white a rule which was binding.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I ask, What is a constitutional body? A constitutional body is any body which is created under the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. The R. F. C. is a constitutional body.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The R. F. C. could not remotely be considered to be a constitutional body under the language in question at the point where it appears in this measure.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is a great lawyer, and he knows——

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Montana must not be sarcastic. One of my virtues is that I am not a lawyer. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, what is a constitutional body? We create various bureaus which are arms of the Congress of the United States, and they are quasi-legislative bodies. I say that under the language in question the R. F. C. can contend that it is a constitutional body. It is a body which is created under the Constitution of the United States. It is not the intention of the Senator from Michigan that it should be so considered, and it is not the intention of many who helped to draft the proposed legislation; there can be no question about that; but why not say in plain simple language, so there can be

no question about it, "the Congress of the United States"?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The reason is very simple and obvious. The language in this agreement applies to all the nations signatory to it. We have to describe the appropriate constitutional body which, under any given form of government, has the constitutional control of appropriations. I do not think the Senator upon reflection would really undertake to certify the opinion that the R. F. C. is a constitutional body in the accepted sense of that phrase.

Mr. WHEELER. No; I agree that it is not in the accepted use of that phrase. The Supreme Court of the United States has differed not only with me but with great constitutional authorities in the country whose reputations as constitutional lawyers go far beyond mine—and I do not claim to be a constitutional authority—as to what is the meaning of the phrase.

The Senator from Tennessee suggested yesterday—and I think his suggestion to be very appropriate—that a provision should be inserted in the measure that, with respect to the United States, those who represent us in the organization cannot come back here and obtain money without the consent of the Congress.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I rose for the purpose of making a suggestion similar to the one just made by the Senator from Montana. This language can easily be changed so as to make absolutely certain what is intended. The Senator from Michigan very strenuously asserts that it was the intention that only the Congress of the United States should have the decision. If that be the case, then I suggest that after the word "bodies", on page 12, line 9, the period be stricken and a comma or a dash inserted, followed by the words "in the case of the United States, the Congress", or "in the case of the United States it means the Congress of the United States."

The reason I make that suggestion is that, as we all know, several years ago, under the Constitution and in a perfectly constitutional way, we gave the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the power to borrow money on the bonds of the United States, and we have since given the President power to use such money for a great many purposes similar to those in question, and I think unquestionably the R. F. C. could be construed to be a constitutional body. The Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] both say that it was intended that the Congress of the United States was the body which should appropriate the money. If that is what is intended, let us remove all doubt, because it is a very important matter, as we all know, and we ought to say exactly what we mean, and mean exactly what we say in this matter. For that reason I have suggested an amendment after the words "constitutional bodies" to add "in the case of the United States the Congress of the United States is meant."

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his statement.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not care to prolong this metaphysical constitutional argument with respect to the difference between a constitutional body and any other body. This question, however, arises in the United States not only in respect to the Federal Government, but in respect to all the States. Most of the interpretations which have given to that subject with respect to the State constitutions, which are more numerous than the interpretations with respect to the Constitution of the United States, have to do with offices and bodies within the State which have been divided into constitutional and statutory offices and bodies.

As a rule, constitutional offices or bodies have been held to be those which are specifically established in the constitution under which they exist. Other offices created by legislation in the States are regarded to be statutory offices and not constitutional offices, although they are created under power given to the legislatures by the constitution under which they operate. So there is a very clearly drawn distinction between statutory offices and constitutional offices, and I think the same distinction would apply to the R. F. C. or to any office created by Congress as an agency of Congress or the Government, as distinguished from the bodies which are specifically created by the Constitution of the United States.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest a further exhibit as identifying the meaning of the language.

Mr. WHERRY. Which language?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The language which is causing the able and vigilant Senator from Tennessee so much trepidation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not trepidation, but actual fear.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Well, I am sometimes impressed by the Senator's fears and sometimes I am not. I am referring to the language on page 12 in line 9, "appropriate constitutional bodies." I respectfully suggest that the first sentence of the joint resolution says:

> That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated—
>
> And so forth—
>
> such sums—
>
> And so forth—
>
> as the Congress may determine from time to time to be appropriate for participation by the United States—

And so forth. Read in connection with that clear and unequivocal statement it seems to me, if I may again use the word "fantastic"—it seems to me to be fantastic to think that anyone would undertake to say that the appropriate constitutional body to make appropriations in the United States or to provide one nickel for this institution, would be any other than the Congress itself.

I simply wish to add, and then I am through for the day, that if I so totally lacked confidence in this administration that I feared it would distort the words "constitutional bodies" to mean the R. F. C. in order to go behind the barn and cheat the intent of Congress, I certainly would not vote for the joint resolution at all, just as I have never voted for the administration at all. [Laughter.]

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

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I simply wish to say in connection with what the Senator from Michigan has said, that I have every confidence in the present administration. But we are confronted with a question as to the meaning of words. We all here say that what we intend is that the money to be used for the purposes of the joint resolution is to be drawn from the Treasury of the United States after action by the appropriate committees of the Congress and by the Congress itself. If we all mean that, why do we not say precisely what we mean?

I have had the legislative drafting service of the Senate prepare an amendment which contains this language, and I challenge any Senator—it makes no difference who—to rise and say the language I propose will not carry out what it says we mean. Of course, we must do this by way of reservation; we cannot put it in by way of amendment, because it must be agreed to by the other nations.

The language is as follows:

> SEC. —. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservation:
>
> That in the case of the United States the appropriate constitutional body to determine the amount and character of the contributions of the United States is the Congress of the United States.

That is exactly what the Senator from Michigan says his language or the language of the joint resolution as reported intends. If that is what it intends, why not say so?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, just a further word, and then I shall keep the promise I made a moment ago.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not make such a promise. We like to hear the Senator from Michigan; he is always interesting.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator insists on this identification, which seems total surplusage to me, instead of attempting to do it by reservation to the agreement as it is carried in the resolution, that procedure obviously requiring subsequent consent from other governments, inasmuch as it is dealing solely with the domestic question, I suggest that the Senator attach his definition at the end of the joint resolution, so that it will relate to the portion of the joint resolution which refers to the activities of our own Government of the United States. In that way it would be just as effective.

However, I wish to add that I think it is surplusage. I think it would be just as sensible to say that wherever the word "President" is used in the joint resolution it means Franklin D. Roosevelt until next January, and then it means someone else.

Mr. McKELLAR. It might not; he might be President after next January. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we hope he will not be. [Laughter.]

I desire to make a concluding statement, and then I shall yield the floor. I wish I felt as confident about the limitations in the joint resolution as the senior Senator from Michigan seems to feel. I cannot feel other than that article I, on page 2, goes a long way toward having this organization enter into obligations which will go far in excess of the appropriation now sought to be authorized, and that then the organization will come back and want additional appropriations. Of course, we add a limitation by requiring that the request for additional appropriations must be brought to the Congress, as the senior Senator from Michigan has so ably and forcibly shown here this afternoon.

But my decision as to whether I shall support the joint resolution will depend upon whether this thing can be buttoned up and sewed up with respect to the limitation of power.

I do not want to provide for this administration or any other administration a loophole which will enable it to exercise powers beyond the powers intended to be granted under the pending measure. I saw now that it seems to me there is a question. Question has been raised all the way through. The fact that the able senior Senator from Michigan stated over and over again that there were limitations, and yesterday charged the Appropriations Committee that they were the only ones to pass on this matter, convinced me that there is some doubt as to whether the pending measure contains sufficient limitation of authority.

I say that for the reason that it is my humble opinion that contained in the agreement is the substance of provisions which should be contained in a treaty. If that be so, a favorable vote by two-thirds of the Senate should be required, instead of a majority vote by both Houses of Congress. For that further reason, I feel we should see to it that the limitations are contained in the joint resolution.

I appreciate the amendments which have been submitted; and I hope other amendments will be submitted, so that we shall have a piece of legislation which will require that Congress, not any other body which might be interpreted as being a constitutional body, shall be the one to pass on the question whether we shall appropriate and continue to appropriate for contracts which will be made, not by the Senate, not by the United States Congress, but by a group of 44 nations joined in an organization in which we shall have only one vote. We will not obtain protection there. We must obtain it in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] gave an exact definition of constitutional and statutory offices and bodies. There should be no confusion at all on that point, because the courts have unanimously, I think, interpreted "constitutional offices" just as the Senator described them—those that are authorized or named in the Constitution itself.

The joint resolution now pending before the Senate is based wholly on the agreement which is found in the document I hold in my hand, entered into at Atlantic City on November 9, 1943. That agreement is the foundation of the joint resolution, and is based upon it.

Mr. President, whatever is contained in the joint resolution obtains its authority from the agreement. I desire to call attention to the fact that the agreement is certainly in treaty form, if not in name. What we are undertaking to do here is to approve, by implication at least, an agreement entered into with some 40 foreign nations, having to do with a continuing subject. It is not a finished subject; it is not an agreement that they shall perform some individual act, and then end. It is a continuing subject for whatever length of time may be necessary.

So, Mr. President, I am greatly concerned about the meaning of this contract, about the method by which it was entered into, and about where it will lead the United States of America. Under our form of government this country can enter into an agreement in the form of a treaty with another nation or other nations only by the act of this body. The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has said that this proposal is not a treaty. I do not know. It is certainly a treaty in form, if nothing else.

Chiang Kai-shek, being a dictator over his country, can sign a treaty, agreement, contract, or whatever it may be called, by placing his name on it. Joe Stalin, being a dictator in his own country, can bind his country to a contract, agreement, treaty, or whatever it may be called, by placing his name on it. As to whether or not Winston Churchill can bind Great Britain by placing his name upon an agreement, I do not know; but I do know, without any if's or and's about it, that the President cannot bind his country by placing his name upon a contract or agreement without the approval and consent of this body.

The agreement which I have before me was made weeks ago, without the knowledge or consent of the American people and without the knowledge or consent of this body. It has never been submitted to us for approval or confirmation. It was signed on behalf of this country by the President of the United States.

It is provided in the joint resolution that this agreement, contract, treaty, or whatever it may be called, shall go into effect upon his signature. Therefore, this contract went into effect on the day the President of the United States signed it, without the knowledge or consent of this body and without the knowledge or consent of the American people, and, in my opinion, without any authority to do so. In my opinion, that is one of the most serious things in connection with this joint resolution and the contract or agreement upon which it is based.

I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to a few of the things which cause me great concern. If it were not for the very able discussion and explanation of the senior Senator from Michigan yesterday I am quite certain in my own mind that I would vote against the joint resolution. In my opinion, he has shown that the joint resolution is in reality a part of our war effort. If that be so, we are bound to do some things which we would not otherwise do. That is why I have been so concerned about the language of the contract and whether or not the Senator has satisfactorily explained it to us.

Yesterday I asked the Senator from Michigan who is to control the interpretation of this sort of agreement. He said he did not know, but he presumed that the 43 other nations which signed the agreement, contract, or treaty would control, and our one little vote would be pretty ineffectual in deciding the interpretation of the contract.

We shall be up against the same thing that we were up against in connection with the so-called Moscow agreement or pact of a few weeks ago. I was much interested in it. I have never seen the exact terms of it. I do not know what it is, except as it is reported in the newspapers. However, I find news comments to the effect that there are three distinct, separate, and somewhat contradictory interpretations placed upon the Moscow Pact by the three principal countries involved.

If we can believe the press reports with respect to the Moscow Pact, Russia has interpreted it to mean that no central European federation will be tolerated by Russia. Russia interprets it to mean that there will be no artificial union of powers in Russia, and that there will be no buffer states between Russia and the rest of Europe. That is the Russian interpretation of the Moscow Pact.

What does our Secretary of State say about it? His interpretation is in complete disagreement with that of Russia. Secretary Hull says that the Moscow Pact means that there shall be no more alliances, no more spheres of influence, and no balance of power.

How does England interpret the Moscow pact? England interprets it to mean that it is necessary for England to have the balance of power which has been controlling Europe for hundreds of years, in order that England may continue to exist.

Those are the three interpretations of the Moscow Pact by the three principal countries. The interpretations are completely at variance. I use that only as an illustration of what may happen when this agreement goes into effect, if it is not already in effect. There may possibly be 44 different interpretations as to what the contract means; and certainly the United States of America would receive short shrift from its associates if our interests should happen to conflict with those of other nations.

I invite the attention of the Senate to one or two things in the joint resolution. Yesterday the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] called to our attention the powers to be conferred upon the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

They are set forth in article I, subparagraph 1, on page 2 of the joint resolution.

The Administration shall have power to acquire, hold, and convey property—

That is a pretty broad grant of power to this Council, made up of representatives of foreign governments. There is no limitation as to where property may be acquired, how it ma. be acquired, or what amount may be acquired. The Administration is simply given power to acquire property.

The Administration is to have the power to convey property. It may buy and sell property anywhere in the world. Under the provisions of this section it may "enter into contracts and undertake obligations."

What obligations? What contracts may the Administration enter into without our knowledge and consent? We are bound by article I, subparagraph 1, to turn over the operation of the whole program to a council of foreigners.

The Administration is also to have the power—

to designate or create agencies—

We might lend them some of our bureaus, but this Council is to have power to create any number of new ones—

and to review the activities of agencies so created, to manage undertakings, and in general to perform any legal act appropriate to its objects and purposes.

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

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Having raised the question as to what this organization is, what would the Senator say is the legal effect of the organization? It cannot be a partnership of nations, can it, because nations are unable to be partners? How would the Senator class the organization?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I class the agreement as a treaty, and the organization might be termed a "league of nations" or a "confederation of nations." I believe the point raised by the Senator is fundamental.

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

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. Does the Senator have any information as to how this agreement was approved by other countries? Did they submit it to their respective legislative bodies for approval? Has the Senator any information on that point?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I have no information on that point.

Mr. WILLIS. I have seen no statement concerning how the agreement was received and approved in other countries.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. According to the pamphlet issued by the committee, or by the Council of the United Nations at its first session, purportedly the heads of the various nations signed the agreement. That is the only information I have on the subject.

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator has no information as to their constitutional authority for signing?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No; I have not. I know that it is necessary that the legislative bodies of France and England approve any agreement entered into by their representatives.

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

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I notice that on page 2 of the joint resolution the Administration, which is the association, takes unto itself the power "to acquire, hold and convey property."

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would not such power be determined entirely by the place and location at which this association was attempting to exercise the power?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator restate his question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have stated that on page 2, line 21 of the joint resolution now under consideration, the following language is set forth: "The Administration"—which is the association—"shall have power to acquire, hold and convey property." Would any such act be governed by the laws of the area in which the association or Administration attempted to hold or convey property?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator means that the Council would have no authority unless the laws of the particular nation involved approved the act of the Council.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Perhaps the Senator is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. In the attempt to determine what kind of an association this is, let us consider this question: Because a sovereign nation cannot be sued without its consent, the United States, for instance, certainly could not be sued and could not sue, could it?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. So, when we come to the language which states that the Administration has the right "to enter into contracts and undertake obligations," do we not have to say that these contracts and these obligations must be interpreted by the law of the area in which they are to be entered into? How could this association enter into a binding contract here in the United States? It certainly could not enter into a contract upon which a suit could be based and maintained, could it?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I do not believe so, unless by this resolution such authority is granted.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I was coming to. By adopting this resolution do we approve and ratify this particular organization?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I think we do. I think it is unquestioned that the minute the Congress gives its O. K. to this resolution it approves the whole U. N. R. R. A.

Mr. FERGUSON. Do we classify this as being an executive agreement at the time it was entered into, and assume that we are now ratifying that executive agreement, and insofar as the Congress of the United States is authorized to do so, are creating an organization approved by the United States Congress?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. It would seem so to me. We are going further than that, if I may be permitted a suggestion. The minute we approve this resolution we approve the contract which was entered into by the 44 nations, and approve by a vote of this body, a treaty in form.

Mr. FERGUSON. If I may inquire further, when we say that we are approving all contracts, is it not true that we are approving them only insofar as moral obligations are concerned? In other words, this creates no legal obligation, because the United States as a Nation cannot be sued unless it consents to the suit. However, we can create moral obligations in the minds of our people and in the minds of the people of other nations.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. And when we have a moral obligation, and no legal obligation, we are more strongly bound to carry out the moral obligation, to a certain extent, than we are to carry out the strict terms of a legal obligation.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator is absolutely correct.

I now return to the point which I started to discuss a moment ago. I refer to section 5 on page 11 of the resolution. The language to which I refer reads as follows:

The Director General shall make periodic reports to the Central Committee and to the Council covering the progress of the Administration's activities.

Yesterday, in connection with the discussion relative to those reports, I raised the point that the Congress of the United States would know nothing about what was going on under this contract except what it gained from the newspapers.

The next sentence of this paragraph reads:

The reports shall be made public except for such portions as the Central Committee may consider it necessary, in the interest of the United Nations, to keep confidential.

By that language we have surrendered every right to know what is taking place on the part of the Council, and what it is doing. Yesterday I asked the distinguished Senator from Michigan if the Congress would be informed and he said, "Oh, yes; the President informs it." I am sorry to differ with my distinguished friend, the Senator from Michigan, but the President does not inform us. Support for that statement is found on page 12 of the joint resolution, article VI, reading as follows:

The Director General shall submit to the Council an annual budget, and from time to time such supplementary budgets as may be required, covering the necessary administrative expenses of the Administration.

To that extent only would the President report to Congress the money he had received, and the money he had paid out. The report would perhaps be in the form of an itemized statement. However, there are no reports provided for in this resolution to be furnished Congress or anyone else concerning what this organization of foreign governments does with our money in carrying out the program of relief, and all the activities implied in the joint resolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment at this point, on page 11——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to advise the Senator that

a committee amendment is now pending. The Senator may offer his amendment now only by unanimous consent.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Chair. I wish to state the purpose of the amendment, and then I shall ask unanimous consent to offer it, if I may do so. On page 11, line 11, following the word "Council," I propose to add the following words, "and to the Congress"—just those four words. In other words, I wish to provide that these reports must be made to the Congress as well as to the Council.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator means the Congress of the United States?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes; the Congress of the United States of America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think we should follow the orderly procedure. The Senator will have an opportunity to offer his amendment, but I do not think the pending committee amendment should be set aside for the purpose of allowing a Senator to offer another amendment now.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Very well. Is there any objection to having the amendment printed so that it may lie on the table?

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no; the Senator has that right.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator proposes to offer an amendment to the agreement itself, which in turn would have to be ratified by all the other nations.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes; I presume that is true. However, I think it is most essential that the Congress of the United States shall know what takes place under the agreement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator realizes that as to the language of the agreement itself, if we are to amend it so that Congress shall be notified by the Director General, as well as by the Council of the organization, every other nation signatory to the agreement will have the right then to amend the agreement so as to provide that its legislative body shall also be notified.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I cannot see why that should not be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that event we would have this agreement going back and forth for an interminable length of time before we would really know what it was.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask the Senator from South Dakota especially in what respect will he say that the amendment he would offer on page 11, line 11, would alter the requirement provided in section 2 of the resolution itself and on page 15, lines 1 to 3, which read:

> The President shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures made under any such appropriations and of operations under the agreement.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. There is no requirement, as I read the joint resolution, for a report on the activities of the Council. The President is to report on expenditures of money and on operations under the funds placed in his hands, but we will know nothing about what is going on and about what the Council may have done. That is the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I did not hear the precise amendment offered by the Senator, but I gathered that it was to that portion of the joint resolution which embodies the agreement itself. As the able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has said, if we modify the agreement, then it has got to go back to every nation which is a party to it, and if it were not approved by all these nations it would be a nullity, and they would not be bound by the provisions of the agreement. In other words, if we amend the agreement it will have to go back to be ratified again by all who have heretofore approved it, or it will be a nullity as to those who do not assent to the reservation or amendment. I think I am correct in that respect.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Let me say to the Senator that the interest and welfare of the American people are far more important than the welfare or the interest of 43 other nations, and it is our job to try to protect the American people first.

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator will permit me, I think everyone agrees with the Senator in the statement he has just made. The only point I had in saying anything was inferentially to suggest that the Senator's amendment might be added at another place, a later place in the joint resolution, and not be added as an amendment to the agreement which is simply recited in the joint resolution.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator, and thank him.

Mr. President, as I stated in the beginning, and now repeat, I do not oppose now nor would I oppose at any time assisting in any manner that we could toward the relief of people who have been stricken in this tragic war. I do not want to be placed in the position of appearing to oppose that objective. I am only calling attention of the Senate to some of the provisions of the joint resolution which are detrimental to our people, but not for the purpose of opposing the resolution itself.

The very point the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] brought about a moment ago was mentioned yesterday by me in a query submitted to the senior Senator from Michigan. My query was:

> While we have the legalistic right to do thus and so, as the Senator has so clearly pointed out, is there not a moral obligation to go along with the agreement and fulfill all its terms, regardless of what Congress may decide to do in the future?

To that question the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] replied as follows:

> I do not think so; and when I have concluded my schedule of limitations, I think the Senator will agree with me that the situation is fairly clear.

Immediately before that question I asked the Senator from Michigan this question:

> Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan a question. If the other forty-odd members of the Council should place a different interpretation upon some decision than our own representative or our Congress places upon it——
>
> Mr. VANDENBERG. It would be just too bad.

That is the point which was brought out by the junior Senator from Michigan. If we enter into this contract, if we approve all the provisions set forth in the joint resolution and in the contract, it will be "just too bad" for us and probably for the world if we do not go along with the proposal.

A Senator said on the floor yesterday that we can withdraw from this organization if we want to at any time and thereby relieve ourselves of the obligation. But, Senators, that is not true. We cannot withdraw from the organization at any time we want. The provisions of the joint resolution itself take care of that, but the moral obligation, stronger by far than the legal part of it, prohibits us from withdrawing. If we enter into commitments and obligations across the water, if we start rehabilitation programs across the water, even though they be mismanaged to our disgust and our anger, and we want to get out of the organization, we cannot get out of it; we are in it to the finish. We are in it not only because of the moral obligation but we are in it because the joint resolution itself says the only way in the world we can get out of the agreement is to serve notice at a time 6 months after the agreement goes into effect, and then we cannot get out for 12 months after we have served such notice. The last provision of the joint resolution says it shall terminate on June 30, 1946, which is a trifle over the 18 months it would take us to get out of the organization. So in my opinion, Senators, the provision with reference to withdrawal and being relieved of the obligations is simply a futile gesture and does not mean a thing in the world.

In another portion the joint resolution provides that before we can get out we must make every payment and perform and finish every commitment we have said we would undertake. So while Senators may talk about withdrawal, there is no such thing as withdrawal. We have got to take the thing as it is, and know we are going through with it, or stay out of it. That is the decision the Senate must make when it finally comes to vote upon the joint resolution.

Mr. President, I am wondering in what position we are with regard to the resolutions which might be considered to be in the form of amendments, some 34 of them, which are included in the report of the organization. Some of them go pretty far; some of them really commit us to do things which, in my judgment, do not appear in the joint resolution itself. If the Council can change the picture by subsequent resolution or

amendment, or whatever it may be called, what is to prohibit the Council, loaded against us as it is at the start, from changing the agreement and the resolution to suit themselves?

Senators, I think this matter is so serious that we should give it plenty of time before acting upon it, not with the idea of opposing proper proposal along this line but with the idea and hope of protecting the interests of this country and preventing the waste of our substance.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 205. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons who have claims for damages or losses allegedly resulting from the construction, further development, and improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway, Miami to Jacksonville, Fla., and for other purposes;

H. R. 213. An act for the relief of Edward H. Smith;

H. R. 399. An act for the relief of John Sims;

H. R. 547. An act for the relief of Kernan R. Cunningham;

H. R. 550. An act for the relief of Mrs. Renzie Graham.

H. R. 610. An act for the relief of Pacific Dry Dock & Repair Co., Inc.;

H. R. 850. An act for the relief of George M. Louie;

H. R. 1311. An act for the relief of Dan Crotts;

H. R. 1388. An act to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the construction of a scenic parkway to provide an appropriate view of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park from the Tennessee side of the park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1442. An act for the relief of Lafayette Gibson;

H. R. 1467. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Rev. Julius Paal;

H. R. 1854. An act for the relief of Ethel Cohen;

H. R. 1872. An act for the relief of J. E. McCoy & Son;

H. R. 1934. An act for the relief of Mrs. Donald B. Johnston;

H. R. 2075. An act for the relief of Charles R. Hooper;

H. R. 2199. An act to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1898, as amended;

H. R. 2340. For the relief of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.;

H. R. 2580. An act to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of South Dakota and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Belle Fourche River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote the most efficient use of those waters, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2639. An act for the relief of William M. Tucker and Nelda M. Tucker;

H. R. 2690. An act for the relief of Oswald L. Sawyer;

H. R. 2691. An act for the relief of Tom S. Steed;

H. R. 2804. An act for the relief of Ruth E. P. Phillips, as executrix of the estate of Amos Russell Phillips, deceased;

H. R. 2924. An act to give effect to the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada; to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands; and for other purposes;

H. R. 2976. An act to grant military rank to certain members of the Navy Nurse Corps;

H. R. 3001. An act for the relief of James T. Rogers;

H. R. 3076. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Arthur J. Martin, Jr., a minor;

H. R. 3153. An act for the relief of the estate of Jennie I. Weston, deceased;

H. R. 3189. An act for the relief of Thomas Lewis;

H. R. 3329. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles H. Morhouse;

H. R. 3332. An act for the relief of Spencer Meeks;

H. R. 3428. An act to amend sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 743; 48 U. S. C., secs. 440, 441, 442);

H. R. 3477. An act to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3504. An act for the relief of Wade Bros., a partnership composed of M. J., G. W., and Ovid Wade;

H. R. 3605. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in tents used as quarters by members of the Twelfth Naval Construction Battalion, Long Island, Alaska, on December 26, 1942, and May 26, 1943, respectively;

H. R. 3606. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire at the outlying degaussing branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942;

H. R. 3607. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in tent L-76 at the Amphibious Training Base, Camp Bradford, Norfolk, Va., on March 15, 1943;

H. R. 3760. An act authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Lt. Gen. Thomas Holcomb, United States Marine Corps; and

H. R. 3916. An act to permit the construction and use of certain pipe lines for pneumatic tube transmission in the District of Columbia.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words on the joint resolution. The questions which I asked the able Senator from South Dakota might indicate that I was against the joint resolution. That is not the case. I believe that we should try to make up our minds as a Congress to determine whether or not we want to appropriate the sum of $1,350,000,000 for relief and rehabilitation. I have come to the conclusion that that should be done by the Congress of the United States. I realize that this is an unusual piece of legislation. It is in effect an approval of an Executive agreement by the President of the United States which he entered into last November. It is unusual in that, by adopting a joint resolution to authorize the appropriation of money, we are asked—and I believe the Senate will do it—to approve that Executive agreement.

There is no doubt in my mind that the joint resolution does not authorize the R. F. C. or any other statutory body to finance this association of nations. I think the able Senator from Kentucky gave a proper definition of a constitutional body. I should like to add that I think the distinction between a constitutional body and a statutory body is that the Congress has the power and the authority to abolish or to alter in any way a statutory body, whereas it has no authority to abolish a constitutional body.

The constitutional body referred to, I am satisfied, because of the wording in the agreement, is the Congress of the United States. The R. F. C. does not appropriate money. "Appropriate" is not a proper term when applied to what the R. F. C. does. It may lend money, it may advance money, but it does not appropriate money. The word "appropriate" as used in the joint resolution clearly refers to an appropriation by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I am of the opinion that when, by the joint resolution, we enter into this agreement, we should carry out every letter and every word of it, and that we should be prepared in the future not to expect to look too closely into what the money has been used for, because when we ratify the agreement, we are giving authority to the governments of the United Nations to go into the war areas and, approving their discretion and their judgment, to the best of their ability, to grant relief and bring about rehabilitation as they may see fit, so far as this Government is concerned, to the amount mentioned in the first part of the joint resolution, on line 4, which is $1,350,000,000.

Mr. President, I for one am willing to go along with the proposal. I do not believe this should ever be considered as a precedent indicating that the Senate of the United States is relinquishing its right to approve so-called Executive agreements, or is relinquishing its right in the future to approve treaties, and it should be clearly understood that by approving this agreement, we are not giving away or altering in any way the Constitution of the United States or our constitutional authority to approve treaties as treaties, and that we have the right to approve Executive agreements if we are called upon later to appropriate money.

We are not by this act determining what is an Executive agreement and what is a treaty. We are ratifying the proposed agreement as an Executive agreement, and we are authorizing an appropriation of a certain sum to carry it out.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask consent at this time to offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read, and I shall ask then to have it printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend article X, on page 15, by the insertion of the following:

SEC. 5. None of the funds appropriated in pursuance of this authorization shall be expended in the promotion of any educational, religious, or political program in any country in which rehabilitation is carried on.

In the first line on page 11, it is proposed that "Sec. 3" shall be changed to "section 6."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the joint resolution, but with a good many reservations and doubts, and I should like therefore to explain why I intend to vote for it.

Yesterday I asked the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] as to the nature of this particular proceeding, and it was suggested that this is something new, that it is an Executive agreement to be approved by a majority of both Houses of Congress. That is something different from what we have understood as an Executive agreement, and something different from a treaty.

What concerns me about the proposal is that if the Executive can enter into an agreement and say, "I make this agreement subject to the approval of the Congress," and thereby relieve himself of the obligation of making a treaty and submitting it to the Senate for approval by a two-thirds vote, we are establishing a precedent which would be very dangerous indeed. If by Executive agreement there can be set up an international food relief organization, and it can be removed from the treaty field simply by saying it shall be subject to approval of the Congress, then exactly the same thing could be done in the case of a league of nations; a league of nations could be established subject to the approval of the Congress, and at once we would lose entirely the power to carry out the treaty-making process provided in the Constitution. I do not think this Executive agreement can be validated simply because it is subject to congressional approval.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Without expressing approval of or dissent from the philosophy of the Senator from Ohio, he is aware, is he not, that the last World War was finally terminated by the United States not by the ratification of a treaty, but by the adoption of a joint resolution, in which we endeavored to claim all the benefits and privileges of the Versailles Treaty without assuming any of its obligations? That was a departure, too, from constitutional procedure.

Mr. TAFT. What the Senator states is that we did not assume any obligations, and the whole question about a treaty is whether we assume obligations, so that I do not think there is any precedent in that respect. We may have ended the war by joint resolution, we may have recognized the settlements made, but so long as we did not assume any obligations, it cannot be said that under the Constitution we should necessarily have to act by treaty.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as the process which the Senator is discussing is concerned if we can by joint resolution accept the benefits of a treaty to which we are not a party without violating our procedure, or the proprieties, is there any difference between that and undertaking obligations which might ensue under the same sort of procedure?

Mr. TAFT. I think so, yes. If we can get any benefit, I do not suppose we care whether we ratify the instrument or not. The question is, can the Executive, without two-thirds of the Senate, assume obligations? That is the substantial question. I do not think we did get any benefit, that is, to the extent of getting any benefits of promises from any nation to do anything. In effect, we attempted to recognize the settlements made, the boundaries fixed, in the Versailles Treaty, but, so far as I know, we never received any benefits from it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In line with the argument the Senator has been making, and in spite of the fact that he says he intends to vote for the joint resolution, I should like to ask him whether, if such a joint resolution as this were enacted, and once we set such a precedent—and despite the fact that the Senator from Michigan so ably argued yesterday that we were not setting a precedent, it seems to me inescapable that we are—he believes it is likely that at anytime in the future any treaty will ever be presented to the Senate under the constitutional process as provided by the Constitution itself? It seems to me this is a far-reaching departure, which is a congressional recognition of the principle of Executive agreements to be approved by Congress, rather than treaties to be approved in accordance with the constitutional requirement of a two-thirds majority.

Mr. TAFT. That is the difficulty I have been trying to get over, but I do not think it is a precedent, if the Senator wants to know my view.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have been trying to get over it, too, and I find myself unable to get over it in any logical way I have heard discussed. I listened to the very persuasive speech of the Senator from Michigan yesterday, hoping that I could be convinced by it, but unfortunately I find myself in the position of regarding this as a bypassing of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is, however, without any doubt, an authority in the President to do certain things by Executive agreement. Where the line is between what can be done by Executive agreement and what can be done by treaty is uncertain, but I hope at least to suggest where that line is. My conclusion is that this is properly an Executive agreement; not an Executive agreement because approved by Congress, but valid before approved by Congress. In fact, the resolution says so in so many words on its first page:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated * * * such sums * * * as the Congress may determine from time to time to be appropriate for participation by the United States * * * in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, established by an agreement concluded by the United Nations and associated governments on November 9, 1943.

So the validity of this agreement in no way depends on the action of Congress. Congress is asked to appropriate money to support it, and the agreement itself makes it clear that we are free to do so or not, as we choose. But the agreement is a valid agreement. The organization has been established. Governor Lehman has been appointed Director General. The whole thing is set up. This is not an Executive agreement approved by Congress. This is an Executive agreement. Its validity stands or falls on the question whether it is an Executive agreement or a treaty by the United States. If it is a treaty it should be submitted to the Senate for ratification by two-thirds vote. If it is an executive agreement it does not have to be submitted to Congress at all, except as Congress may be asked, and as it may be necessary, to provide money.

Executive agreements may be made, and if they are in the proper field of Executive agreements, they stand or fall on the basis of their own nature. But of course if money is necessary to be appropriated in connection with them, Congress must be asked for the money. That is the situation as I see it now. We do, by appropriating money, indicate that we approve of the agreement, but such approval is not essential to the validity of the agreement.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has the Constitution before him on his desk. I wonder if he would be good enough to point out the provision of the Constitution which authorizes an Executive agreement.

Mr. TAFT. I think there is a provision which would apply in the general power to conduct foreign relations. The Senator will find many Supreme Court opinions dealing with the right of the President to make Executive agreements. I wish I could say that the Senator is correct, that we could not enter into any obligation with a foreign nation without making a treaty, but that is not a fact. It is not supported by precedent. Precedent after precedent has supported the

right of the President in certain fields to make Executive agreements. The important thing for us is to determine what those fields are, and to see that the Executive agreements are held to the fields where there is a proper scope for the making of Executive agreements.

A year or two ago I cited to the Senate a book written, as I recall, by Mr. McClure, who was in the State Department, in which he maintained that anything could be done by Executive agreement. If that is so, the function of the Senate in foreign relations has come to an end.

I do not think that extreme position is tenable, but it is taken by some persons. I am afraid, however, that once this resolution is adopted it will be said, as the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] suggested, that if this is a new thing, and if it is based simply on the principle that anything can be done by Executive agreement if it is submitted to congressional approval, undoubtedly it will be used as a precedent for every other negotiation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will permit me, I will say that I am very familiar with the book to which he referred, which was cited not only by the Senator from Ohio on the floor, but cited at great length before the Finance Committee by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

What I dread about the joint resolution is that no matter what excuses may be made for it, it comes here in the precise form of the suggestion made by a responsible official of the State Department, evidently put out more or less by authority, although signed by his own name, that in the future it is entirely constitutional and possible to bypass all submissions of treaties to the Senate, and to proceed in this very way, according to the very model presented in the pending joint resolution, without ratification by the Senate according to the provisions of the Constitution.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Before the Senator answers the statement made by the Senator from Missouri I wish to call attention to certain words of the Constitution.

> He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Now here is a treaty, and it is certainly a treaty, because it is an agreement with 43 other nations or subnations. Forty-three of them agree with us.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. All financed by lend-lease.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know whether they are all financed by lend-lease; but here is an agreement, as we know, with foreign countries, submitted to the Congress and not to the Senate. A treaty is an agreement between foreign nations, as we all know. Here is a proposed agreement with 43 other nations. It is just as plain as the nose on a man's face; there cannot be any mistake about it. Under those circumstances, since the Senator is not able to put his finger on any provisions providing for Executive agreements with foreign nations, except the provision I have read in the Constitution, I am sure there cannot be any doubt about its being a treaty.

Mr. TAFT. I wish the Senator from Tennessee were correct. I mean I wish that were the law. But it is not the law. Supreme Court opinion after Supreme Court opinion has held that under the general provision that the Executive power shall be vested in the President of the United States, and possibly in connection with his power to appoint ambassadors and other public ministers and consuls, the President of the United States has certain power to enter into Executive agreements with foreign nations. I cannot cite to the Senator the cases which have so held, but there have been many of them. I should like to agree with the Senator. I wish it could not be done. But, unfortunately, I am afraid it can.

I might ask the Senator from Tennessee, did he himself vote for the trade agreements?

Mr. McKELLAR. Which agreements?

Mr. TAFT. For the Trade Agreements Act?

Mr. McKELLAR. Congress passed an act dealing with trade agreements.

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. That measure was passed within the constitutional limitation. The President signed it in the usual way. I have no doubt that we could make an agreement of that sort. But that is something that dealt with trade. The Constitution gives us power over interstate and foreign commerce, and we simply exercised that power. It is a specific power contained in the body of the Constitution, which anyone can see. But there is not a word in the Constitution with respect to Executive agreements.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, before we go further I should like to run over the classes of Executive agreements as I have analyzed them, and I must admit that my study is not complete and that I may not be entirely correct.

In the first place, there is no doubt that minor matters may be dealt with by Executive agreement, and the most usually cited instances of minor matters are postal agreements as to the transmission of mail, the honoring of the stamps of other countries, and extradition treaties—so-called treaties, but which actually in most cases have been made by the President without submission to the Congress.

I think it is generally true that all minor matters, or matters which do not assume any substantial obligation with foreign nations, may be handled by the President by Executive agreement.

In the second place, in the field of minor matters the Senate not long ago approved the so-called Panama agreement. It was not really a minor matter. That agreement was approved by a majority of both the House and the Senate. I have no doubt the Senator from Tennessee voted for it. I think I voted against it on the ground that it was an amendment to a treaty, and so it seemed clear to me that even though it were minor it ought to be done by a treaty. But my impression is that the Senator from Tennessee voted for it. If it was valid, it was valid on the ground that it was a relatively minor matter, a matter of business negotiation which was not particularly important.

Where the line is to be drawn between minor matters and important matters, I cannot say; but I think we can insist on having classified as major matters certain things which definitely are not minor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. Does he consider an authorization of an appropriation of $1,350,000,000 a minor matter? I consider it a major matter.

Mr. TAFT. I agree, but there is another reason why I think the pending matter can be handled by Executive agreement.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Speaking of Executive agreements, I find by reading the list of signatories to the agreement the President signed for us, without our knowledge or consent, that 13 of the signatories to the agreement signed it with reservations requiring approval by their own legislative bodies.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, undoubtedly the trade agreements can be justified only on the ground that they can be handled by Executive agreements; because if it were merely a matter of domestic law, such an agreement could be changed the moment it was made; whereas, under the trade agreements procedure, when an Executive agreement is made, without action being taken by either House of Congress, to bind the United States for 3 years not to change its tariffs, that is something which Congress by itself could not do. It could only be done, I think, under the treaty-making power; and I voted against the agreements on that ground. But the agreements were voted for by a majority of the Congress on the theory that such matters could be handled by Executive agreement. I suppose it might be said that 3 years is a very short time, and that if at the end of 3 years a change could be made, the matter would not be so important that it could not fall within the rule applying to minor matters which can be dealt with by Executive agreement.

There are also matters which are clearly matters of domestic policy which can be handled by action of a majority of both Houses. If, for instance, we desire to authorize a policy of lending money to foreign countries, I think that is a domestic matter, although it may be carried through by agreements with foreign nations, and although, when authorized, we obligate ourselves to make those payments. But, obviously, I think it could be established by congressional authority, and then Congress would have to appropriate the necessary money.

In any case, any of these minor matters may have to be submitted to Congress, because one thing which is true of an Executive agreement is not true of treaties, and that is that an Executive agreement cannot modify an existing statute. An existing statute may prevail over an Executive agreement. I am inclined to think that an Executive agreement can be changed by statute if it attempts to deal with domestic law. But that question, at least, has not been settled.

There is another type of Executive agreement which I think can be made, and that is an Executive agreement by which the President binds himself with respect to his policy for the balance of his term, in reference to matters within his power. That is the only justification for some Executive agreements. We entered into an Executive agreement with the other United Nations that we would not make peace with Germany without their approval. The agreement was not submitted to Congress. Congress is the only body which can make peace. I do not think the agreement is binding on Congress. I suppose that so long as the President continues in office he can bind himself not to make peace; and he is the only man who can initiate a treaty of peace.

So, I assume that the United Nations agreement may be good for the remainder of the President's term, but that after his term is over it will no longer be binding on the United States. Thus, Mr. President, I think the President can undoubtedly by Executive agreement bind himself for the remainder of his term to pursue some policy.

It seems to me that justification for the U. N. R. R. A. agreement can be sought in only one way, and that is that it is a part of the war effort. Undoubtedly during the war the President may combine our armies. He is now authorizing the American armies to serve under foreign commanders.

The pending measure is strictly limited to 2 years. If it runs beyond the actual end of the war it will still be a part of the war, as I see it; and I am inclined to believe that by Executive action during the war the President is going to have to enter into a whole series of agreements with foreign nations, that will not affect post-war policies. That, to my mind, is the nature of this particular agreement.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was going to suggest—I sought to secure the Senator's attention a few moments ago on that particular point—that we assume the following situation: As Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, during a state of war, what is there to prevent the President in the exercise of his powers in that function to call together representatives of the other United Nations, and to say to them, "We are going to have to provide some relief so long as the war continues. Acting as President of the United States, I will hand over to you some money, and set up this fund, if I can get the money from the Congress."

Is not that about what the pending measure would mean?

Mr. TAFT. That is about it; yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. And what is there to prevent him from meeting with the other chiefs and saying to them, "I will do this if I can get the money from Congress"?

Mr. TAFT. I think that would be the case. I think there may be many other agreements. If they are confined to the operations in the war effort, I think they may come under the general power of the Executive to enter into agreements. Of course, if they require money, the agreements would have to be approved by Congress, if money for use under the agreements were desired.

But, apart from that, I believe the pending measure is a war measure. If we do not provide for relief, the Army can do it. Armies are obligated to see that everything possible be done to feed the people of occupied areas into which they go. Under lend-lease we have already authorized the making with other nations of agreements which may provide exactly the same relief, except perhaps not in enemy countries. The making of lend-lease agreements is clearly an Executive function authorized by Congress, and the money is provided by Congress; but an executive agreement is not a treaty. The agreements that have been signed with foreign nations are executive agreements, and their validity depends upon the statutes passed by a majority of the Members of Congress. Executive agreements are not treaties.

Mr. President, what I think is not an Executive agreement is the proposal for a United and Associated Nations stabilization fund. That was submitted by Secretary Morgenthau to the members of the Banking and Currency Committee and the Finance Committee. On July 28 he submitted it again. It has been revised. It is in the form of an agreement. But Secretary Morgenthau himself said:

> The international stabilization fund of the United and Associated Nations is proposed as a permanent institution for international monetary cooperation.

It seems to me that is of such outstanding importance, it is of such permanent policy, that I cannot see how we can enter into an agreement with England and other countries to set up a joint stabilization fund to which large sums of money must be contributed, unless we are willing to do so by treaty.

The distinction which I see is that the pending joint resolution is limited to 2 years during a war, as a part of war operations, whereas the international stabilization fund would be a permanent plan for the welfare of the world.

We have an even more extreme case, I think, in the agreement submitted by Secretary Morgenthau as the preliminary draft outline of a proposal for a United Nations bank for reconstruction and development. That fund is also to be a permanent fund. It grows out of the war, but has no relation to the war. I cannot see how we can enter into an agreement with the other nations to put up a certain amount of money unless the matter is submitted to the United States Senate in the form of a treaty.

Obviously a final agreement to enter into an international organization for the maintenance of peace, with the obligation to use our armed forces to enforce the peace, as is contemplated in the Connally resolution, must be by treaty.

I do not feel entirely confident of my position, but there is no doubt in my mind that Executive agreements can be made, and I believe that cooperation between nations at war together justifies this thing being done as an Executive agreement. It is not the fact that this must be submitted to Congress. It is the fact that this thing itself is part of the actual operation of the war.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think the Constitution does recognize the difference between a treaty and an agreement. The first subsection of section 10 of article I relates to treaties. It provides as follows:

> No State shall enter into any treaty—

And so forth. That is an absolute prohibition. But in subsection 3 there is a qualified prohibition relating to agreements, namely:

> No State shall, without the consent of Congress, * * * enter into any agreement—

And so forth. I do not care to discuss it, but I think there is an express recognition of the difference in quality between agreements and treaties.

Mr. TAFT. Whatever may be in the Constitution, by the construction of the courts today there is no doubt of the Executive power to make agreements. The only important thing is to define what falls within the field of Executive agreements, and what falls within the field of treaties.

The important thing, from my standpoint, is that it cannot be made an Executive agreement simply because it may be said that it must have the approval of Congress, and that anything can be put into an Executive agreement if we reserve the right of Congress to ratify it. If we do that we end forever the whole power of the Senate to pass upon agreements, treaties, or obligations with foreign nations. I am voting for this proposal solely on the ground that it is a part of the war effort, and something in which the President can properly engage.

Mr. President, as to the question of policy I have also had some reservations. I do not question the importance of undertaking relief. I served in the American Relief Administration immediately after the end of the last war. I saw perhaps $2,000,000,000 distributed during a year or more for the relief of foreign nations. I think we never received better value for our money. I think it created more good will than it was possible to dissipate by some of the things we did afterward.

I feel very confident that the proposed relief is a part of our whole war effort. So long as we are involved in the war, it

seems to me that we must carry through the obligation and see that the war is conducted with as little harm as possible, particularly to the people who are fighting on our side. I believe that kindness and liberality of treatment are what distinguish us from the Germans and the Japanese so far as occupied territories are concerned. Certainly I do not wish to follow a policy which would subject us to an unfavorable comparison, in many cases, with what the Germans and Japanese have done. They have done much to condemn them, but there have been instances of their having done exactly what is proposed here.

I am opposed to financing our future trade by loans to foreign countries, but the prevention of starvation is another matter. Although I do not believe that the joint resolution goes so far as to provide assistance in the restoration of property, I should be willing to contribute machinery or whatever may be necessary to get the economic machine going again in those countries, provided it comes from this country. I should vote against the joint resolution with the greatest regret. I think it embraces a policy which we should approve. I am sure that if we were to reject the joint resolution, it would be construed as a disapproval of that policy.

I do not believe that an international organization can be an efficient distributor of relief. If I had to initiate the program, I would propose an international council, in which everyone could speak up, whose members would constantly confer, but who would leave the actual administration of the relief to the particular country which was prepared to put up the money for the relief. I think such an organization would be more efficient. That was what we did after the last World War. I believe that in that instance we did a very efficient job. It was done promptly. Even before the armistice came, we provided for the accumulation of great stocks of supplies. We put ships in motion the moment the armistice came. We were able to negotiate with every other country. We had some difficulty with the blockade, because the British would not lift it immediately; but I am perfectly certain that if that had been an international organization it would have been 6 months before anything could actually have been done. Perhaps we have more time to plan now; but up to this time the Army has been doing the work, largely because the other organization has not been able to get started, or to find sufficient funds.

I believe that an organization which has six masters, and cannot do anything that will offend a particular nation, is likely to be a slow and rather unsatisfactory organization. On the other hand, the Administration has the initiation of foreign policy. It has chosen this method. I may be mistaken. Perhaps the organization in this case can be made as efficient as individual administration.

I believe that if we are to provide food, and are to be generous, we ought to have full credit. I doubt very much if, in the intricacies of an international organization, with employees from every nation in the world, there will be such credit. After the world war we had a small organization from the food administration. The whole distribution was made by the United States Food Administration. The organization was officered by Americans. When the war ended we must have taken 500 men out of the Army who wanted to stay a while longer. They went into every country in Europe. They were fine, upstanding men. They made a favorable impression for the whole American people. The people to whom relief was being administered appreciated what they were doing. All the way from Armenia to Rumania, Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Finland, American supplies were distributed largely under the American flag. I think that was a more satisfactory method than that which is here proposed.

I somewhat question the wisdom of having a council of four deciding how and where the distribution shall be made, when, as a matter of fact, only one of the four will really provide any of the relief supplies. Great Britain will make a contribution, but obviously England has no food or other resources. The British contribution will come very largely from Canada and Australia. The Canadians have been most generous. For example, in the Greek relief, they have been more generous than has the United States. They have been more concerned with feeding children in occupied countries than we have. Certainly the Canadians should participate. I do not see why the relief should not be distributed by a council made up of those who are to supply the relief.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Under the proposal now pending, it will be possible for relief to be given to India, will it not?

Mr. TAFT. With the consent of the British, yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Why is the consent of the British necessary? Is that simply because they have jurisdiction over the territory? Section 4 of the joint resolution is the one which provides for assistance.

Mr. TAFT. Section 4 provides as follows:

> In expressing its approval of this joint resolution, it is the recommendation of Congress that insofar as funds and facilities permit, any area important to the military operations of the United Nations which is stricken by famine or disease may be included in the benefits to be made available through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

In another section there is an agreement that relief may not be carried on in the territory of any member government without the consent of the member government, if I correctly remember.

Mr. BREWSTER. What troubles me in that connection is the very great evidence of want which we saw in India. Thousands were starving. Apparently the situation is still continuing. That is a primary responsibility, I assume, of the British Commonwealth of Nations. The thing which greatly impressed me was that much of what Canada or Australia would be able to do would, under the ordinary laws of humanity, go first to those for whom they are primarily responsible. It seemed to me as I saw many of the 350,000,000 Indians that it would be a very great drain on the resources of any nation which undertook adequately to supply their needs.

Mr. TAFT. I believe the House of Representatives wanted to make clear that there was nothing in the agreement which would prevent distribution of relief to India. I do not think there was.

Mr. BREWSTER. India has not been an occupied nation. There has been practically no encroachment on the territory of India; has there?

Mr. TAFT. That may be true.

The provision to which I have referred was in article VII, reading in part as follows:

> Notwithstanding any other provision herein contained, while hostilities or other military necessities exist in any area, the Administration and its Director General shall not undertake activities therein without the consent of the military command of that area and unless subject to such control as the command may find necessary.

That language would certainly limit the distribution of relief in India.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator mean that the Indians would come under the definition of "military necessities" existing in the area? The hostilities have encroached very little on the territory of India. They have been chiefly in Burma, I believe. But India might well come under the language "military necessities."

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. On page 3, beginning in line 5, may be found the answer to the Senator's question. The language reads in part as follows:

> To plan, coordinate, administer, or arrange for the administration of measures for the relief of victims of war in any area under the control of any of the United Nations through the provision of food—

And so forth. If the people of India can be considered as victims of the war—and I believe the starvation there is attributed to the war in that area——

Mr. BREWSTER. It has been caused largely by the cutting off of the rice supply by the Japanese occupation of Burma.

I think this matter has arisen under the language found near the beginning of the agreement, which has so often been referred to:

> that immediately upon the liberation of any area by the armed forces of the United Nations or as a consequence of retreat of the enemy—

And so forth. I think that is the basis on which it is usually thought of as being designed for the relief of occupied territory.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. In just a moment. My impression is that under paragraph 2 (a) of article I, reading in part, that—

> Subject to the provisions of article VII, the purposes and functions of the Adminis-

tration shall be as follows: (a) To plan, coordinate, administer, or arrange for the administration of measures for the relief of victims of war in any area under the control of any of the United Nations—

India would be covered, even if the other clause had not been included.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, if occupation is the test, the British have been in hostile occupation of India for nearly 200 years.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate. There is this to be said in favor of a joint organization, and that is that I think we do want today to emphasize our desire to cooperate with the other United Nations as closely as possible. Probably it is very important today that we make it clear that we are prepared to engage in that cooperation, because some of the other allies seem to be forgetting the fact that cooperation is also necessary on their part. However, I do not believe that such a policy can be said to be definite enough to justify any change in our policy. It can be said for this method that it emphasizes tremendously our desire to cooperate just as closely as possible with the other United Nations. Therefore, I shall vote for the joint resolution, although I do not like the method provided for in it, and I have some doubts about that. I have indicated the fear, at least, that it will be used as a precedent for other things for which I do not think it can properly be used as a precedent. However, since the administration has chosen this method of achieving an object which I think is all-important in the war effort, I propose to vote for the joint resolution.

PHOENIX-TEMPE STONE CO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 375) for the relief of the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co., which was, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$1,500" and insert "$1,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 16, which will be stated.

The amendment of the committee was, on page 16, line 2, to strike out "at the conclusion of 2 years following the termination of hostilities on all fronts unless specifically extended by an act of Congress" and insert "on June 30, 1946."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, after line 25, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservation:

That the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall not be authorized to enter into contracts or undertake or incur obligations beyond the limits of appropriations made therefor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Texas will accept the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I assume the Senator, by the language contained in the amendment, does not mean to limit the expenditures by the entire organization to the amount we would appropriate; does he?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. CONNALLY. What the Senator means is that he does not want the organization to assume any obligation——

Mr. McKELLAR. Any obligation beyond that of the appropriations which would be made by the Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY. As to the United States?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have no serious objection to the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator whether his amendment would be a reservation, or an amendment to the text of the agreement?

Mr. McKELLAR. It has been stated by the chairman of the committee, and I believe generally acquiesced in by most Senators on both sides of the aisle, that the amendment should appear as a separate section on page 15. That will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. CONNALLY. It would have to be in that form, because it could not be an amendment to the agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment which I offer, and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, after line 25, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservation:

That in the case of the United States the appropriate constitutional body to determine the amount and character of the contributions of the United States is the Congress of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Texas will accept the amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator agree to have included in his amendment, in line 4, after the word "character", the words "and time"? The language would then read:

That in the case of the United States the appropriate constitutional body to determine the amount and character and time of the contributions of the United States is the Congress of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection to the modification.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection I may add that the time of the contribution will be determined by the act of Congress appropriating the money for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it will; but I have no objection.

Mr. WHITE. What the Senator from Kentucky has said probably is true, but I think it would avoid controversy if those words were inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee adopt the modification suggested by the Senator from Maine?

Mr. McKELLAR. I adopt it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator's amendment is somewhat didactic. It solemnly states what everyone knows, or should know—that in the case of the United States the constitutional body of the United States when it comes to appropriations is the Congress of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will accept the amendment, I will plead guilty to the charge.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not care to argue with the Senator from Tennessee about fine distinctions as to language, because of course the Senator is much more familiar with distinctions in the use of language; he has been in the Senate so much longer than I have.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to caution the Senator from Texas against making suggestions to the Senator from Tennessee along that line.

Mr. CONNALLY. I realize that the admonition the Senator from Kentucky gives me arises from an experience he had regarding raiment, during a colloquy with the Senator from Tennessee.

I shall not endanger my own safety in that respect, though I see no objection to saying that A is A and B is B.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator, and I hope that the Senate will adopt the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Tennessee adopted the suggestion of the Senator from Maine and modified his amendment accordingly?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer another amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I think the Senator has had his quota. He has had two amendments added to the joint resolution. Has he still another one?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. I offer another amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, after line 25, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservation:

That the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall not be authorized to enter into contracts or undertake or incur obligations beyond the limits of appropriations made therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have one more amendment, and then I shall yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, line 21, after the word "area", it is proposed to insert "(except areas within enemy territory)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I would not be in favor of that amendment. I do not know what the circumstances are, but there may be place within enemy territory where we would want to furnish relief, for instance, Formosa. That island certainly is within enemy territory. I have no great objection to furnishing some relief to enemy countries. I think we are obligated when we invade them to afford relief if they are without other means of support.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not adopt the amendment, and I trust the Senator from Tennessee will not insist upon it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall have to do so. Under the joint resolution as now written relief and rehabilitation may be furnished to any enemy country. The members of the committee, as I understood, said that it was intended by the provisions of section 4 to include India only, and that it was not intended to include Germany, Austria, France, Belgium, and various other nations of the earth.

Mr. TAFT. What about Sicily and Italy? Are they not enemy countries? They have been enemy countries, and portions of them maintain they still are. Certainly the definition is a very doubtful one.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am quite sure the Senator from Ohio would not want, and I do not believe any other Senators would want, to give relief to that portion of Italy which is now under the control of Germany. Under the provision, I repeat relief may be extended to enemy countries taken over. I hope the Senator from Texas will reconsider the matter, accept the amendment, and take it to conference, anyway, and let it be considered there.

Mr. TAFT and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The only ground on which Italy could be included in the joint resolution would be on the ground that they had ceased to make war. The only time we could possibly afford relief to people of Germany would be when they have ceased to make war. So, either it excludes Italy, or it does not mean anything. I think it excludes Italy, and I think it is fully intended that we should distribute relief in Italy and Sicily.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understood that both the distinguished Senator from Texas and the distinguished Senator from Michigan, members of the subcommittee, stated that the purpose of this provision was to include India. I can see a reason for that, and I am perfectly willing that that shall be done, but unless the provision is limited as I suggest, let us see what the result would be. Our bomber planes and other planes have been raining bombs over Berlin, and I presume they have caused a great deal of loss of life and injury to persons and to property. Is it the idea of anyone that we should go to Germany and make reparations for that damage?

For instance, suppose we have destroyed the greater proportion of the buildings in the city of Berlin, is it possible that we are going there and give relief to rehabilitate that city and restore it? What is the use of blowing it up if we are going to make the American people pay the bill for restoring it? It does not seem to me that we ought to provide for it in this joint resolution, and I hope the Senator from Texas will reconsider, and take the amendment to conference.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the amendment, as we know is proposed to be added to the India section. I do not know whether the Senator from Tennessee thinks he is prohibiting U. N. R. R. A. from distributing relief in enemy countries by putting it into the India section. If not, if it only affects India, of course, the amendment does not mean anything.

Mr. McKELLAR. I submitted it to the draftsman of the Senate, who is a very competent and efficient man, and I believe that it will have the effect he says it will have. I told him what we wanted to do, that we wanted to provide for relief in India, as the committee has stated it was their purpose to do; but not to extend it to enemy countries. India is not an enemy country. I presume a number of Senators have been to India and have seen the conditions which have been portrayed here this afternoon—a tremendous horde of poor, dilapidated, and hungry men, women, and children. It would be the height of charity to help them, but in order to help them I do not think we ought to put a provision in the joint resolution by which we would be obligated to help the people in enemy countries.

Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. BREWSTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe the Senator from Kentucky was on his feet first, and I yield to him, and then I shall be glad to yield to other Senators.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that section 4 provides that:

In expressing its approval of this joint resolution, it is the recommendation of Congress that insofar as funds and facilities permit, any area important to the military operations of the United Nations which is stricken by famine or disease may be included in the benefits to be made available through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

The crux of that paragraph is found in the words "any area important to the military operations of the United Nations which is stricken by famine or disease." Suppose we go into some Japanese territory in the Pacific, as we have conquered territory that was formerly under Japan, suppose we go into portions of Germany which from a military standpoint will become important to the operations of the United Nations, and we find famine and disease there that would jeopardize even the safety of our own Army. If we included the amendment of the Senator, then we could not do anything to relieve that situation. It seems to me inasmuch as we are undertaking to provide by the section that relief may be afforded in any area important to the military operations of the United Nations, where there is famine and disease, we ought not to restrict it if the area happens to be a strip of enemy territory.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in this war every inch of Germany is important to the military operations of the United Nations; not a single foot of German territory is unimportant to the military operations of the United States in the war, and for us to invade that country and then obligate ourselves at the same time we invade it to furnish relief to those who may be suffering or dying by reason of famine or disease seems to me to be monstrous.

Mr. BARKLEY. Suppose we go into Germany. As we go into Germany, the territory we take over behind the Army must be administered.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no question about that. That is not what is being referred to here.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Army proceeds, let us say, into the middle of Germany. The Army does not want to take charge of all the territory it may have occupied, and U. N. R. R. A. would take charge in order to relieve it. It is in that sense that the Senator's amendment would even prohibit the U. N. R. R. A. from going in behind the Army at any stage and undertaking to relieve famine and disease which might themselves affect the safety of the Army.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield at that point?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield in a moment. When the Army takes charge of any part of Germany, it is not Germany any longer, but it is the property of the United States or of the Allied Nations.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is enemy territory.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; it is anything else but enemy territory. It is Allied territory in the sense of the meaning here. Of course, they would have a right to do it.

I yield now to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator to the last portion of the paragraph which was read by the Senator from Kentucky. The effect of this section, that is, section 4, is not to amend the agreement but merely to state the recommendation of the Congress in this regard.

I should like to have the opinion of the Senator from Texas, in charge of the joint resolution, as to whether or not section 4 would have any effect whatsoever, so far as the agreement is concerned, or so far as the authorities who will operate under it are concerned.

Mr. CONNALLY. If I may be permitted by the Senator from Tennessee to answer——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. So far as the legal effect is concerned, I do not think section 4 has the force of law. Other terms in the agreement and in the preceding portions of the joint resolution, define where the relief shall be expended. As I view it, this is merely a suggestion to the organization, that if they can find a way to do what is needed, it is hoped they will do it.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wonder whether the Senator would be satisfied if the amendment read, "except areas occupied by the enemy." It seems to me that would reach what the Senator is trying to cover.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it would, and I modify my amendment to that effect.

Mr. TAFT. That would be entirely satisfactory.

Mr. BARKLEY. What effect would the amendment, even as modified, have in Finland, for instance, which is enemy territory to some of the United Nations, although not to us, or in Norway? Would they be regarded as enemy territory?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; neither of them would be regarded as enemy territory, because they are not enemy territory to us, certainly not.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask that the amendment be restated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment as modified.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert on page 15, line 21, after the word "area", the words "except areas occupied by the enemy."

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think there is any danger of our extending any relief to territory actually occupied by the enemy, and I shall not resist the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. OVERTON. Before the amendment is acted on, Mr. President, I should like to say that I do not know that the amendment as modified carries out the intention of the Senator from Tennessee. Suppose some of the United Nations should be occupied by the enemy, suppose a part of England should be occupied by the enemy; could not relief be sent into that territory? I think it should say, "and while occupied by the enemy."

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the suggestion of the Senator is well taken, and I further modify my amendment by accepting his suggestion. Let the clerk state the amendment with that modification. I think clearly it should be so corrected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment as now modified.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, line 21, after the word "area", it is proposed to insert "except within enemy territory and while occupied by the enemy."

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a word, Mr. President. I wish to quote from the report of the committee, on page 9, which shows that there is no purpose to do what the Senator from Tennessee is seeking to prevent:

> The policy resolutions adopted by the Council specifically provide, furthermore, that the Council must approve the scale and nature of such operations and that all expenses of operations in an enemy or ex-enemy country should be borne by that country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, after line 25, it is proposed to insert the following:

> No amendment under article VIII (a) of the agreement involving any new obligation for the United States shall be binding upon the United States without approval by joint resolution of Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment. It has been worked over by the committee and the State Department, and we have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, some time ago I offered an amendment in line 11, page 11. I wish to withdraw the amendment, because of the suggestion made as to it being mixed up with another provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment was never formally offered, and the Senator has a right to withdraw it.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I offer the amendment, which I now send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, after line 25, it is proposed to insert the following:

> The Director General shall make periodic reports to the Congress of the United States of America covering the Administration's activities.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not know that there is any objection to having the amendment agreed to, but the Director General is not an officer of the United States, he is not under the control of the United States, he is an officer of the organization we are proposing to set up by the agreement. What legal power have we to direct him as to what he shall do with respect to the administration of his office? That is not a captious question, because I think it is generally agreed that we as a Nation, singly, and by ourselves, have no control over the Director General. It happens that today the Director General is an American citizen, but suppose that some time in the near future he should happen to be a British citizen or a Chinese citizen, would we have any right to say to him that he should make a separate report to the Congress of the United States?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. We might not be able to enforce the provision, but so long as we held the purse strings, I think they would submit a report to us.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think they would do that anyway, but the question whether we have the power legally to control the Director General is what we are considering. If we cannot control him, I have some doubt as to the wisdom of making such a gesture.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the purpose of the amendment, but if we are to do what is proposed at all, it seems to me the amendment should be leveled at the American member of the Council, who will be our member. Another safeguard is that before any appropriations are made the organization must come before Congress, and I assume that the one who comes before Congress will be our representative, or the Director General, Mr. Lehman, and he will have to make a report, and we will ask, naturally, what they did with the money previously provided. It seems to me the effect of this might be offensive to some of the other nations, since it might seem that we were assuming to take charge and dictate.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Would the Senator have any objection to the amendment if it were modified so as to read "the American member of the Council," instead of "Director General"?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to ask the Senator what he finds lacking at the top of page 15, where the language is:

> The President shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures made under any such appropriations and of operations under the agreement.

Is not that the appropriate point at which to require reports?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No; I feel that that language refers only to the expenditures and the receipts of money.

Mr. BARKLEY. The whole operation is under the agreement. Not only appropriations but all operations are under the agreement. Everything done is under the agreement.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. My thought was that that language did not go far enough. That is why I submitted my amendment, so as to require someone who could do so

to report to Congress what the organization was doing.

Mr. VANDENBERG. We thought we were doing precisely that thing in the language on the top of page 15.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from South Dakota will not insist on his amendment. It seems to me the language just quoted by the Senator from Michigan completely answers the Senator's suggestion. The language provides that the President shall submit reports. He is the man who is shot at, instead of some subordinate. It seems to me the language is entirely adequate, in addition to the additional safeguard which is provided by the necessity for coming to the Appropriations Committees.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Suppose the President should not submit a report of the organization's activities?

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, someone can always express such a fear. The President, however, does submit reports when it is provided that he shall do so by act of Congress. The President has to come to Congress for every dollar he receives.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. We are still waiting for the report on the Food Congress held last winter.

Mr. BARKLEY. That was not held by direction of Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator from South Dakota will not insist on his amendment. It seems to me the provisions of the bill are quite adequate.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I do not feel that the provisions of the bill go far enough. Regretting, as I do, not being able to agree with the views expressed by the Senator from Texas, I shall ask for a vote on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have not heard any Senator protest against the proposal that the United States provide $1,350,000,000 of the money paid into the Treasury by American taxpayers who are so loaded down with debt and weary and tired of taxes now that they can hardly budge. It is proposed that we shall put up $1,350,000,000 of their money, which we shall need so badly to provide for our veterans when they return, and place that money in the hands of a group of foreigners to do with as they please. As a Member of the United States Senate I protest against it. If there shall be but one vote against the proposal I shall vote against the United States putting up $1,350,000,000 of the hard-earned money of the weary taxpayers of this country and placing it in the hands of a group of foreigners to do with as they wish.

Mr. President, I can now see that the Senate is going to vote the $1,350,000,000. In view of the fact that we are putting up two-thirds of the money, and that perhaps, as the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] said today, we shall probably put up 90 percent of the money, because all the 43 countries participating in this matter are receiving lend-lease from us, with the exception of Canada and Liberia—in view of the fact that we are putting up virtually all the money to feed all the world, I think at least 50 percent of the money contributed by us could be spent in the purchase of American farm products and machinery, medicines, and such other things as are going to be used by this world-wide distributing organization.

Therefore, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 5, after the figures and words "$1,350,000,000 in the aggregate", it is proposed to insert ", of which 50 percent shall be spent for the purchase of farm products and other supplies in the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that this organization is not controlled by us, that we have only 1 vote in 44, and in view of the fact that we are participating very heavily in this war, and that the lives of our men are in jeopardy in virtually every part of the world, and, in view of the further fact that we are interested in the preservation of the lives of those men, and that we do not want any foreign organization to interfere with our military activities, I maintain that before the proposed international organization composed of 44 nations, in which we have 1 vote, is permitted to go into a territory and to begin its operations, the Chief of Staff of our Army who is in charge of that particular territory should be consulted in order that the activities of this foreign international organization may not interfere with our military operations, or be likely to do damage to any operations which are in the minds of our military authorities to be carried forward.

In line with that thought I offer an amendment which I send to the desk, and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 16, after line 4, it is proposed to add a new section as follows:

SEC. 6. No program of relief or rehabilitation or policy contemplated or proposed by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall be placed into operation, without it having first been submitted for approval to the Chief of Staff of the Army of the United Nations in charge of the area in which the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration proposes to operate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, that is already taken care of in the joint resolution where it is provided that within military areas nothing shall be done by the organization without the consent and cooperation of the commander of our armed forces in that territory.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I ask for the adoption of my amendment, Mr. President, because I think its provisions are specific. I am under the impression that probably our military commanders would welcome a qualification of that sort, so there would be no question about the organization coming in and interfering with their military program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that our Army is making expenditures of millions of dollars in buying foodstuffs for the purpose of making distribution to the civilians of different countries in which we operate. In view of the fact that we have a Government school in Charlottesville, Va., where we are training men to administer aid and to participate in suggestions relative to government in the respective countries after we enter them, I am rather of the opinion that those individuals whom we have in the field now would be better prepared to handle this relief than any foreign organization we might set up. Therefore, I think the appropriations should be made to the Army to augment the money they have now for that particular purpose in emergency cases. I, therefore, offer an amendment to that effect, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause and to insert:

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as Congress may determine to be necessary, to the Army and Navy, for use of military governments established in occupied countries for the adequate conduct of relief and rehabilitation and related necessary activities. A complete record shall be maintained by each military government of all expenditures and submitted to Congress in semiannual reports of the Army and Navy, whichever the case may be.

It is proposed to amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution authorizing the appropriation of funds for use by military governments established in occupied countries in conducting relief and rehabilitation and related activities."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I believe we are all in agreement that there is no greater humanitarian organization upon the face of the earth than the American Red Cross. The American Red Cross is considered to be one of the finest organizations of its kind that was ever formed anywhere in the world. For many years it has done a magnificent job, a job of which not only we in America are proud, but of which the people of the world are actually very proud; because during its existence the American Red Cross has administered to the sick, the wounded, and the unfortunate in almost every section of the entire world.

In view of the fact that the American Red Cross is an American organization,

in view of the fact that we are actually to put up 90 percent of all the money to be used under the pending measure, in view of the fact that the American Red Cross already has a world-wide organization, and that we have implicit faith in it, and that all other nations of the world have implicit faith in it, I think the fund should be administered by the American Red Cross.

However, instead of providing in my amendment, or my substitute, as it might be called, that $1,350,000,000 shall be authorized to be appropriated, I have provided that not to exceed $350,000,000 in the aggregate shall be authorized to be appropriated. I ask that the Senate direct that the money for relief be distributed by an organization we know, not by an international organization in which we shall have virtually no voice—only one voice among 43 others.

Mr. President, I send my amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $350,000,000 in the aggregate, as the Congress of the United States may determine from time to time to be appropriated, and such sums to be used for relief among the populations of areas liberated by the armed forces of the United Nations. Such sums shall be administered solely by the American Red Cross, using the facilities of their international organization.

SEC. 2. The American Red Cross shall submit to Congress quarterly reports of expenditures made under any such appropriations.

SEC. 3. Relief shall be defined as aid in furnishing food, clothing, shelter, the prevention of pestilence, and recovery of health of the peoples of the liberated areas.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint Resolution authorizing an appropriation of funds to be administered by the Red Cross for relief in areas liberated by the armed forces of the United Nations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I submit the last amendment I propose to offer, and send it to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $350,000,000,000——

Mr. REYNOLDS. No, Mr. President; not $350,000,000,000, but $350,000,000.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $350,000,000 to be expended under the direction of the President, for the furnishing of food, clothing, medicine, and other absolute essentials of life, to relieve starvation and suffering among individuals in those countries which have been overrun by, or have directly suffered from hostile action of, the enemies of the United Nations in the present war.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to authorize the appropriation of $350,000,000 for use in relieving starvation and suffering in countries which have been overrun by, or have directly suffered from hostile action of, the enemies of the United Nations in the present war."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the record show that the amendment provides for $350,000,000,000 or $350,000,000?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I corrected the clerk's reading of the amount. The amount stated in the amendment is $350,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amount carried in the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. Three hundred and fifty million dollars.

Mr. REYNOLDS. But, Mr. President, considering the way the Congress appropriates billions of dollars, one might think the amount was $350,000,000,000 instead of $350,000,000. I suppose the clerk mentioned $350,000,000,000 because the national debt has almost reached that amount at the present time.

Mr. President, I think this matter is of great concern to everyone in America. I do not desire to take up very much of the time of the Senate in discussing the amendment. I have offered the amendments in order that my record may be clear. I want the American people to know I am not going to vote $1,350,000,000 for a group of foreigners and aliens in an international organization to spend all over the world.

I submitted the amendment to cut down the amount to $350,000,000; $350,000,000 is a great deal of money—a very great deal of money. We do not know where the money will be spent; we do not know to what particular use it will be put. We know it will be spent in stricken countries, but at the same time we do not know exactly what organizations there will be called upon to make the distribution; because in an organization of this kind there is bound to be some politics. It is almost inevitable that there will be some politics in it—just as we see today, in Italy, a fight occurring between the Fascists and the Communists, and just as we see occurring in Yugoslavia today a fight between the Fascists and Communists.

We in the United States are being called upon to put up virtually all the money to be used to feed all the world, just as if we had not already done everything possible in that direction. Mr. President, we have done a great deal. Not only have we done a great deal through governmental action, but let us see what we are doing through private activities. I read a brief newspaper article which bears on that point:

SOVIETS GIVEN $16,781,333 IN RELIEF GOODS LAST YEAR

NEW YORK, February 14.—Russian War Relief, Inc., announced today that $16,781,333.74 worth of clothing, medical supplies, and miscellaneous articles were consigned through it to the Soviet Union last year.

In a report to the agency's board of directors, Edward C. Carter, president of the organization, said that clothing comprised 70.07 percent of the shipments; medical supplies, 20.42 percent; seeds, food, and miscellaneous items, 4.35.

Mr. Carter said that of the relief goods consigned $7,742,430 was contributed in goods by Americans. The remainder was received in cash contributions through war chests and the National War Fund, he said. Administrative, promotion, and operating costs total 4.43 percent of income, the report stated, an amount which Mr. Carter said was believed to be the lowest ever achieved by a comparable agency.

The 1944 goal, recently announced, is $21,000,000, which includes a $9,000,000 allocation from the National War Fund.

So, Mr. President, we find that from private charitable sources the Soviets were given $16,781,333.74 worth of clothing, medical supplies, and other articles last year, and that the goal for this year is $21,000,000, to be collected in this country and to be sent to the Soviets.

I think we have done our part, and I am protesting about our chucking away the money of the taxpayers of our country.

Mr. President, the reason why I keep harping on the matter is because, scattered all over the world we have 10,000,000 or 11,000,000 men and women in uniform who are dying and bleeding and suffering. When the war is over, we shall have to take care of their widows and their orphaned children, and we shall have to take care of hundreds of thousands of invalids—veterans who will be armless, legless, blind, or deranged. The question is, when the war is over will we have the money with which to take care of our own veterans who will have gone forth to fight for the "four freedoms' throughout the world?

I am interested in that, and I think the time has come to cut down the amount to be authorized. If we approve the pending measure as it now stands, it will really be our recommendation for an appropriation of $1,350,000,000. Of course, Mr. President, we all want to help those who are afflicted. We all appreciate the suffering which is being experienced by the unfortunate people in the invaded countries, and our heart goes out to them in sympathy. But, Mr. President, charity must begin at home. If we give away everything now, what shall we have left for our own veterans when the war is over? And only God knows when the war will end. No one else knows. The war may last for years.

I am pleading today in the interest of our men and women—our soldiers who are fighting on 72 fronts throughout the world. I hope to God we will save enough so that we shall be able to buy the medicine and food and to furnish the nurses required in order to take care of the hundreds of thousands of wounded who will return to this country after the war is over. I ask for a vote on the question of cutting down the amount from $1,350,000,000 to $350,000,000. Let us give away $350,000,000. We have plenty. They will do what they want with it. But for God's sake, let

us save $1,000,000,000 of this money for our own soldiers.

Mr. President, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article written by Constantine Brown in his column entitled "This Changing World," and a newspaper article in reference to a young American hero who has returned to this country blind, broke, and 20.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of January 25, 1944]

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

If a section of the United States were hit by a major tragedy and funds for its relief and rehabilitation had to be obtained by private contribution in which, say, Thomas Lamont, was the principal contributor, no one would be surprised if his representative were given a decisive voice in the distribution of the funds.

It appears, however, that what seems logical in regard to domestic affairs is not logical in a large-scale international undertaking.

Congress has been asked to appropriate $1,350,000,000 for the relief and rehabilitation of the devastated and hungry areas of the war-stricken world.

The people of the United States never have been stingy in assisting other nations when they were in distress. Americans contributed hundreds of millions after the World War to feed not only our former associates, but they sent aid into Russia, which at that time was ostracized by our Government, and into Armenia to save millions of people from starvation.

The relief and rehabilitation of Europe, the United Nations Governments have decided among themselves, must no longer be based on charity. All parties concerned must do their bit to raise a large fund to help the starved peoples of Europe and Asia soon after their liberation from the Axis yoke. Industries and public utilities which have suffered so much from the "torch" policy of the Germans and the Japanese and from aerial warfare, will have to be restored to permit quick economic rehabilitation. The devastated areas comprise practically the whole of Europe—with the exception of the few remaining neutral countries—and the major portion of China.

For this purpose the United States, which has the largest national income of the world, probably will be assessed an amount equal to 1 percent of its 1943 income.

It is immaterial whether or not the 1943 figure represents the real income of the United States or is an inflated amount due to war conditions. It is argued in some quarters that American industry will remain very busy long after the war, since it will be forced to produce for the whole civilized world everything from hairpins to machine tools and planes.

But what appears important to many legislators—even though they are going to vote for the required appropriations—is that while the American taxpayer is the heaviest contributor to this undertaking, the United States has only a 25-percent voice in the handling of both relief and rehabilitation.

A committee of four forms the directing council of the U. N. R. R. A., in which Britain, Russia, China, and the United States are represented with equal voice, although there is a most unequal contribution of funds.

Nations which are to receive assistance are to be consulted whenever their own countries are involved, but do not participate in the framing of the U. N. R. R. A.'s general policies.

The United States Government was careful to see there was no hitch in this United Nations' attempt to present a solid front to the world. The whole matter was presented to the country as the first endeavor of the associated powers to work in complete harmony and on the surface the project does not seem to involve any controversial political problem. But it appears that with the best will in the world politics cannot be kept out of the organization.

Definite trends and a race for jockeying for political domination are only too obvious in Europe today.

The Russians are in the midst of an offensive in old Poland. In Yugoslavia there is a bitter fight between the representatives of King Peter and those of Moscow. A similar situation is said to exist in Greece. In Italy there seems to be an ill-concealed struggle between the supporters and nonsupporters of the House of Savoy. In France several factions are preparing for a fight for power after the Nazis have been eliminated and Gen. Charles de Gaulle hopes he will be the man who will guide his country's destinies. There are many who still oppose him.

Feeding the starved people of all these countries will be a strong trump card for the would-be leaders. Food in a starved country is far more important than gold, and the organization which has the key to the larder in its pocket can impose itself on that country.

If the council of four were composed of representatives of countries not involved in the game of power politics we could look on it as an adequate directorate to insure a fair distribution of the materials purchased largely with the American taxpayer's money. But unfortunately both Britain and Russia are involved in that game and their representatives might be tempted into some sort of "patronage" which would help their protégés obtain political supremacy, for a while, at least.

The fact that America has no decisive vote in the U. N. R. R. A. is likely to get this country involved in the game of power politics when we favor unwittingly the formation of this or that puppet government in Europe.

RETURN OF A HERO: BLIND, BROKE, AND 20

McCLOUD, CALIF., February 12.—Young Robert Wetzel has been led back home from the wars in Italy—back to the beloved mountains he no longer can see. He arrived with $2 in his pocket, a Japanese-American soldier for an escort and a receipt showing his Government would not even buy a pair of glasses to cover his sightless eyes.

A receipt made out by the post exchange of McCloskey Hospital, Temple, Tex., acknowledges that Wetzel paid $8 for glasses—Wetzel paid, not the Army. Date: January 24.

He asked for his new glasses, for there was—and is—a chance he will see again. But the Army doctor, as Wetzel recalls the words, said:

"If you could be put in shape to fight again, the Army would pay for the glasses. But since you are being discharged, you will have to pay for them yourself."

BLIND VET AT 20

Bob Wetzel was 19 when he entered the Army, scarcely 20 when he came back, a blind veteran, to this mountain community, where his father works in the office of the lumber company.

He was in that spearhead formed by Company I, One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Infantry, the night of October 13 when the Volturno churned red with blood. They crossed the Volturno, established the beachhead.

But that beachhead was a thicket of land mines, Wetzel heard an artillery shell coming, dived into a ditch—and landed on a mine.

His left eye was literally torn from its socket. Three fragments pierced the right eye. He was totally blind.

It was five hospitals and 70 days from the Appennines of Italy to the Siskiyous of California.

An Army major came one day and told him of a bitter failure.

"They had tried to take those splinters out of my right eye with a magnet and it didn't work," said Wetzel.

"But he said there was a chance that corrective glasses might restore vision to my right eye."

From that moment he lived for the day when treatment could begin. They fitted him with his first glasses and soon he could see shadows, only shadows. But it was seeing.

The problem, they told him, was one of constant adjustment of the lens to strengthen the eye.

Two weeks later the blow fell. He was told he was being discharged.

"Of course, I wanted to get back home," Wetzel related, "so I didn't feel so badly about it.

"But if I was going to see again, I thought they should do everything they could now. I thought they could keep me and transfer me to a hospital near home."

PAID FOR GLASSES

"I wanted the new glasses right away, but the doctor just gave me a prescription and told me to get it filled at the post exchange. So I went and paid the $8, but haven't received the glasses yet."

He was placed in a hospital car with a Japanese-American corporal as an escort to deliver him home.

Wetzel's father concluded the recital:

"Bob is not bitter. He thinks the Army is grand. We all do. But perhaps the public should know about cases like Bobby's. We're thinking about all the thousands of other wounded men.

"Bob has a mother and father to come to, and the American Legion is handling his case.

"But what about the men who won't have a family to come home to?"

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, because of the fact that I have been serving as a member of the conference committee which has been holding both morning and afternoon sessions, it has been impossible or impracticable for me to be present during much of the debate in the Senate on this very important subject. I do not intend to take more than a minute or two of the time of the Senate.

I believe that when a measure of this kind is before the Senate of the United States for approval or disapproval, the Senate is facing one of the most important problems it has faced, at least during my short period of service here. I am not willing to vote without at least registering for the RECORD some of my thoughts on the matter. My remarks shall be very brief, I can assure the Senate.

Mr. President, I can remember the trainloads of relief supplies which were collected in the prairie States of the West, including my own State of Nebraska following the last war. I was then engaged in the milling and grain business and in the manufacture of flour. I know that the millers from all over the United States solicited trainloads and shiploads of flour, which

were taken to the devastated areas of Europe and distributed through relief organizations. Some of our most distinguished people joined in that work and donated their time and effort, and performed valuable services, indeed.

I am of the opinion that today the American people are just as liberal as they were at that time; they are just as anxious to help in the terrible catastrophe which faces many of the people who live in the war-devastated areas; and I am sure the American people will come to the rescue. But here we are adopting a different policy. We are saying to the people who gave of their might in the previous war situation, "This time the Government will take charge of relief."

If one is a stockholder in a large corporation, does he think for a minute that his duty as a citizen is fulfilled when the board of directors or the president of the corporation gives $1,000, $10,000, or $100,000 for relief? The man who wants to give wants to give as an individual. If relief is to be administered through a corporation—and in this instance our Government is acting in the capacity of a corporation—if we give the last penny of the substance of this Nation, no individual citizen will feel in his heart that he has contributed to the solution of the problem.

I for one want the people of America to decide how charitable they wish to be. I have no doubt that they will be charitable to the extreme limit in this catastrophe, as they were in the previous catastrophe.

I do not know how I can register my protest against a measure of this kind, meritorious as it may be, without casting my vote in the negative. At the same time, I want the Members of this body, and others who may look at the vote in the RECORD, to understand that I expect them to be as liberal in this instance as they have always been in the past. I do not wish to create an organization behind which everyone can hide and say, "I have made my donation through the Treasury of the United States by paying taxes; therefore, I do not wish to contribute at this time."

I do not believe that we, as a government, have any more right than have the officers of a corporation to become the charity organization for each individual citizen of this country. I, for one, want to give. I expect to give, and I have no doubt that the people of America will give liberally. However, I am sure they will not like the idea of setting up a tremendous relief organization, in which much of the money will be wasted in administration, and in which they will have no opportunity to decide where their gifts shall go.

In my State—and I know the statement applies to other States—there are many distinguished citizens of wealth, as well as citizens of very ordinary means, who came from some of the war-torn countries of Europe and elsewhere, or whose ancestors came from those countries. For years they have been contributing liberally to organizations which gave relief to the people in their fatherland. They will do so again. They would give a thousand times more as individuals to an organization of that kind than they would give to the Treasury of the United States to become their representative in charity.

I for one hope that the people of America will continue to be as charitable as they have been in the past, and that they will continue to give in the old-fashioned way, a method by which they know that their contributions reach those whom they wish to help. Because of that principle, I shall have to vote against the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS].

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wish to have the RECORD show that I tried to save the United States a billion dollars, and also to show how I voted on the proposal. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, a short time ago I sent to the desk an amendment which I asked to have lie on the table. I now offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is not in order at this time. There is an amendment pending. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I could not give my support to the joint resolution in its original form, previous to the amendments which were adopted this afternoon. After studying the measure and hearing it fully discussed, I am still unwilling to vote for it so long as the amount which we are authorizing to be expended remains at $1,350,000,000. I should be willing to go to a limit of $500,000,000 of absolute commitment if the joint resolution were so amended as to provide such an amount. I am unwilling to go beyond that point at the very beginning of this most extensive program of relief throughout the world which is to be conducted at our expense.

I wish my country to do its part. I wish my Government to share the responsibility of all civilization in the performance of humanitarian works necessary and incidental to the catastrophe which has come upon the world. I think we should be acting very generously if we should provide an authorization of $500,000,000 at this time.

I give this reason for not wanting to go further: In the first place, Mr. President, I do not agree to many of the terms and provisions of the agreement which has been entered into. I do not like at all the idea or principle of the United States furnishing 67½ percent of all the money which is to be expended under the terms of the joint resolution, and at the same time turning over to other nations which are participating, and some nations which are not participating in the contribution of the over-all relief fund, the control of our money. That is exactly what is proposed. The Council would be composed of representatives from 44 nations or authorities signing the agreement, including our own representative, who would have only one vote. Russia, which would make no contribution whatsoever to the fund to be distributed and expended, would have an equal vote with the representative of the United States in the control and distribution of the fund. From my viewpoint, that is one of the serious objections to the joint resolution.

Even with the amendment which I have suggested, I should very much dislike to vote for the joint resolution, but I should be willing to yield my better judgment and go along if I could be assured that we are to retain the control to the extent of the obligations to be created by the Council of the relief authority.

Mr. President, there is another provision in the articles of agreement which causes me to take the position I take with reference to the amount of the authorization which we are about to make, and that is that we cannot withdraw from this agreement or from whatever obligation we incur, for a period of 1 year after giving notice of withdrawal. We must first give 6 months' notice, and then we are not permitted to withdraw for 1 year thereafter. That, Mr. President, represents more than half of the time for which this authorization would be made.

It has been said that we hold control of the money because the Administration must come back to Congres for an appropriation. Mr. President, when we authorize the appropriation of $1,350,000,000, I know from my observation and legislative experience in the Congress that we have already gone more than half the way; indeed, we have gone two-thirds of the way toward actual expenditure of the money. I am not ready today to go that far with $1,350,000,000. I am ready to go that far with half a billion dollars, which I think is very generous.

I would rather put that limitation on the authorization now so that in the course of the expenditure of the money, and in the course of the operation of the U. N. R. R. A. up until the time that authorization is exhausted by the expenditures which will be made under the authority of the authorization, we can have an opportunity to see how this organization is working, how it is being administered, and how its affairs are being conducted. Then we can determine, after having had such an opportunity, whether this Nation and we as the Congress wish to commit this Government to any further part of the program outlined and in process of execution by the U. N. R. R. A. It is true that we can keep our hands on the purse strings; but if we provide this authorization we shall morally obligate this Government for every dollar of it, and I am not ready to go that far at this time.

Mr. President, I wish to make one further observation in reference to the withdrawal provision. We cannot withdraw even at the end of a year and a half unless our Government has by that time met all financial, supply, or other material obligations accepted or undertaken by it.

According to my interpretation of the language of the joint resolution, if we make an authorization today of $1,350,000,000, there will be, in my judgment,

an obligation for us to perform to that extent before we can withdraw from it. I do not know that we shall ever want to withdraw. I hope the organization will be so conducted that we will never want to withdraw from it. However, Mr. President, I want the Congress to keep its hands on the purse strings and to reduce the amount of the authorization to half a billion dollars or less. Then, if additional appropriations are requested, we can make an additional authorization when the time comes. We shall have an opportunity then to look at the picture, obtain reports, and know how the enterprise is operating. In that way we can better judge the situation. There is no reason why we cannot determine about another authorization at the time when an additional appropriation is needed.

Mr. President, if the joint resolution is amended so as to provide a limit of $500,000,000 in the authorization, with the amendments agreed to this afternoon, one of which, that offered by the Senator from Tennessee, prohibits the making of obligations by the Council and by the administrator of this authority beyond the amounts of appropriations already made, we shall be able to retain essential safeguards, which I think we ought to retain for the protection of our own Government and our own people in launching this tremendous enterprise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] to reduce the authorization from $1,350,000,000 to $350,000,000. The clerk will resume the calling of the roll.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wish to modify my amendment by limiting the amount of the authorization to $500,000,000 instead of $350,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the calling of the roll has been started and one Senator has voted.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from North Carolina has modified his amendment so that the amount of the authorization is to be $500,000,000 instead of $350,000,000.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the roll call has started and one Senator has voted. Discussion is not in order. Furthermore, after the yeas and nays have once been ordered, a modification of the amendment is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will resume the calling of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. I do not know how he would vote if he were present, and I, therefore, withhold my vote.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. LANGER's name was called). I have been asked to announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is necessarily absent on business of the Government.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that if present and voting he would vote as I have voted, and, therefore, I allow my vote to stand.

Mr. WAGNER (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and permit my vote to stand.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is detained from the Senate by illness. If present and voting he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is detained from the Senate by a slight cold. He has a pair with his colleague, the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I am advised that if present and voting the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would vote "nay."

The junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained from the Senate on public business.

If present and voting the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] would vote "nay."

If present and voting the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is detained attending the funeral of Representative Schuetz, of Illinois.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] are detained on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—17

Aiken	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Bushfield	McClellan	Wheeler
Butler	Moore	Wherry
Clark, Idaho	O'Daniel	Willis
Clark, Mo.	Overton	Wilson
Ellender	Reynolds	

NAYS—47

Andrews	Gerry	Murray
Austin	Gillette	Nye
Bailey	Green	Radcliffe
Ball	Guffey	Stewart
Barkley	Gurney	Taft
Bilbo	Hatch	Thomas, Okla.
Brewster	Hayden	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Holman	Tunnell
Capper	Jackson	Vandenberg
Caraway	La Follette	Wagner
Connally	McFarland	Wallgren
Danaher	McKellar	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Maloney	Weeks
Eastland	Maybank	White
Ferguson	Mead	Wiley
George	Murdock	

NOT VOTING—32

Bankhead	Hill	Revercomb
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Bridges	Kilgore	Russell
Brooks	Langer	Scrugham
Buck	Lucas	Smith
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McNary	Tobey
Chavez	Millikin	Truman
Downey	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Glass	Pepper	Walsh, Mass.
Hawkes	Reed	

So Mr. REYNOLDS' amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 1, line 4, to strike out the figures "$1,350,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$500,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I have sent an amendment to the desk, which I now offer and ask to have stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend article X, on page 15, by the insertion of the following:

SEC. 5. None of the funds appropriated in pursuance of this authorization shall be expended in the promotion of any educational, religious, or political program in any country in which rehabilitation is carried on.

In the first line on page 11, it is proposed that "Sec. 3" be changed to "Sec. 6."

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I have no desire to cast any reflection on the good faith of the proponents of the joint resolution, or on those who have already been appointed to administer it.

It is unfortunate that many of us are to be measured as to our desire for permanent world cooperation by our vote upon the pending measure.

It is unfortunate that the joint resolution was not submitted to the Senate without the request for an authorization, so that it could have been worked out thoroughly, and could then have repre-

sented the sentiment of the Congress. It is unfortunate that the people of this country have had no opportunity to express themselves upon the objectives of the joint resolution. It has been drawn by the Executive, and placed before us on a very nebulous foundation.

I say again that it is unfortunate that we have not had opportunity thoroughly to work out the provisions of the pending joint resolution, and thus give adequate expression to the views of those of us who are anxious that we should cooperate in a real and practical movement for rehabilitation of the countries which have been devastated by the war. I have no objection to the appropriation of this vast sum of money for the relief of war-stricken areas. I do say, however, that if we are to provide two-thirds of the money, the high purpose and good will of America should not be submerged by distribution under the administration of twoscore nations which supply the other third. If we subscribe two-thirds of the stock, we certainly should control the business.

Many of us are anxious that other provisions be added to the joint resolution. Many of us are anxious that some means be provided to take care of the starving women and children in the lands which are already occupied by the armies of the Allies, and also in those lands where the Axis Powers are in control. Starving women and children will provide a very weak foundation for those countries for tomorrow. Taking care of them is a present crying need, and a solution of this problem might have been worked out in connection with the joint resolution by proper consideration of it.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I merely want to call attention to the fact that the Senate recently adopted a resolution calling upon the State Department to initiate negotiations with the British and others to provide relief for children in the occupied areas to which the Senator refers. The matter could not very well have been included in the pending joint resolution. If what he suggests is to be done, it will have to be done by the International Red Cross. It would have to be the subject of negotiation with the British with regard to relaxation of the blockade. So I think Congress has done all it could, and I have no doubt that the State Department will proceed under the request of Congress to negotiate for the relief the Senator has in mind.

Incidentally, all the countries concerned are willing to provide their own money, so we do not have to furnish money for that particular undertaking. I think it should be perfectly clear that this joint resolution is entirely consistent with the resolution already adopted, and Congress has gone on record, and has asked the State Department to proceed with the other relief to which the Senator refers.

Mr. WILLIS. I thank the Senator. I was not present on the day when the resolution was agreed to, but I am in hearty sympathy with it. The effort has been too long delayed. It seems to me it could well have been made a part of the program we are considering, inasmuch as some of the nations in this present plan have heretofore resisted, and may continue to resist, the effort to provide relief for starving women and children.

Mr. GILLETTE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. I suggest to the Senator that, if I understood his proposed amendment right, it proposes to amend article X, on page 15. Article X is a part of the article having to do with United Nations Rehabilitation and Relief, and is not subject to amendment. There is no portion of it on page 15 which is part of the joint resolution and subject to amendment. I am afraid the Senator has not applied his proposed amendment as it should be applied.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I modify my amendment by providing "at the proper place in the joint resolution insert the following"——

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

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. May we have the amendment stated again?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the joint resolution it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall be expended in the promotion of any educational, religious, or political program in any country in which rehabilitation is carried on.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to provide a safeguard against expansion by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration into the fields of governmental ideology. I am free to say that nowhere in the resolution can one find any provision which might be construed as authority for any such extension on the part of the administration. In the last few years, however, we have seen the present administration exercise the dubious policy of going out into fields entrance into which was not definitely barred by legislation. I wish to have the Senate provide a safeguard for the American people against deviation by the organization from the policy set forth in the agreement, so there may be no expansion by it into fields of governmental ideology. For that purpose, I have offered my amendment.

Since the beginning of the war we have seen the administration exploit many different forms of governmental ideology to the world and to the American people. The administration has talked about the "four freedoms." We have heard something about the Atlantic Charter. These matters all seem to have been forgotten, and now we have this new kind of world organization offered to us. Therefore I am proposing my amendment, so as to provide a safeguard against such expansion as I have spoken of, and so that we may still keep faith with the nations of the world, to assure them that the American people have no purpose and no desire to force any specific ideology, much less our own system in America, upon other nations of the world.

Mr. President, I think we should make clear that none of the funds which are to be appropriated from time to time for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall be used for the purpose of propagandizing for any new system of politics or religion or education. I regret that we could not have had an opportunity to amend the agreement itself to the same effect. The only way I know of providing such a limitation is by keeping our hands upon the purse, and saying that no fund shall be used for such purposes.

Mr. President, I hope to have the hearty and sympathetic support of the Senate for this amendment.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. LANGER's name was called). I make the same announcement as before, that the Senator from North Dakota is absent from the city on official business.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a general pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY].

Mr. WAGNER (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and permit my vote to stand.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is detained from the Senate by illness. If present and voting he would vote "Nay."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is detained from the Senate by a slight cold. He has a pair with his colleague, the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained from the Senate on public business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has been called from the Senate to attend a conference.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is detained attending the

funeral of the late Representative Schuetz, of Illinois.

The senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] are detained on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—45

Aiken	Ellender	O'Daniel
Andrews	Ferguson	Reynolds
Austin	George	Shipstead
Barkley	Gerry	Taft
Brewster	Gurney	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Holman	Vandenberg
Bushfield	Jackson	Wagner
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Walsh, N. J.
Capper	La Follette	Weeks
Caraway	McClellan	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Wherry
Connally	Maloney	White
Danaher	Mead	Wiley
Davis	Moore	Willis
Eastland	Nye	Wilson

NAYS—18

Bailey	Hatch	Overton
Ball	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bilbo	McFarland	Stewart
Gillette	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Green	Murdock	Tunnell
Guffey	Murray	Wallgren

NOT VOTING—33

Bankhead	Hawkes	Reed
Bone	Hill	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Brooks	Kilgore	Russell
Buck	Langer	Scrugham
Byrd	Lucas	Smith
Chandler	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Chavez	McNary	Tobey
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Truman
Downey	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Glass	Pepper	Walsh, Mass.

So Mr. WILLIS' amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is open to further amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, before the yea-and-nay vote is taken, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD—I shall not read it, in order to save time—a letter and memorandum with reference to the expenditures by this Government for relief during and following World War No. 1. This tabulation includes money which was loaned for specific relief purposes, as well as money which was appropriated directly or contributed. The tabulation shows that the Government of the United States expended in these loans and gifts of all kinds approximately $2,600,000,000, rather than the $1,350,000,000 carried by the pending joint resolution.

There being no objection, the letter and accompanying memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., December 20, 1943.

The Honorable DEAN ACHESON,
Assistant Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ACHESON: I send you herewith a memorandum on the cost of relief and rehabilitation to the United States in World War No. 1.

There appears to be a great deal of confusion as to what exactly is meant by loans, advances, or grants, so I think this attached memorandum should be considered only as an approximation and not used authoritatively in detail.

Very sincerely yours,
HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

THE COST OF RELIEF AND REHABILITATION TO THE UNITED STATES IN WORLD WAR NO. 1

1. The total cost to the United States of financing relief and rehabilitation in continental Europe in World War No. 1 is estimated at approximately $2,600,000,000. (See attached table.)

2. Of this $2,600,000,000, some $2,300,000,000 represents United States Government loans directly or indirectly for relief and rehabilitation. Approximately $1,000,000,000 of the $2,300,000,000 were loans directly for relief purposes, primarily for foodstuffs. The remaining $1,300,000,000 was spent by foreign governments for relief and rehabilitation supplies against general credits established by the United States Treasury. Only about 10 percent of the $2,300,000,000 of loans was repaid; the remaining 90 percent was, in effect, a gift.

3. The estimated total cost to the United States of financing relief and rehabilitation to continental Europe, $2,600,000,000, was 4 percent of the national income for 1919, which is estimated at $64,200,000,000.[1] The $2,300,000,000 of relief and rehabilitation loans by the United States Government comprised 3.6 percent of the 1919 national income, and the $1,000,000,000 of direct United States Government relief loans totaled 1.5 percent of the national income of that year.

4. The scope of relief covered by the above figures cannot properly be compared with the prospective cost of relief and rehabilitation after the present war, in view of differences in the geographic areas involved, in the composition of relief and rehabilitation supplies required, in the degree of devastation, and in the number of displaced persons, to mention only leading differences.

[1] The estimate of national income is from National Income and Its Composition, 1919–38, by Simon Kuznets, National Bureau of Economic Research, 1941, p. 137, table 1.

Financing of relief and rehabilitation in continental Europe by United States public and private agencies, World War No. 1 [1]

[In millions of dollars]

1. U. S. Government relief loans:[2]	
(a) Prearmistice (to Belgium)	223.2
(b) Armistice and post-armistice	778.3
	1,001.5
2. Other United States loans to continental Europe, Dec. 1, 1919, to Nov. 1, 1920[2]	1,266.0
3. U. S. Government gifts	37.0
4. Gifts of private agencies	340.0
Total	2,644.5

[1] Source: Relief Deliveries and Relief Loans, 1919–23, and Europe's Overseas Needs, 1919–20, and How They Were Met, League of Nations, 1943.

[2] Only 5 or 6 percent was repaid.

FOOTNOTES TO TABLE 1

NOTE.—Numbers of footnotes refer to items in table 1. Reference is to relief deliveries and relief loans, 1919–23, unless otherwise stated.

1. (a) P. 56, footnote 1, column 10. Official figure of Committee for Relief in Belgium.

1. (b) P. 55. These loans were made by:
1. Liberty loans.
2. U. S. Liquidation Commission.
3. American Relief Administration and U. S. Grain Corporation.

2. Europe's Overseas Needs, 1919–20, and How They Were Met, League of Nations, 1943, pages 25–27, tables 14 and 15. This figure represents mainly United States Treasury advances in addition to the direct relief loans in item 1 (b). Total advances of $2,560, less $778 for direct relief loans, less $215 for advances to the United Kingdom gives the figure of $1,567 for 1919 and 1920. To this may be added advances during December 1918 of $193, giving a total of $1,770. If expenditures not directly related to relief and rehabilitation are deducted, amounting to $504, the figure is $1,266, which is the figure given in the table.

3. Page 7, table 1.

4. Page 7, table 1, and page 26, table 8B.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the joint resolution pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. CAPPER's name was called). The senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] has been called from the Chamber. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. McKELLAR (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] who is absent attending the funeral of the late Representative Schuetz. Not knowing how the junior Senator from New Mexico would vote, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I am advised, however, that if present he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WAGNER. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who

is absent on public business. I am advised that the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea." I vote "yea."

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that he would vote as I have voted. Therefore, I permit my vote to stand.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY].

My colleague the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness. I am advised that if he were present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Massachussetts [Mr. WALSH] are absent on public business.

I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], who is detained in a conference, is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent on official business.

The senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who would vote "yea" if present, is detained because of a slight cold. He has a general pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

I am advised that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "yea," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 14, as follows:

YEAS—47

Aiken	George	Murray
Andrews	Gerry	Nye
Austin	Green	Radcliffe
Bailey	Guffey	Stewart
Ball	Gurney	Taft
Barkley	Hatch	Thomas, Okla.
Bilbo	Hayden	Thomas, Utah
Brewster	Holman	Tunnell
Burton	Jackson	Vandenberg
Caraway	Johnson, Colo.	Wagner
Connally	La Follette	Wallgren
Danaher	McFarland	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Maloney	Weeks
Eastland	Maybank	White
Ellender	Mead	Wiley
Ferguson	Murdock	

NAYS—14

Bushfield	Moore	Wheeler
Butler	O'Daniel	Wherry
Clark, Idaho	Overton	Willis
Gillette	Reynolds	Wilson
McClellan	Shipstead	

NOT VOTING—35

Bankhead	Hawkes	Reed
Bone	Hill	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Brooks	Kilgore	Russell
Buck	Langer	Scrugham
Byrd	Lucas	Smith
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McKellar	Tobey
Chavez	McNary	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Tydings
Downey	O'Mahoney	Walsh, Mass.
Glass	Pepper	

So the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) was passed.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1140) to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That there shall be in the Department of the Interior an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall perform such duties in the Department of the Interior as shall be prescribed by the Secretary, or may be required by law. The Assistant Secretaries of the Interior shall be without numerical distinction of rank and shall have salaries of $9,000 per annum. The additional office provided for by this act shall cease to exist at the expiration of 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by the President by proclamation or by the Congress by concurrent resolution.

Mr. HATCH. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AUTHORITY TO COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO CONVEY LAND

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, on Tuesday the Senate passed Senate bill 1657, to amend an act to empower the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to convey land. On the same day the House passed an identical House bill, H. R. 4059. Therefore, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I shall ask unanimous consent that House bill 4059 be considered, with a view to its passage, in which case I shall ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the Senate passed Senate bill 1657, a bill to amend an act to empower the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to convey land, be reconsidered, and that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4059.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The House bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4059) to amend an act entitled "An act to empower the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to convey land" (approved April 28, 1922).

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote by which Senate bill 1657 was passed is reconsidered, and the bill will be indefinitely postponed.

SALE OF FISH IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, on Tuesday the Senate passed Senate bill 1641, relative to the sale of shad or herring in the District of Columbia. On the same day the House passed an identical bill, House bill 3997.

Therefore, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I shall ask unanimous consent that the House bill be taken up, with a view to its passage, in which event I shall ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 1641 was passed, and that the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

Therefore, Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3997.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3997) to amend the Code of the District of Columbia providing for the sale of fish of the shad or herring species, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3997) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote by which Senate bill 1641 was passed is reconsidered, and the bill is indefinitely postponed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations in the Army, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

Sundry employees for appointment and/or promotion in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Joseph D. Nunan, Jr., of Douglaston, N. Y., to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in place of Robert E. Hannegan, resigned; and

Joseph T. Sylvester, of Portland, Maine, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 1, with headquarters at Portland, Maine. (Reappointment.)

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters; and

Frederick G. Newell, to be postmaster at Niagara Falls, N. Y., in place of E. V. Canavan, deceased (reported adversely).

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY—SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Martin Travieso to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John P. McMahon to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these two nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

STANDARD OF IDENTITY OF DRY-MILK SOLIDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the unfinished business is House bill 149, the title of which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 149) to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry-milk solids was announced as next in order.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have been asked by a number of Senators what the prospect is for legislation next week. The unfinished business will no doubt be disposed of within an hour or two on Monday. Barring the possibility of a veto message, which must go first to the House, and which, if the veto is sustained there, will not come to the Senate, I do not anticipate much legislation of importance next week. It may be possible for us to take a recess from Monday until Thursday, and from Thursday until the following Monday, depending upon contingencies which are not absolutely certain at this moment. However, on the whole, I believe that the program will not be heavy next week.

I now move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 21, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 17 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonels with rank from February 1, 1944

Lt. Col. Edward Caswell Wallington, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Carl Ernest Hocker, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. John William Leonard, Infantry (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. Richmond Trumbull Gibson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. John McDonald Thompson, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. James Alward Van Fleet, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Edward Gill Sherburne, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Walter Wood Hess, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Michael Frank Davis, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. John Fuller Davis, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Carl Randolph Mitchell, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 1, 1944.

Lt. Col. Michael Gerard Healy, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 3, 1944.

Lt. Col. Martin Fred DuFrenne, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 13, 1944.

Lt. Col. Philip Lewis Cook, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 18, 1944.

Lt. Col. Charles Fremont Snell, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 21, 1944.

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. Howland Allan Gibson, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 1, 1944.

Maj. Edward John Kallus, Medical Corps, with rank from March 5, 1944, subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Otis Blaine Schreuder, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 29, 1944.

To be major

Capt. Robert Purcell Rea, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 20, 1944.

To be captains

First Lt. Alf Torp Haerem, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from March 18, 1944, subject to examination required by law.

First Lt. Stanley David Burton, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 20, 1944.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. Warren Charles Caldwell, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 12, 1944.

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. James Melvin Epperly, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 8, 1944.

CHAPLAINS

To be colonel

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Philip Francis Coholan, United States Army, with rank from March 7, 1944.

To be captains

Chaplain (First Lt.) Marvin Earl Utter, United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from January 31, 1944.

Chaplain (First Lt.) Loren Thomas Jenks, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from March 3, 1944.

Chaplain (First Lt.) Gervase George Sherwood, United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from March 3, 1944, subject to examination required by law.

Chaplain (First Lt.) Ralph Henry Pugh, United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from March 4, 1944.

Chaplain (First Lt.) James Clarke Griffin, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from March 12, 1944.

Chaplain (First Lt.) John Bartholomew Day, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from March 24, 1944.

Chaplain (First Lt.) Charles Edwin Brown, Jr., United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from March 27, 1944.

Chaplain (First Lt.) Steve Pettie Gaskins, Jr., United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from March 29, 1944.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 17 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

Martin Travieso to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

John P. McMahon to be associate judge of the municipal court of the District of Columbia.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Irene E. Hodges, Ashville.

COLORADO

Edna A. Kennedy, Peetz.
Alice J. Reed, Sanford.
Merrill D. Harshman, Wiggins.

GEORGIA

Melcena Royal, Ambrose.
Floyd L. Crawford, Appling.
Billy S. Hickman, Colbert.
Cleone M. Fincher, Culloden.

KENTUCKY

Mary M. Stahr, Hickman.

MASSACHUSETTS

Josephine M. Welsh, Sudbury.
Elizabeth C. Kelley, Thorndike.

NORTH CAROLINA

Elizabeth P. Bailey, Advance.
Lawrence G. Garvin, Avondale.
Manning B. Mahafee, Caroleen.
Albert K. Dickens, Castalia.
Edelweiss Mishoe, Castle Hayne.
Thomas G. Long, East Rockingham.
Margueritte M. Wells, Henrietta.
Zora Leah Thomas, Hiddenite.
Ruth B. Hickey, Hiwassee Dam.
Ruth R. Wyatt, Hobgood.
Grace Pugh, Hudson.
Carl P. Linn, Landis.
Marion H. Current, Leicester.
Margaret L. Rourk, Leland.
Lossie S. Campbell, Lucama.
Arthur Lee Nicholson, Macon.
Annie F. Briscoe, Mill Spring.
James R. Crutchfield, Moncure.
Elma B. Harris, Mooresboro.
Bessie C. Cox, Newton Grove.
Samuel P. Covington, Pinnacle.
Lawrence V. Sigmon, Rosman.
Sue C. Worsham, Ruffin.
McLain L. Furr, Stanfield.
Hardee C. Butler, Tuxedo.
Maggie S. Cooley, Wagram.
Eva Walker, Walkertown.

PENNSYLVANIA

Emory C. Gardner, Hellam.

VERMONT

Harleigh A Somers, Barnet.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Thou who takest the wings of the morning, we would have Thy Spirit lead us to the ancient pastures of our fathers and bind us again with the ties of human relationships, dispensing the blessings of free government. Do Thou calm all differences and let our devotions be far from the din of the streets and from the tangled thoughts of the crowd. Hear us as we pray: "May the words of our mouth and the meditations of our hearts be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer."

O Father of matchless mercy, grant that every crown of prosperity may suggest a brother's cross, every hearthstone remind us of the homeless and those who live and die in solitary places. We pray for an honest, sincere consideration of the opinions of others. There is no quality which has more response than courtesy, the aroma of good conduct; he who sows it reaps love. As fervor and faith are the seeds of democracy, give us such earnestness to do the right that distressed humankind shall be free to stand amid the storms and blasts of time. O may we be servants among men, the nobler of the noble and the truer of the true. While our fair world is wrestling with the demons of darkness may we scorn their inglorious strife, and over the sea and over the tides of iniquitous war let us see Thy face and hold Thy hand. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3193. An act for the relief of J. C. Davidson and Vassie Lee Davidson;

H. R. 3298. An act for the relief of Nels J. Pedersen; and

H. R. 3351. An act for the relief of Howard L. Pemberton.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 429. An act authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously in the name of Congress a Medal of Honor to William Mitchell;

S. 556. An act for the relief of Pedro Jose Arrecoechea;

S. 616. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Vullo;

S. 662. An act to authorize pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children, and for other purposes;

S. 698. An act to amend part II of Veterans Regulations No. 1 (a);

S. 866. An act to fix compensation of registers of the district land office in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended;

S. 891. An act for the relief of Rebecca Collins and W. W. Collins;

S. 1028. An act to amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia;

S. 1102. An act for the relief of Helene Murphy;

S. 1112. An act for the relief of Taylor W. Tonge;

S. 1227. An act to amend section 1 of the act providing punishment for killing or assaulting the Federal officers;

S. 1232. An act to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior;

S. 1272. An act to amend section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended, for the purpose of making the provisions of such section prohibiting political contributions apply equally to labor organizations and management organizations;

S. 1323. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret M. Ross;

S. 1326. An act for the relief of the estate of Charles A. Straka;

S. 1335. An act to amend the fourth and fifth provisos of section 2 of the act entitled "An Act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain", approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, 438; 30 U. S. C., secs. 201, 202);

S. 1340. An act to provide for the grading of restaurants in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1387. An act to extend the time within which the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming may negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River;

S. 1399. An act for the relief of Frank Knowles;

S. 1407. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Puerto Rico, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1917, as amended, and known as the Organic Act of Puerto Rico;

S. 1421. An act making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers, feeds, nursery stock, or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States;

S. 1428. An act to amend the provision of the act authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of officers, enlisted men, or nurses of the Navy or Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

S. 1433. An act for the relief of Clarence A. Giddens;

S. 1484. An act for the relief of Walter Eugene Hayes;

S. 1517. An act for the relief of Staff Sgt. Marion Johnson, United States Marine Corps, and Sgt. George B. Kress, United States Marine Corps Reserve;

S. 1539. An act to authorize the carrying of Civil War battle streamers with regimental colors;

S. 1542. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building B. O. Q. O-3 at the United States naval construction training center, Davisville, R. I., on March 27, 1943;

S. 1546. An act to amend an act relating to the incorporation of Providence Hospital, Washington, D. C., approved April 8, 1864;

S. 1549. An act for the relief of Vern M. Stanchfield;

S. 1554. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to change the name of Conduit Road in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1942;

S. 1563. An act for the relief of W. E. Dowdell and June Dowdell;

S. 1579. An act to amend the act entitled "An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma," approved January 27, 1933;

S. 1589. An act for the relief of C. Guy Evans, Garland Mineral Springs, Index, Wash.;

S. 1632. An act for the relief of Capt. S. E. McCarty (Supply Corps), United States Navy;

S. 1635. An act to eliminate a pay discrimination against the teacher of music at the United States Military Academy;

S. 1640. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept gifts and bequests for the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes;

S. 1647. An act to amend the act approved March 2, 1895, as amended;

S. 1653. An act to provide titles for heads of staff departments of the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

S. 1658. An act to extend for 1 year the date of termination of Public Law 22, dated April 1, 1943, entitled "To provide for a temporary increase in compensation for certain employees of the District of Columbia Government and the White House Police force";

S. 1668. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship repair facilities, and for other purposes;

S. 1669. An act to clarify the law relative to allowances for mileage of graduates of the United States Military Academy and transportation of their dependents on assignment to their first duty station and to the mileage allowance of persons entering the United States Military Academy as cadets.

S. 1676. An act for the relief of Sgt. Maj. Richard Shaker, United States Marine Corps.

S. 1677 An act for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Newt A. Smith, United States Naval Reserve, for the value of personal property

lost or damaged as the result of a fire occuring on August 11, 1943, in quarters occupied by him in the armory of Aviation Free Gunnery Unit, Dam Neck, Va.

S.1681. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Marine Corps personnel attached to Marine Utility Squadron 152 for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in officers' quarters on February 9, 1943;

S. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities; and

S. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate to have printed for its use additional copies of a consolidated edition of the hearings held before said committee during the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress on the bill S. 942 to amend the Interstate Commerce Act relative to the regulation of rate bureaus.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1528. An act for the relief of Col. Anderson F. Pitts.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a letter I have sent to the London Daily Mail.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF NEW YORK STATE SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of my State, Governor Dewey, yesterday made a rather bold announcement that he was going to insist upon appointing all the justices of our supreme court with the consent of a sort of rubber-stamp State senate. The citizens are limited to the right only to reject his appointment at the polls. His appointees would remain in office until the citizenry acts. This is a rather brazen proposal. He also has the temerity to say that New York City, do or die, shall be compelled to swallow that proposal, but those in the northern part of New York State shall have the right to reject it. That is his idea of equality before the law. It is a sort of a case where a Governor wants to be the legislative as well as the executive branch, and the public be damned. Louis XIV said, before the Parliament of Paris, "L'état, c'est moi"—I am the state—and Governor Dewey now seeks to be the State in its entirety. He would be the "be all and end all" of New York. He would be imperator, nabob, and caliph all rolled into one. His action is a straw in the wind. Let Republican delegates to a coming convention beware.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short newspaper article from the Washington Times-Herald.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two editorials from the Pittsburgh Press concerning the soldier vote.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by me on February 1 at the annual convention of the American Road Builders held in Chicago.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE JAMES R. CLAIBORNE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of great regret to me to be forced to announce the death in St. Louis yesterday of the Honorable James R. Claiborne, who served in this House for 4 years during the Seventy-third and Seventy-fourth Congresses, elected to his first term at large and his second term from what is now the Twelfth District of Missouri.

Everyone who came in contact with Bob Claiborne, as I knew him, held him in high esteem. He was an eminent and distinguished attorney. During the 4 years he served in this House he was devoted to his duties. He was a man who did not hesitate to express his own convictions, and his independence had considerable to do with his retirement from Congress.

His great-grandfather and grandfather were pioneers in Virginia.

Mr. Claiborne had been sick for a number of years, and he leaves a devoted wife as well as a daughter and son. I know that the Members of this House join me in extending our deepest sympathy to his widow and children in their hour of sorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at two points in the RECORD, at one point to include an address delivered by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] at Cincinnati, on February 12, and at the other point to include a newspaper item.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make regarding the C. A. A. this afternoon and include therein a list of 672 heroes which I have compiled.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein the Federal war ballot, with my comments.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Mr. Lothair Teetor, of Indiana.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in this morning's Times-Herald.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial on more about soldier voting.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by me before the Republican Clubs of Rhode Island, at Providence, on Saturday, February 12, 1944.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF NEW YORK STATE SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have just listened with mingled feelings of awe and surprise to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] who has taken occasion to remind the House that the present distinguished and able Governor of that State, Thomas E.

Dewey, is planning to foist upon the State of New York the selection of a number of judges without consulting anyone except the members of his own party and the Senate.

My mind goes back to yesteryears, and I think of another distinguished gentleman. He spoke of Louis XIV and his influence upon the French judiciary. I speak of Franklin the Third, and his influence upon the courts of this country, who established the appalling precedent of naming 7 out of the 9 members of the present Supreme Court of the United States, to the Federal district courts 113 as against 80 who were sitting before him, and to the circuit courts of appeal 37 now sitting as against 17 appointed by other Presidents. If a precedent is needed, the distinguished Governor of New York has it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial by the Honorable Josephus Daniels regarding a speech delivered by our colleague from California [Mr. IZAC] on the floor of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXCLUSION OF JAPANESE FROM UNITED STATES

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that the Congress will speedily pass the pending bill, H. R. 4103, and that such amendments as are permissible under our Constitution extending and strengthening the scope of the act will be adopted.

While I come from a section of the country in which fortunately there are no Japanese, I sympathize deeply with those of my colleagues who live in sections of our Nation where the scourge of the Japanese has so seriously complicated their lives. The problems of California and those States on the west coast are ours also in South Carolina and we are anxious to fully cooperate in the speedy and proper solution of these difficulties.

The President in speaking to us the day following Pearl Harbor referred to December 7, 1941, as "the day of infamy." Indeed, of all the unfortunate experiences our country has had since its birth, none is comparable to the dastardly, unjustified assault made upon us at Pearl Harbor.

Although for 100 years we have been extending a friendly hand to Japan, yet our sympathetic, cooperative efforts have been of no avail. The philosophies of the Japanese people are so diametrically opposed to our ideals they can never be reconciled. Our devoted Christian missionaries and friendly, cooperative commercial and business representatives have labored long and faithfully among these benighted people. Yet, after the expenditure of uncounted moneys and time, not the slightest ray of hope can be observed.

Let me urge upon you, my colleagues, to join with us in broadening the scope of the pending bill so that under its terms eventually every person with Japanese blood flowing in his veins may be for all time excluded from our shores.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 443), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 346 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not exceeding $5,000, which sum is hereby allocated from the amount made available to the Committee on Agriculture by House Resolution 258 in carrying out the terms of House Resolution 38, both of the Seventy-eighth Congress, including expenditures for the employment of experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTESTED ELECTION: JAMES C. MORELAND, CONTESTANT, AGAINST LEONARD W. SCHUETZ, CONTESTEE

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia, from the Committee on Elections No. 3, submitted the following report on the resolution (H. Res. 444) the contested-election case of James C. Moreland, contestant, against Leonard W. Schuetz, contestee, Seventh Congressional District of the State of Illinois, for printing in the RECORD:

ELECTION CONTEST CASE OF JAMES C. MORELAND, CONTESTANT, AGAINST LEONARD W. SCHUETZ, CONTESTEE, SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

The Committee on Elections No. 3, having had under consideration the election contest of James C. Moreland, contestant, against Leonard W. Schuetz, contestee, Seventh Congressional District of the State of Illinois, submit their unanimous report and recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the election contest of James C. Moreland, contestant, against Leonard W. Schuetz, contestee, Seventh Congressional District of the State of Illinois, be dismissed."

STATEMENT

The contestant in his petition alleges that the "contestant actually received at said election more votes than contestee received, and were it not for the several and divers material and substantial incorrections, imperfections, frauds, mistakes, miscounting, mistallying, illegalities, and other wrongs hereinafter set forth, contestant would have been declared to have received more votes and the highest number of votes cast at said election and accordingly elected to said office instead of contestee."

In support of his allegations the contestant in his notice of contest referred to specific wards and precincts in which he contended that "there were sufficient of the aforesaid irregularities and miscounting of votes on the part of the respective election judges and clerks therein to change the result of said election" as it was officially proclaimed. He set out in his notice of contest the number of votes he would gain in each of these wards and precincts upon a recount.

The official return showed that the contestee received a total of 179,906 votes and the contestant received 177,931. This gave the contestee a lead of 1,975 votes over the contestant. There were 1,007 voting precincts in the congressional district.

The contestant in his notice of contest alleges that a recount of these particular wards and precincts to which he specifically referred would show a total gain in votes for the contestant of 4,948.

On the 16th day of February 1943 the contestant petitioned the House of Representatives for an extension of time in which to complete his evidence and indicated in this petition that the reason he desired additional time was for the purpose of making a review or recount of the ballots cast in the general election and in particular the ballots cast in the wards and precincts about which the petitioner has specifically complained in said notice of contest.

On the 6th day of April 1943 the House of Representatives adopted a resolution extending the time for taking testimony by the contestant for 30 days from April 12, 1943.

According to the evidence the contestant and the contestee agreed upon the procedure to be followed in the recount which began on Monday, April 19, 1943, with representatives of both the contestant and contestee present. The recount continued daily through Tuesday, May 4, 1943. During this time the ballots were counted in all of the wards and precincts about which specific complaints were made in the notice of contest with the exception of Leyden Township where it appears that only a comparatively small vote was cast and in which township the contestant claims that a recount would give to the contestant a gain of 22 votes.

At the close of the recount on Tuesday, May 4, 1943, the contestant discontinued any further recount of the ballots although 7 days of the time allotted to the contestant for taking testimony remained and only approximately 42 percent of the total ballots cast had been recounted.

The evidence shows that the precincts counted during this time were the ones in which the contestee received a heavy majority and that while only 42 percent of the total votes cast were counted these votes included approximately 56 percent of the total votes cast for the contestee and only approximately 28 percent of the votes cast for the contestant.

In the recount certain ballots which were disputed by either the contestant or the contestee were not counted for either party and there was a total of 646 such ballots.

Although the total votes received by the contestant and the contestee as shown by the recount varied from the total votes received by the contestant and the contestee as shown by the official count, and although the change represented a gain in votes for the contestant so as to indicate a reduction in the majority of the votes received by the contestee by about 898 votes, still it is clear that this did not give to the contestant a majority of the total votes over the contestee.

The results of this recount made by the contestant of the wards and precincts specifically referred to in his notice of contest fall far short of substantiating the gains in votes for the contestant which the contestant claimed in his notice of election contest such a recount would show, and still leaves the contestee with a clear majority of the total votes cast in the congressional district.

The committee call attention to the fact that according to the evidence the irregularities about which objections were made in the recount by either the contestant or the contestee and the variation in the total votes for the contestant and the contestee in the various precincts as shown by the recount appeared among ballots cast for the contestant as well as among ballots cast for the contestee. As the contestant stated before the committee, "there are many reasons" for this such as improper initialing of ballots by election holders, improper marking of ballots, failure of election holders to initial ballots, spoilation of ballots, and other reasons. As stated above, this included ballots cast for the contestant as well as ballots cast for the contestee. (There is no evidence whatsoever of fraud on the part of the election officials.) So, it is evident that this condition was general and prevailed among all of the ballots cast and it can, therefore, be seen that the gains made by the contestant in the partial review or recount which included only 42 percent of the total ballots cast, but which included at the same time over 56 percent of the ballots cast for the contestee, is by no means conclusive proof that the trend of the change as shown by the recount in favor of the contestant would have continued throughout the recount of all the remainder of the ballots. This is particularly so in view of the fact that the remaining precincts which were not recounted included those in which the contestant received a heavy majority of the votes and about which precincts the contestant made no specific complaint in his petition.

So in reality it appears that the contestant has actually made a recount of all the votes which he challenged in his notice of election contest, for which purpose he requested additional time in which to prepare his evidence, and has admitted in his evidence which he presented to this committee that even after such recount the contestee still has the largest number of total votes.

The contestant discontinued the recount at his own instance 7 days before the time allowed him for taking testimony expired and evidently made no effort to continue the recount after the ballots cast in the precincts about which he made specific complaint in his petition had been recounted.

Under these circumstances the committee does not consider that the results shown by the partial recount submitted as evidence by the contestant is sufficient evidence to warrant the committee entering into a recount of all the ballots cast in the election.

Had the contestant desired to recount all of the ballots cast in this election for the purpose of securing evidence to submit in support of his contest he did not exhaust the remedy afforded him for such a recount.

It is the duty of the contestant to produce evidence sufficient to support the allegations set forth in his petition, and as this committee has heretofore held, it is not the duty of this committee to take upon itself the obligation of securing evidence for either party to a contest for the purpose of substantiating the allegations set forth in an election contest.

In the opinion of the committee the evidence submitted by the contestant does not substantiate the allegations made by the contestant in his notice of election contest.

The committee do not find any evidence of fraud.

The committee recommend that the election contest be dismissed.

Respectfully submitted.

Hugh Peterson, Chairman, Eugene J. Keogh, John L. McMillan, O. C. Fisher, John W. Murphy, Charles A. Plumley, Ralph A. Gamble, Angier L. Goodwin, Homer A. Ramey.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 444) the election contest of James C. Moreland, contestant, against Leonard W. Schuetz, contestee, Seventh Congressional District of the State of Illinois.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the election contest of James C. Moreland, contestant, against Leonard W. Schuetz, contestee, Seventh Congressional District of the State of Illinois, be dismissed.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF NEW YORK STATE SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to correct the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLER], in his defense of Governor Dewey's court-packing plan in New York City.

The Constitution of the United States provides that members of the Federal bench shall be selected by the President for life, whereas the constitution of the State of New York provides that judges shall be selected for the State courts for a term of years by the citizens through the medium of their vote.

I have always maintained that it is far more wise that the citizens should have this right. To allow the head of the executive department to select the members of the judicial branch has inherent danger. It is my own recollection that Governor Dewey personally opposed the so-called Supreme Court packing plan of a few years ago.

The people of the State of New York have been wise through the last 150 years in their selections. They have selected men of the type of Charles Evans Hughes, Benjamin Cardozo, Frederick E. Crane, and a host of others who were not mere ornaments of the bench but men who did much to establish the law of the country and whose judicial philosophies are still held to be examples of propriety, law, and ethics. What has caused Governor Dewey to demand these Fascistlike powers? Could some gentleman on the other side of the aisle enlighten me on this point?

If the Governor intends to use the Aurelio case as the example of the impropriety of the present system of electing judges, allow me to remind my Governor that far more hand-picked Federal judges have been charged with unethical conduct, malfeasance, and nonfeasance than have those judges who have graced the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein an editorial from the Soldiers' Magazine, on the soldiers' vote.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Santa Monica Outlook.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRINTING COPIES OF HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE OF THE SENATE

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 34.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use a consolidated edition of 1,000 copies of the hearings held before said committee during the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress or the bill (S. 942) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, to provide for agreements between common carriers by railroad, between common carriers by pipe line, between common carriers by motor vehicle, between common carriers by water, and between freight forwarders, for the making and filing of rates, fares, charges, or classifications for transportation of passengers and property, and for other purposes.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF NEW YORK STATE SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I wondered if it was an oversight on the part of the gentleman from New York who has just addressed the House in enumerating the category of well-known judges who were elected by the voters of New York when he omitted to mention Judge Aurelio. If that was an oversight, I take the opportunity now to supply the omission. I would like to say further that the concern of the other gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] about interference by the Executive in the affairs of the legislative body is a recent thing. Have he and his colleagues of the New Deal forgotten the "must" legislation of the past 8 or 10 years sent down here by the President? I am sure no Republican Governor, least of all the great Governor of the State of New York, will ever be

guilty of sending to any legislative body the kind of "must" legislation which was sent to this body.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

THE LATE DANIEL BROADHEAD HEINER

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I announce the passing on February 14, 1944, of the Honorable Daniel Broadhead Heiner, a former Member of this body. Mr. Heiner was elected to the Fifty-third and Fifty-fourth Congresses from Armstrong County, Pa.

He was a descendant of a colonial pioneer family, a great-great-grandson of Gen. Daniel Broadhead, a colonel on Gen. George Washington's staff.

He was collector of internal revenue in Pittsburgh during six Presidential administrations. In this capacity he served under Presidents McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover. He was admitted to the bar of Armstrong County in 1882 and served as district attorney in this county of Pennsylvania.

Born in Kittanning, Pa., in 1854, Mr. Heiner was graduated from Allegheny College and Dickinson Law School. During his lifetime, he was a prominent banker and a Republican leader.

Mr. Heiner had been married 58 years and his wife, Mrs. Belle Acheson Heiner, preceded him in death only 4 days, having passed away on February 10, 1944. He is survived by one son, William Graham Heiner, Esq., of Pittsburgh.

It was my privilege to know him real well. Armstrong County and the State of Pennsylvania have lost an outstanding citizen.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

APPOINTMENT OF NEW YORK STATE SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat concerned about the speeches that have taken place here this morning in regard to the conditions in my State, New York State, and I am not going to stand here to try to defend any particular judge. The voters of New York City took their stand and named their choices for the existing vacancies. I would like to call attention to the gentleman who preceded me, that when our President or any President, as a matter of fact, names one to the Federal bench he does so with the endorsement of the Senate. New York's Governor does not want any such limitation of the powers he seeks. Furthermore, if the Governor of our State desires to establish one procedure in regard to the nomination of the judges in our State, I do not see how he can expect to apply it only to New York City and not to the entire State. If it is the consensus of opinion in New York that the Governor of New York shall appoint or name the judges with the consent of the New York State Senate, I think the same thing should apply to the entire State and not only to New York City.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a resolution relating to small business.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article appearing in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on January 23, pertaining to our distinguished and esteemed colleague, Hon. ROBERT CROSSER.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief letter addressed to the instructors of Hunter College by the president of that college.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial from the Elizabeth (N. J.) Daily Journal entitled "Union Dues for Prisoners of War."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio address I delivered with reference to the soldiers' vote.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the regular business of the day and following any special orders heretofore granted I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Idaho Granger.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and insert the so-called Federal ballot, this bobtail ballot, just as it is printed in the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MARSHALL FIELD BANQUET

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, last night Fulton Lewis, Jr., in a Nation-wide broadcast over the radio, left the impression that in my speech on yesterday relative to the Marshall Field banquet, I was interfering with the freedom of the press.

How any intelligent man could have come to that conclusion is more than I can understand.

It is not interfering with freedom of the press to demand that Marshall Field pay taxes on his vast income, just as other men do.

It is not interfering with freedom of the press to demand that he pay taxes on that part of his income which he is now wasting in riotous living, or on useless or subversive publications, such as PM.

While our boys are fighting and dying to protect American institutions, and while their fathers and mothers are saving and scraping to get every dollar they can to buy bonds and pay taxes, I submit that it is no time for a man like Marshall Field to escape taxes on a $70,000,000 income of which he never earned a cent, or to escape taxes on that part of his annual income used to finance a publication that is attempting to destroy the very things for which those boys are fighting.

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

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker,
United States House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the following-named committees: Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress; Expenditures in the Executive Departments; Invalid Pensions; Public Lands; Roads; War Claims.

Respectfully yours,
DANIEL K. HOCH,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 30]

Arends	Flannagan	McCowen
Baldwin, Md.	Ford	McMillan
Bates, Mass.	Fulmer	Morrison, La.
Bell	Gamble	Newsome
Bloom	Gifford	O'Brien, Ill.
Brehm	Gordon	O'Leary
Brooks	Gorski	Pfeifer
Burch, Va.	Halleck	Philbin
Chapman	Hare	Pracht, C.
Cole, N. Y.	Hartley	Frederick
Costello	Hobbs	Price
Courtney	Hoch	Reed, Ill.
Cullen	Jennings	Richards
Curley	Johnson,	Robsion, Ky.
Dawson	J. Leroy	Rowan
Dewey	Johnson,	Sheridan
Dingell	Lyndon B.	Short
Dirksen	Kee	Smith, Va.
Domengeaux	Keogh	Smith, W. Va.
Doughton	Kirwan	Snyder
Douglas	Knutson	Taylor
Elston, Ohio	Landis	Whelchel, Ga.
Fenton	Lesinski	White
Fish	Lynch	Winter

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 369 Members answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. McCORMACK, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read:

FEBRUARY 17, 1944.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives.

Respectfully yours,
ROGER C. SLAUGHTER.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Rules: ROGER C. SLAUGHTER, Missouri.

Banking and Currency: DANIEL K. HOCH, Pennsylvania.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the question of privilege of the House is set forth in a resolution (H. Res. 446) which I send to the Clerk's desk, and on that I ask for recognition.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas on February 15, 1944, the President of the United States transmitted to the Senate of the United States, where it is now pending, a treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, which was signed in Washington on February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande from Fort Quitman, Tex., to the Gulf of Mexico, including a report on the treaty made to him by the Secretary of State (Executive A, 78th Cong., 3d sess.); and

Whereas under the terms of said treaty, the United States of America disposes of certain waters of the Colorado River by alloting them to Mexico in guaranteed annual quantities, and provides for the delivery of said waters, thereby invading the privilege of the House; and

Whereas said treaty makes provision for use in the beneficial interest of Mexico of certain public works on the Colorado River, for which public works citizens of the State of California and of other States have obligated themselves to pay, under contracts with the Secretary of the Interior; and

Whereas the Congress enacted the Boulder Canyon Project Act (Public, 642, 70th Cong., approved Dec. 21, 1928), in section I of which the Congress authorized the construction of the Boulder Dam and a main canal and appurtenant structures located entirely within the United States now known as the All-American Canal "for the purpose of controlling the floods, improving navigation, and regulating the flow of the Colorado River, providing for storage and for the delivery of the stored waters thereof for reclamation of public lands and other beneficial uses exclusively within the United States, and for the generation of electrical energy as a means of making the project herein authorized a self-supporting and financially solvent undertaking"; and

Whereas under the terms of the said Boulder Canyon Project Act, citizens of the State of California have entered in good faith into contracts with the Secretary of the Interior for the purchase of electrical energy in such quantities and at such prices, and have entered into contracts for the payment of construction costs and operating expenses of the All-American Canal, necessary to make the said projects self-supporting and financially solvent undertakings under the terms of said act; and

Whereas at a conference of the Governors of the seven States of the Colorado River Basin, held at Denver, Colo., in August 1927, the said Governors unanimously adopted a memorial to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of State, the essence of which is contained in the following words, to wit:

"Now, therefore, and to the end that no unfortunate misunderstanding may arise between the United States of America and the United States of Mexico, and that no false encouragement may be given to present or future developments along the Colorado River in the United States of Mexico, we the Governors of all seven of the Colorado River States, with our interstate river commissioners and advisers in conference assembled in the city of Denver on this 26th day of August 1927, do hereby in great earnestness and concern make common petition that a note be dispatched to the Government of the United States of Mexico calling attention to that Government to the fact that neither it nor its citizens or alien investors have any legal right as against the United States of America or its citizens to a continuance of the flow of the Colorado River for beneficial purposes, and that the United States of Mexico can expect no such continuance except to the extent that, as a matter of comity, the two Governments may declare hereafter by treaty and that especially under no circumstances can the United States of Mexico hope to use water made available through storage works constructed or to be constructed within the United States of America, or hope to found any right upon any use thereof." (Hearings, House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation on H. R. 5773, pt. 2, p. 202, January 1928); and

Whereas paragraph 2 of section 3, article IV of the Constitution of the United States of America provides, "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States or of any particular State": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be, and it is hereby instructed to inquire into the facts hereinbefore recited and any other facts deemed pertinent thereto by said committee, and report to this House as soon as practicable:

First. Whether the waters of the Colorado River, or any of them arising within the United States are "property belonging to the United States," within the meaning and sense of the Constitution.

Second. Whether a treaty in which the United States disposes of the waters of the Colorado River, or any of them arising within the United States, to the United States of Mexico, without action by the Congress is authorized by the Constitution.

Third. Whether a treaty disposing of the waters of the Colorado River, or any of them arising within the United States, to the United States of Mexico, to which any State makes claim that such disposition is prejudicial to such State, is authorized by the Constitution, such claim notwithstanding.

Fourth. Whether the public works known as Boulder Canyon Dam and the All-American Canal, and their incidental works and appurtenant structures are "property belonging to the United States" within the meaning of the Constitution.

Fifth. Whether a treaty which disposes of any portion of the beneficial use of such dam, canal, works, or structures to the United States of Mexico, without action by the Congress, is authorized by the Constitution.

Sixth. Whether a treaty making disposition of such beneficial use to which disposition any State shall make claim that its rights or interests are prejudiced thereby is authorized by the Constitution.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I would not employ this unusual procedure except that the matter I have brought before the House is one of gravest importance to the people of my State and of the other States of the Colorado River Basin.

I feel strongly that the prerogatives of this House are so deeply involved that this matter should be given the most thorough study and careful deliberation lest we discover at some future date that we have waived our rights and through inaction abandoned much of our control over public funds.

The pending treaty with Mexico for distribution of water of the Colorado River presents some of the most vital questions that have been raised in international affairs in this hemisphere. Far-reaching constitutional issues are involved as well as the interests of several million people residing in the areas intended to be benefited by the Boulder Canyon Project Act.

Before discussing the particular points which I deem worthy of special study, I

wish to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the taxpayers of southern California alone have obligated themselves to the extent of approximately one-half billion dollars in paying for these monumental public works that were intended primarily to benefit the citizens of this country. By guaranteeing to pay for the construction of Boulder Dam, the 250-mile-long Colorado River aqueduct, the huge power lines, Parker Dam, and the All-American Canal, they have committed themselves to reimburse the Federal Government for many millions of dollars advanced to finance these undertakings.

The provisions of this treaty appear to take away a large part of the benefits expected from these works. As a result, a storm of protest already has arisen in California and such serious questions raised that my resolution should be adopted speedily and these doubtful points weighed thoroughly.

I think this House should know of some of the reactions in southern California to the announcement that the United States had agreed to deliver to Mexico 1,500,000 acre-feet of water annually.

The City Council of Los Angeles has by unanimous vote authorized a telegram of protest against ratification of the treaty. The city's official objections have been transmitted to both the President and the Senate. In addition, the City Council has approved the employment by the Board of Water and Power Commissioners of a special expert to analyze the treaty and prepare exhibits showing the detrimental effect this international agreement will have on the taxpayers of the community.

The directors of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, after hearing that ratification of the treaty would in effect give Mexico first priority on a large part of the water discharged from Boulder Dam, asked Governor Warren to intercede with President Roosevelt in an attempt to have this treaty modified so the interests not only of California but of Arizona will be adequately protected.

The reason why this agreement is considered of such vital importance to Los Angeles has been emphasized by Mayor Bowron. Pointing out the people of Los Angeles and other communities making up the metropolitan water district have committed themselves to an outlay of $220,000,000 for an adequate water supply, the mayor last week declared the treaty may definitely limit the growth of the Los Angeles area. If this water distribution agreement is ratified, the ability to furnish an adequate water supply for a population of 10,000,000—which would be a reality within a short space of time at the recent rate of growth of these communities—would be seriously jeopardized. There is a grave question whether new industries could be assured the necessary water for their operations if the limitations resulting from the treaty are imposed.

The California State Chamber of Commerce has shown a definite concern about the consequences of this international agreement. The question was raised by Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul, one of our most noted educators and public figures, who is chairman of the State chamber's natural resources committee, whether this treaty should not make Mexico's allotment of anything over 750,000 acre-feet of water unconditionally junior to the rights and claims of the other parties to the interstate compact and the contract between the Federal Government and the States of California and Arizona.

This House should not overlook the fundamental fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Boulder Canyon Act, designed to make water from the Colorado River available to the citizens of the United States, was enacted by both Houses of Congress. This treaty, in my opinion, will have the effect of amending this great piece of legislation. And, I should like to point out, the amendment would be accomplished by the executive branch of the Government with the approval of two-thirds of the Members of one branch of the Congress.

The contract between the Federal Government and the States of Arizona and California apportioning the waters discharged from Boulder Dam likewise was put into effect by legislation requiring the approval of both Houses of Congress. There is a grave question whether this contract can be modified or altered merely by ratification of a treaty or whether the parties to the contract—which means the entire Congress—should not give their consent to any changes.

One very essential point which deserves painstaking deliberation is the way this treaty would commit the Congress to future expenditures that are not even estimated in any of the papers accompanying the treaty. Under the pact now awaiting ratification, the United States agrees to construct a new regulating dam and reservoir on the Colorado River at an unnamed site between Boulder Dam and Parker Dam. In addition, this country is obligated to construct or acquire works needed to deliver the specified water to Mexico at the various diversion points.

If this provision of the treaty becomes operative, this House at some future time will be called upon to appropriate unknown sums of money to finance these operations. No specific authorization ever has been voted for such undertakings. As a result, a point of order might lie against the appropriation. If the money were not forthcoming, the United States would not carry out all of its pledges to Mexico and the treaty in all likelihood would be held to have been automatically invalidated. Embarrassing international consequences easily could result, straining the good will between our two Republics.

The net effect of this treaty, Mr. Speaker, is to deprive the citizens of a large portion of the Nation of rights and property. In simple terms, the United States would be disregarding the treasured "due process" clause of the Constitution.

Water in the southwestern portion of this country is one of the most valuable of all properties. For the United States to give to Mexico without the specific permission of the whole Congress a substantial portion of this prized possession would be a flagrant contradiction of the constitutional guaranty that no citizen shall be deprived of his property without due process of law.

The adoption of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, would not affect adversely our international relations. Nor would it have any injurious effect on any of the people of this country. The problem of reaching an agreement on distribution of this water has been before us for more than a score of years, so there is no need for haste in ratification of this treaty.

Not only should the House be advised as to its rights in this vital matter, but the people of the Western States are entitled to sufficient time to study the complicated provisions of the treaty and the far-reaching consequences which may flow from it. They should be afforded an opportunity to prepare exhibits and collect evidence which should be weighed before the treaty is ratified. The adoption of my resolution undoubtedly would help prevent hasty action, thus enabling these affected parties to protect their rights and safeguard their interests.

I am advised that requests have been made for postponement of action on this treaty in the other body, and that both of the distinguished gentlemen from my State asked for this courtesy, since they feel the effects of the treaty would be decidedly contrary to the welfare of our people. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that adoption of my resolution will harmonize completely with their attitude on the question.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I desire to read from the letter of the Secretary of State to the President which accompanied the treaty that was transmitted to the other body. On page 3 of his document appears this language:

> Part III, which is divided into six articles, prescribes the rules that are to govern the allocation and delivery to Mexico of a portion of the waters of the Colorado River. By article 10 the United States guarantees to Mexico a minimum quantity of 1,500,000 acre-feet of water each year, this water to be delivered in accordance with schedules to be furnished in advance by the Mexican section of the Commission. Beyond this minimum quantity the United States will allocate to Mexico, whenever the United States section decides there is a surplus of water, an additional quantity up to a total, including the 1,500,000 acre-feet, of not more than 1,700,000 acre-feet per year.

Mr. Speaker, competent engineering authority has disclosed in a memorandum which I hold in my hand that the contracts already entered into by the Secretary of the Interior with the people of the States of California and Arizona for the waters of the Colorado River, which are there available, are in all probability far in excess of the average amount which will be available from those public works. To further allocate 1,500,000 acre-feet to the United States of Mexico will no doubt seriously impair the rights and privileges of the people of those States and their right to the enjoyment they have had under the Colorado River Compact and which they hope to enjoy in the future.

I understand that just recently the State of Arizona through its Governor has signed a contract and that the Governor intends to call a meeting of the State legislature to ratify that contract. I see the gentleman from Arizona is on his feet. May I ask him if that is true?

Mr. MURDOCK. I wish to confirm what the gentleman from California has just said. The Governor of Arizona has signed a contract for 2,800,000 acre-feet of water out of Lake Mead and has called the State legislature to act upon it. I think all the waters of the lower Colorado River available in the lower basin have been contracted for and disposed of, besides what has been put to beneficial use, so that there probably is no such amount of firm water to be had for Mexico as is said to be provided for in the treaty, without depriving some of our own lands of water.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from California who so ably represents the district embracing the famous Imperial and Coachella Valleys.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The amount which Arizona would want is 2,800,000 acre-feet. I wish the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] would point out that the water being offered Mexico in this treaty is firm water, that is, water which comes ahead, sufficiently down in the priority scale of water that it would take away other water which the people think they are sure of getting.

Mr. HINSHAW. I can see nothing in the treaty which indicates that the water to be allocated to Mexico is other than firm water. I desire to read from part III, article 10, of the proposed treaty, a subparagraph:

> Of the waters of the Colorado River, from any and all sources, there are allotted to Mexico:
>
> (a) A guaranteed annual quantity of 1,500,000 acre-feet (1,850,234,000 cubic meters) to be delivered in accordance with the provisions of article 15 of this treaty.

Mr. Speaker, the run-off into the basin of the Colorado River has a minimum flow of approximately 4,000,000 acre-feet per year and a maximum flow of approximately 28,000,000 acre-feet over the past 45 years that are of record. The public works that have been built upon the Colorado River are very largely for the purpose of storing the excess waters in time of excess in order that they may be used in the times when there is a drought.

It is figured by the engineers that there is available for use on the Colorado River not more annually than a total of 16,000,000 acre-feet. That amount of water is to be allocated to the States of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, and California. Under the terms of the contracts that are already entered into by the Secretary of the Interior, the entire 16,000,000 acre-feet average flow has been allocated to the various interests of the various States, and perhaps more.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks I desire to insert a certain matter which has been presented to me by the engineers, concerning the contracts that have been entered into under the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and other matters relating thereto.

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

There was no objection.

NOTES ON COLORADO RIVER

MEXICO

1. The Colorado River drains about one-thirteenth of the area of the United States.

2. Total area of drainage basin in the United States—242,000 square miles.

3. Total area of drainage basin in Mexico—2,000 square miles.

4. All of the water supply of the river comes from the United States.

5. Mexico contributes no part of the water supply of the river.

6. Mexico has no storage sites where the river flow could be impounded.

7. Mexico received all water used prior to construction of Boulder Dam from diversions made in the United States.

8. Mexico, because of existing treaty provisions, can build no diversion dam on the river without permission from the United States.

9. Mexico's maximum use of Colorado River water from natural flow (prior to construction of Boulder Dam) was 750,000 acre-feet in 1925.

10. Mexico's use of Colorado River water during period 1920 to 1930 (maximum period prior to Boulder Dam) averaged 600,000 acre-feet per year. In 1934 (lowest river flow of record) Mexico received only 228,000 acre-feet.

11. Mexico could not have continued irrigation of all land under cultivation prior to Boulder Dam if the United States had not controlled the floods and silt.

12. Mexico has an extensive underground water basin in the delta which should be fully explored to determine yield by pumping which would be available and could be used to firm up surface supply during periods of low river flow. This amount should be part of the river water apportioned to Mexico.

13. Mexico was offered 750,000 acre-feet per annum by the American section of the International Water Commission in 1929–30, after exhaustive investigation of entire Colorado River situation. This amount was considered to be just and generous by American section.

COLORADO RIVER COMPACT BETWEEN STATES OF RIVER BASIN

14. Has been ratified by all of the Basin States, except Arizona, and has been approved by the United States.

15. Apportions by paragraph 3 (a) from waters available in the Colorado River system ("system" is defined as including the main stream and all of its tributaries within the United States) the beneficial consumptive use, to (a) States of the upper division (Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico), a total of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum, and to (b) States of the lower division (Nevada, California, and Arizona), a total of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum.

16. By paragraph 3 (b), permits the States of the lower division to increase their use by an additional 1,000,000 acre-feet per annum.

17. By paragraph 3 (c), provides that if the United States recognizes a right in Mexico to any Colorado River water, such water shall be supplied first from waters in system which are surplus over those specified by paragraphs 3 (a) and 3 (b); if such not sufficient, each division shall bear deficiency equally. (Theoretical surplus is over 2,000,000 acre-feet.)

18. By paragraph 3 (d), the States of upper division are not to cause flow of river at Lee Ferry (division point at Utah-Arizona boundary between upper and lower divisions) to be depleted below an aggregate of 75,000,000 acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years.

19. There is much ambiguity in the terms of the compact, which has resulted in controversies as to their meaning and application. The basis of division of the water was not that of the most feasible or economic use of the water; it was arbitrary and gave far greater protection to the States of the upper division than to those of the lower division. Construction of Boulder Dam and the All-American for the control of floods and silt, regulation of water supply, and elimination of international difficulties was of great and vital importance. California had no alternative other than accept the compact, in order to secure these works.

BOULDER CANYON PROJECT ACT (45 STAT. 1057)

20. Authorizes construction of Boulder Dam and All-American Canal to provide for storage of Colorado River waters and delivery thereof for reclamation of public lands and other beneficial uses "exclusively within the United States."

21. Provided that before any money be appropriated for construction, the Secretary of the Interior make provision by contracts for revenues sufficient to repay cost of works to the United States.

22. Provided that no person shall have the use of stored water, except by contract with the Secretary of the Interior, such contracts to be for "permanent service."

23. Provided that the act should not become effective unless and until (a) all seven basin States ratified Colorado River Compact, or (b) if said States failed to ratify within 6 months, then when six of the States, including California, ratified compact, and in addition (c) California bound itself by act of its legislature to limit its beneficial consumptive use (diversions less returns to the river) of Colorado River water to not exceed 4,400,000 acre-feet of compact paragraph 3 (a) water plus not more than one-half of any excess of surplus waters unapportioned by the compact.

24. Provided that the act should be subject to Colorado River Compact.

25. Arizona did not ratify compact, the other States did, and therefore California by act of its legislature accepted the limitation on use of water as provided by the act, in order to assure construction of the works authorized by the Boulder Dam Act.

CALIFORNIA CONTRACTS

26. Users of power in California have entered into contracts with the United States which provide for (a) repayment to the United States of the entire cost of Boulder Dam and power plant with interest (except for $25,000,000 of the cost of the dam charged to flood control, payment of which is deferred for a period of years) plus (b) payment of $300,000 annually to each of the States of Arizona and Nevada in lieu of taxes, and plus (c) payment of $500,000 annually into a fund to be used for other developments in the Colorado River Basin.

27. Users of water in California have entered into contracts with the United States providing for repayment in full to the United States of the cost of the All-American Canal and for delivery of water totaling 5,362,000 acre-feet per year, under the following priorities:

	Acre-feet
First priority: To agriculture (Palo Verde Valley, Yuma Indian project, Imperial Valley and Coachella Valley)	3,850,000
Second priority: To the metropolitan district of southern California	550,000
Third priority: To the metropolitan district of southern California 550,000 acre-feet and to the city and county of San Diego 112,000 acre-feet (on equal priority)	662,000
Fourth priority: To agriculture	300,000
Total	5,362,000

28. Projects to use this water are either constructed or well advanced in construction on which expenditures of several hundred millions of dollars have been made. The people of southern California have mortgaged their farms, their homes, and their business to guarantee repayment.

SITUATION ON RIVER BELOW LEE FERRY

29. Records prepared by Bureau of Reclamation show that for periods such as 1897 to 1908 and 1930 to 1940, the upper States would have to reduce use to less than 7,500,000 acre-feet per year in order to meet compact obligation of 75,000,000 acre-feet in 10-year period at Lee Ferry. This means that development in lower States from main stream must be based on not to exceed average of 7,500,000 acre-feet per year being available at Lee Ferry.

30. Considering inflow to river below Lee Ferry and use of large storage in Lake Mead, release at Boulder Dam during critical periods of 8,500,000 acre-feet per year will be possible.

31. On this basis, we find the following situation:

	Acre-feet
Available below Boulder Dam per year	8,500,000
Reservoir and other river losses below Boulder	600,000
Available balance	7,900,000
Nevada contract	300,000
California contracts (existing projects)	5,362,000
Arizona, requested contract [1]	2,800,000
	8,462,000
Deficit	562,000
If Mexico is conceded use prior to Boulder Dam	750,000
Deficit	1,312,000
Additional guaranteed Mexico by proposed treaty	750,000
Total deficit	2,062,000

[1] In addition, Arizona is asking for ½ of any excess or surplus waters unapportioned by the compact but as such is so far beyond any possible available water, no allowances has been included.

32. On the basis of allowing water for only what may be termed "present existing projects," on the main river below Boulder Dam, the following situation exists: (All uses shown are "consumptive" uses.)

		Acre-feet
Available below Boulder Dam per year		8,500,000
Reservoir and other river losses below Boulder		600,000
Available balance		7,900,000
Nevada contract		300,000
California contracts		5,362,000
Arizona:		
Indian projects	360,000	
Yuma project	200,000	
Gila project [1] (first unit)	600,000	
		1,160,000
		6,822,000
Available for Mexico		1,078,000
Guaranteed Mexico by proposed treaty		1,500,000
Deficit to be made up by lower States [2]		422,000

[1] The Gila project, for full development of all its units as proposed, would require 2,000,000 acre-feet; to date only the first unit is under construction.

[2] This is on the assumption that all waste, drainage, and other return-flow waters could be charged to Mexico, which is quite improbable; actually the deficit would be greater—nearer to 600,000 acre-feet.

33. Except during critical periods of low flow, there will be varying amounts of surplus water available in the lower river. While projects in the United States, due to their cost and type, could not be justified upon the use of such water, Mexico could use it to advantage. In the lower delta in Mexico water can be put on the land at a very low cost and could justify being left idle when water was not available. Furthermore, pumping from the underground basin in Mexico, would make it possible to offset shortages during critical periods.

34. In view of all of the foregoing, it would seem that since any use of water in Mexico from the Colorado River must be at the expense of lands in the United States, the most which should be guaranteed Mexico would be the amount used from natural flow prior to the construction of Boulder Dam—750,000 acre-feet. Use of any additional water by Mexico should be made subject to a prior right of contracts made by the Secretary of the Interior for Boulder Dam water.

FEBRUARY 8, 1944.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the Boulder Canyon Dam was built for a great purpose. It was built for the purpose of holding back the waters of the Colorado River and also for the retention of silt. To the best of my knowledge, the Colorado River carries more silt by several times than any other great river in the world. The Boulder Canyon Dam provides for the retention of 1,400,000 acre-feet of silt in the next 50 years. If it were not for the Boulder Canyon Dam, the delta land lying in Mexico would be overrun by destructive floods nearly every year. To that extent, of course, the works of the Boulder Canyon Dam benefit Mexico.

There are other benefits proposed, but in the course of this treaty we find that the United States, as provided in article 12, is to build a regulating dam, known as Davis Dam, at a point between Boulder Dam and Parker Dam. Of course, that project was authorized by the Congress in the enactment known as section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. It was provided that the cost of that dam should be recovered to the Federal Government through the sale of power to the people in the United States, all of the costs of that dam being allocated to power. The repayment to the Government is expected to take place in 40 years at 3-percent interest through the sale of power. None of the funds being expended on that dam have been allocated to the purpose of river regulation.

Approximately $7,000,000 has already been appropriated by this Congress for the purpose of building the Davis Dam. Crews were working in pursuance to a contract let to the Utah Construction Co., and the work was stopped by orders of the War Production Board in December of 1942. That matter, of course, is still pending. The Davis Dam is considered in this treaty as part of the works that are agreed to be constructed by the United States for the purpose of providing a regulated flow of water to the United States of Mexico. Yet at the same time the people who are to purchase the power from the Davis Dam will be required to repay to the Federal Government the entire cost of that dam.

An estimate furnished to me this morning by the Department of the Interior indicates the cost of the Davis Dam, on a pre-war basis, would be $41,200,000, all of which amount the users of power would be obligated to repay to the Federal Government in the price of electrical energy.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a memorandum on behalf of the Committee of Fourteen of the seven Colorado River Basin States and I desire to call attention to certain matters that they have set forth in this report. I desire to place in the RECORD at this point a number of points raised by the Committee of Fourteen, for the perusal of the Congress.

There is one matter contained on page 70 of this report that I should like to read:

> The United States has conducted the Boulder Canyon project and the local agencies have invested hundreds of millions of dollars in the construction of their facilities on the faith in the provision in the Boulder Canyon Project Act that the stored waters of the Colorado River are for beneficial uses exclusively in the United States.
>
> Any material allotment to Mexico of stored water would amount to partial repeal by a treaty of the most important provisions of this act.

Elsewhere it points out in this report that every drop of water that is sent over the line into Mexico would decrease the amount of available water in the United States and thereby cause the future development of that much land in the United States to be retarded, if not absolutely prevented, whereas the United States of Mexico would achieve additional development far beyond anything historical from the use of the water.

It is well known that water to the West is as dear as life itself. Without water there is no life. That is one of the reasons, or the principal reason, why we have come before the Congress in the past asking for the cooperation of the United States through the Congress in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution to enable us to better utilize this water. In so doing we have guaranteed to repay those moneys advanced by the United States pursuant to acts of Congress and are repaying those moneys to the United States faithfully. It is no expense to the United States whatever. It is an expense to our people who use the water and the power, and we are proud to repay the advances with interest.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the matter is fully set forth in the remarks which I have made. I would like to recall to the House once more in conclusion paragraph 2 of section 3, article IV of the Constitution of the United States of America, which provides:

> The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States, and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States or any particular State.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. Regardless of the merits or demerits of the treaty, will the

gentleman at that point amplify his reasons as to how the Congress, that is the House, has jurisdiction of the matter, when it appears it is purely a question of whether or not the Senate of the United States shall ratify or reject the treaty?

Mr. HINSHAW. I have set forth the facts in the resolution which I have submitted but I shall be glad to repeat briefly for the gentleman. The wording of that portion of the Constitution, which I have just read, says that "the Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States." It is claimed this property which is being disposed of to the United States of Mexico is "property" within the meaning and sense of the Constitution. Therefore Congress itself, not one body of Congress or an executive agency, has power to dispose of that property.

Mr. THOMASON. Assuming that the Committee on the Judiciary of the House should agree with the contention of the gentleman, just what could that committee or the House do in connection with the matter except to express their feeling regarding the proposed treaty, or make recommendations to the other body as to how they should dispose of the matter?

Mr. HINSHAW. I may say to the gentleman that I believe that to be the proper function of the Congress, that is, both Houses, the Congress and the President as the approving authority, and it should in all probability enact legislation amending the act relating to the disposition of the waters of the Colorado River and provide for their equitable distribution through an amendment to that act. At the same time, no doubt, the Congress would be willing to consider any damage that was wrought upon the users of that water who believe, by virtue of the fact they are going to pay for it, that they may be entitled, perhaps under the due process clause, to reimbursement or offset for some of the cost they have obligated themselves to pay which will accrue to the benefit of Mexico.

Mr. THOMASON. I am not prepared to argue the merit or demerit of the treaty with the gentleman, but I just wondered if he has any precedent in a matter of this sort, when my quick reaction to it is that the other body has sole and exclusive power and authority to either ratify or reject that treaty.

Mr. HINSHAW. There are precedents in the House and I can refer the gentleman to volume III of Hinds Precedents and items 2563 and 2564, which the gentleman can study.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Last year we had a bill which was submitted to and passed by the Congress providing for the ceding to the Republic of Panama some territory belonging to the United States in the confines of the Panama Canal Zone.

Prior to that we had had a treaty negotiated, but the State Department felt then that an act of Congress was necessary in order to have the United States dispose of this territory, even though there had already been a treaty. It seems to me that that might be a precedent during this very Congress for the action that my colleague from California is now recommending.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to my colleague from California, and thank my friend from Ohio, a distinguished member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for his pointed observation.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is it not possible, in reply to the gentleman who just asked about a precedent, that you will not find many cases in which the United States, through an executive agency, has attempted to give away the property of the United States? It must be understood that Mexico supplies no water to the upper and lower basins from which it is to be given water. Further, Mexico, as a nation, has no technical claim whatever upon this water. There is a casual right which we are willing to recognize, for perhaps 700,000 acre-feet; no more. The rest is an outright gift, not merely of property, if water is property, but of interests in actual physical property, because there are construction works upon the river which have been built by citizens of the United States, and which belong to the United States, which, under this treaty, are being given to Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the integrity of this House is directly involved, if under the act, in this case I think the Swing-Johnson Act, a certain division of water is set up, and the people of an area, no matter where that area may be, obligate themselves to reimburse the United States on the basis of the word of Congress in a bill which originates in this House of the Congress, and which must be passed by both Houses of Congress.

The people of an adjoining area, represented by the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] and others, have put up some $220,000,000 for the construction of an aqueduct and necessary facilities adjacent to and part of that aqueduct. Theirs is the water that is being given away. The first 3,850,000 acre-feet go to agriculture in the district which I represent. The next 550,000 acre-feet go to the metropolitan water district area, of which I have just spoken, and the next water, which is being given to Mexico by the Department of State through this treaty, is water which the county of San Diego and the county of Los Angeles expect to drink in the years when they will most need it. I commend the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] on the able and courageous manner in which he has presented to Congress the attempted violation of the integrity of this House.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. He may be in slight error as to the exact priority but his principle is correct.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. It so happens that 112,000 acre-feet that the city and county of San Diego are to get as a result of the building of $400,000,000 worth of aqueducts and dams is not firm water. It is what we get after all the rest is taken care of, after all of the other people of the upper basin States and the lower basin States and apparently the Republic of Mexico—after all their wants are satisfied we may get 112,000 acre-feet. It is not firm water such as this million and a half that is proposed to be given to Mexico.

Mr. HINSHAW. In all probability if the provisions of this treaty are carried through the city of San Diego will be without this available water in a short time.

Mr. IZAC. Of course, if this war continues and they should pass such a treaty as this, there is no doubt in my mind that there would be reaction from the Army and Navy because we would not have enough water there to take care of the Military and Naval Establishments. So they would see that we would get our water in some way. But, after the war is over the city and county of San Diego will be standing on their own, and there will be no Army and Navy to help us out, and I am wondering what is going to happen to the development of that section of California.

Mr. HINSHAW. It will be smothered, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. IZAC. Water is very necessary for our very life. Here is the point of this whole thing: We have built an all-American canal with American money. We are now proposing that Mexico come up there and use that canal. We let them not only use the works, the concrete, the canal, and all, but we permit them to have 500,000 acre-feet out of that canal, which was never contemplated when it was built. That is just one feature of this thing.

The next thing I would like to call attention to is this: If we pass a treaty of this kind we say to Mexico, "You have no right, under comity or under legal rules to more than you received before our works were installed. However, we are going to give you just double the amount that you used before because we want to be fair and we want to be good neighbors."

I think that would be very fine were it not for the fact that in so doing we are depriving American citizens of the thing that we are so generous with.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona whose State is vitally concerned in this issue.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have not yet read this treaty. I want to assure the gentleman that I am tremendously interested in this, because it is of vital importance. Does this treaty provide for any expenditure of funds? Or does the putting of it into effect call for appropriations?

Mr. HINSHAW. It provides that the United States shall be obligated to construct certain public works, which in my humble opinion, is an obligation to expend public funds. On the other hand, we all know that this treaty cannot go

into effect in full unless, first, the Congress itself has authorized the expenditure of these funds, and I believe also has approved the allocation of the use of the properties and the waters to Mexico.

Mr. MURDOCK. My colleagues from the adjoining State of California have not put this case too strongly. Water is life in our semiarid West. We stand to lose water by this treaty. I am wondering about its other provisions.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman. Copies of the treaty are now available. The injunction of secrecy has finally been removed.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, we are going far afield. The merits of the treaty are in no way before the House. The whole question, as I listened to it, is a resolution which authorizes the Committee on the Judiciary to make a study of the treaty and the action taken by the Executive, and the contemplated action to be taken by the Senate in reference to the treaty, and then to report back to the House whether or not, in the opinion of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, the Executive of the United States and the Senate of the United States have a right, constitutionally, to consummate the treaty. That is all that is before the House.

Something has been said about precedent. Now, there is precedent. The gentleman from California has just called it to my attention. It is away back there, but it stands.

Mr. HINSHAW. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Speaker, I am given to understand the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the majority leader, intends to move that this question be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, in order to determine whether or not the questions raised in the resolution should be inquired into.

Mr. MICHENER. If that is done, the gentleman gets control of the floor under a misapprehension of the facts and the rules, because before any action can be taken by the Speaker under the present procedure, the Speaker must determine that a question of constitutional privilege is embodied in the resolution. If the Speaker so finds, then it would be in order for the gentleman from California to insist upon a vote on his resolution, and if he does that and the matter is referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, you have not gone anywhere except to ask that committee to give its opinion as to the legality of the action contemplated or threatened to be taken by the President and the Senate.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is all the resolution goes to.

Mr. MICHENER. There will be no vitality in any such action, regardless of the merits of the proposition.

Mr. HINSHAW. Now, Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], and I believe that a majority of this House will disagree with the gentleman, that there would be no vitality in the resolution. It would certainly inform, by regular processes, the other body, and the President of the United States, of the opinion of this House in relation to the constitutionality of the acts being proposed. I submit that the Committee on the Judiciary of this House, being a committee composed of some of the most learned legal talent in the United States, and, in my opinion, at least equivalent in their knowledge and common sense to the highest court of the land, would have good reason to report to the House concerning its constitutionality.

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS].

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I want to compliment the gentleman from California on his interest in this matter. You gentlemen in the East can hardly realize the importance of water in the West. This matter is of such magnitude I am sure that every Member of this House has an interest in determining what course should be taken, as much as the Senate. I simply wanted to compliment the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] for bringing it to our attention.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman from Arizona, who is ever alert to the interests of his State.

Mr. Speaker, there being no further questions to be asked on this matter, and as I have stated as much as is necessary to present the matter to the House, I trust that the House will be unanimous in its favorable action on this resolution, favorable to the public interests which I, and the gentlemen who have spoken with me, represent. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this resolution should take the regular procedure of any other resolution, and the bill referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and report back to the House on what action shall be taken.

I move that the matter be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The resolution is referred to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House.

Without objection, a motion to reconsider will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

CONTINUING COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, 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 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 matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That section 1 of the Act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended, is hereby amended by deleting from the first sentence thereof the term '31st of March' where that term first appears therein and substituting in lieu thereof the term '30th of June', and by deleting from the second sentence thereof 'on the basis of the cost, including not more than one year of carrying charges, of such assets to the Corporation, or the average market prices of such assets for a period of twelve months ending with March 31 of each year, whichever is less' and inserting in lieu thereof 'on the basis of the cost, or, insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is the lower'. The first appraisal of the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation on the basis established by this amendment shall be made as of June 30, 1944.

"SEC. 2. Section 7 of the Act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby amended by changing the designation thereof to section 7 (a); by striking out in the first sentence of such section 'February 17, 1944' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1945' (this amendment to be effective as of February 17, 1944); and by striking out the period at the end of such section and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided, however*, That the Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall determine the procedures to be followed in the transaction of the corporate business.

"'(b) The financial transactions of the Corporation beginning with the period from July 1, 1944, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States: *Provided*, That the Corporation shall continue to have the authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers: *Provided further*, That a report of such audit shall be made to the Congress, together with such recommendations as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, and that each such report shall cover a period of one fiscal year: *Provided further*, That a copy of each such report shall be furnished the Secretary of the Treasury and that the findings contained therein shall be considered by the Secretary in appraising the assets and liabilities and determining the net worth of the Corporation under sections 1 and 2 of the Act of March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this section shall be construed as modifying legislation authorizing the use of funds of the Corporation for administrative expenses and requiring accountability therefor.

"'(c) The expenses of the audit as provided in this section may be paid up to and including June 30, 1946, from moneys advanced therefor by the Corporation, or from any appropriation or appropriations for the General Accounting Office, and appropriations so used shall be reimbursed promptly by the Corporation as billed by the Comptroller General: *Provided*, That any such advances or reimbursements shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses of the Corporation. For the purpose of such audit the representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all papers, books, files, accounts, financial records, warehouses, and all other things, property, and places belonging to or under the control of or used or employed by the Corporation and shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances in depositaries and with fiscal agents: *Provided further*, That the certified financial reports and schedules of the fiscal agents of the Corporation based on commercial audits in the usual course of business may be accepted by the General Accounting Office in its audit of the financial transactions of the Corporation as final and not subject to further audit verification.

"'(d) Any examination of the corporate records shall be made at the place or places where such records are normally kept in the transaction of the corporate business, and the Corporation shall retain custody of contracts, vouchers, schedules, or other financial or accounting documents, either original or duplicate, relating to its nonadministrative transactions.'

"SEC. 3. No funds appropriated to, borrowed by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) shall be directly or indirectly used by or made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) to make any subsidy or other payment, or to pay or absorb losses, on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, either to reduce, or in lieu of increasing, maximum prices established on such commodities under the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, except as provided in section 4 hereof: *Provided*, That with respect to any such commodities for which programs involving such payments or losses have been announced on or before January 14, 1944, such programs may be carried out to the extent only that funds are available for such purpose under existing law, but such programs shall be completed not later than June 30, 1944: *Provided further*, That support prices shall continue to be maintained and announced for any such commodities pursuant to section 4 of Public Law No. 147, approved July 1, 1941, as amended, and loans shall continue to be made pursuant to section 8 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, but any maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established for such commodities shall not be below the support prices therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942: *Provided further*, That none of the foregoing provisions shall apply to any payments or losses incurred in transactions with respect to domestic sugar beets and sugarcane and competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed and oil seed meals: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the making of parity payments or soil-conservation payments authorized under existing law, or benefits to sugar growers authorized under title III of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, or the sale of feed wheat as authorized by existing law.

"SEC. 4. (a) Within a period of one hundred and twenty days from the effective date of this Act, and within each six-month period thereafter, maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established on milk and the products thereof (pursuant to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942), shall be adjusted on a regional or market basis as the case may require to the extent necessary to (1) reflect changes in farm labor costs, feed prices (including all feed fed whether purchased or home grown), and other costs since January 1, 1941; (2) place the production of milk and the products thereof on a competitive basis with alternative opportunities which are available to producers of milk; (3) correct inequities as between markets; and (4) maintain or increase the production of milk and the products thereof for war and civilian purposes: *Provided*, That in determining the extent to which maximum prices shall be adjusted as provided herein, due consideration shall be given to historical and normal differentials customarily applied as between markets and regions: *Provided further*, That in no event shall maximum prices on milk and the products thereof be established below support prices therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law Numbered 729, approved October 2, 1942: *Provided further*, That where minimum prices to producers of milk have been regulated under any agreements or orders pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, the War Food Administrator is hereby directed, within the periods prescribed in this section (relating to the adjustment of maximum prices), to adjust such minimum prices to reflect adjustments in maximum prices determined and ordered pursuant to the provisions of this section. Except as expressly provided herein, nothing contained in this section is intended, nor shall be construed to repeal, amend, or supersede the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended.

"(b) In order to effectuate the purposes of paragraph (a) of this section, the War Food Administrator and the Price Administrator are hereby directed to hold public hearings on a regional or market basis as the case requires. For such purposes there shall be utilized the hearing procedure and the personnel of the Food Distribution Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture established under the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and such other personnel of the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration as may be required. As soon as practicable after the completion of the hearing, but in any event within the periods specified in paragraph (a), the War Food Administrator and the Price Administrator shall make public their joint findings based only on relevant substantial evidence of record at the hearing and the Price Administrator forthwith shall issue an order adjusting such maximum price or prices on the basis of and in conformance with such findings.

"(c) Any person (within the meaning of section 302 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended) who is adversely affected by the order of the Price Administrator may, within thirty days after the action adjusting such maximum price or prices, file a complaint with the Emergency Court of Appeals specifying his objections and praying that the order be enjoined or set aside in whole or in part.

"The War Food Administrator shall be made a party to the proceedings and upon service of the summons and complaint, the Price Administrator shall certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record upon which the order adjusting such maximum price or prices was based. The proceedings in and the determinations, orders, and decrees of such court shall be subject to all applicable provisions of section 204 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; except, that wherever the term 'Administrator' is used therein, it shall, for the purposes hereof, be construed to mean the War Food Administrator and the Price Administrator: *Provided*, That during the pendency of such proceedings the Price Administrator may not modify or rescind his order adjusting such maximum price or prices except upon the basis of additional joint findings on evidence adduced pursuant to the order of the court. The provisions of this section shall terminate coterminous with the expiration of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended.

"SEC. 5. The Commodity Credit Corporation may sell at a loss perishable fruits or vegetables, owned or controlled by it, the increased production of which has been requested by the War Food Administrator, if there is danger of substantial loss through deterioration by spoilage."

And the Senate agree to the same.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
ROBERT W. KEAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

J. H. BANKHEAD,
D. WORTH CLARK,
JNO. THOMAS,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Section 1, relating to the method of appraising the assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation, is the same in the House bill, the Senate amendment, and the conference agreement.

Section 2, extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation to June 30, 1945, and providing for the audit of its financial transactions, is the same in the House bill, the Senate amendment, and the conference agreement, except for a typographical error in the Senate amendment and the following technical change with respect to a date referred to in such section. For the purpose of extending the life of the Corporation, the House bill struck out the date "December 31, 1943" in existing law and inserted in lieu thereof "June 30, 1945". Before the bill passed the Senate, this date in existing law had been changed to "February 17, 1944" by the joint resolution approved December 23, 1943. Consequently, the Senate amendment and the conference agreement refer to the date in existing law as February 17, 1944; and, since it is unlikely that this bill can be enacted into law by February 17, 1944, the conference agreement provides that the amendment extending the life of the Corporation shall take effect as of February 17, 1944, even though it should be enacted after that date.

Section 3, containing restrictions upon the payment of subsidies with respect to agricultural commodities, was much the same in the House bill and the Senate amendment. The House bill provided that subsidy programs announced on or before October 13, 1943, might be carried on until December 31, 1943. The Senate amendment provided

that programs announced on or before January 14, 1944, might be carried on until June 30, 1944. The conference agreement follows the Senate amendment in this respect. The House bill provided that this section should not apply with respect to competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oilseed. The Senate amendment provided that the section should not apply with respect to those commodities and also that it should not apply with respect to domestic wool, sugar beets and sugarcane, oilseed meals, and wheat flour for export. The conference agreement follows the Senate amendment in this respect; except that (1) it omits the reference to wheat flour for export, as the provisions of the section do not in any manner affect the present program with respect to wheat flour for export, and (2) the conference agreement omits the reference to wool. The provisions of the section will not interfere with any program such as the present program under which the Commodity Credit Corporation has arranged to purchase the 1944 wool clip. Insofar as this program is concerned, there is no necessity for excepting wool from the provisions of this section, and the reference to wool is omitted only for the purpose of preventing the inauguration of consumer subsidy programs with respect to this commodity. The Senate amendment also contained a provision, which was not in the House bill, providing that nothing in the section should be construed to prevent the making of parity payments, soil-conservation payments, or benefits to sugar growers authorized under title III of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, or the sale of feed wheat as authorized by existing law. The conference agreement retains this provision with a clarifying change to make it clear that the parity payments and soil-conservation payments referred to are not limited by the reference to title III of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended. The Senate amendment made certain other changes of a clarifying nature in the language of this section of the House bill. The conference agreement adopts these changes with an additional clarifying change, which makes it clear that the maximum prices referred to in the section are those established under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942.

Section 4 of the Senate amendment related to the adjustment of maximum prices for milk. There were no provisions in the House bill corresponding to this section of the Senate amendment. The section provided that within 120 days from the enactment of this act, and within each 6-month period thereafter, maximum prices on milk and milk products should be adjusted on a regional or market basis as the case might require to the extent necessary to (1) reflect changes in farm labor costs (including hired workers, farm operators, and members of the families of farm operators engaged in work on the farm computed for all such labor on the basis of wage rates for hired farm labor), feed prices (including all feed fed whether purchased or home grown), and other costs, since January 1, 1941; (2) place the production of milk and the products thereof on a competitive basis with alternative opportunities which are available to producers of milk; (3) correct inequities as between markets; and (4) maintain or increase the production of milk and the products thereof for war or civilian purposes. It also provided that consideration should be given to historical and normal differentials customarily applied as between markets and regions, and that in no event should maximum prices on milk and the products thereof be below support prices therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942. The section also provided for adjustments of minimum prices pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, to reflect adjustments in maximum prices made pursuant to the provisions of this section. Subsection (b) of this section of the Senate amendment provided for holding hearings for the purpose of establishing maximum prices under the section. Subsection (c) provided for appeals to the Emergency Court of Appeals from orders issued under the section, provided that the War Food Administrator should be made a party to the proceedings in such court, and provided that the proceedings in such court should be subject to the applicable provisions of section 204 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended. The section provided that its provisions should terminate whenever the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, expires. The conference agreement retains this section of the Senate amendment, omitting the language which specified what was to be included in farm labor costs, and with other changes which are of a clarifying nature.

The provisions of section 4 (relating to the sale at a loss of perishable fruits and vegetables by the Commodity Credit Corporation) of the House bill were the same as the provisions of section 5 of the Senate amendment. These provisions are retained as section 5 of the conference agreement.

Section 6 of the Senate amendment increased the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation by $250,000,000. The provisions of this section are omitted from the conference agreement.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
ROBERT W. KEAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to address these few remarks to the the merits of the bill or the report. I voted against the bill when it was in the House. I was appointed a conferee and signed the conference report. It perturbed me somewhat as to whether I should have signed that report or not, but after consideration I did sign it and I intend to vote against it. I acted as the agent of the House when I became a conferee. You charged me to carry out your will and I endeavored to do that.

Under the Constitution it is provided that the identical bill must pass both Houses before it can become law and the instrumentality by which that is effected is the conference. I felt it was my duty to subordinate my own views to the expressed will of the House and, therefore, I signed the report in order that the orderly processes of legislation should not be retarded and that the final passage should be expedited.

I make this statement because I do not want to be subjected to the criticism of any of my colleagues who may think it is inconsistent for one to sign a report and vote against it.

I now feel I am free to exercise my own judgment. I am no longer a conferee and under no obligations to carry out the will of the House; therefore, I intend to vote as I voted previously, against the conference report; and if the bill is vetoed, I intend to vote to sustain the President's veto.

The bill as it comes back here is practically the bill that was sent to conference except there are a few more producers' subsidies in the bill. It states no fixed policy, it enunciates no principle except that the unorganized, nonvocal majority, the consumers, shall not have the benefit of a subsidy.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes back to us in better form and more understandable than when it left us. We anticipate that if we adopt this conference report and this bill goes to the President the usual argument will be made that unless consumer subsidies are paid we are going to have inflation. Nothing could be further from the truth. There is not an economist not on the Federal pay roll but who is in hearty accord that the payment of consumer subsidies is decidedly inflationary based upon the premise, as has been so frequently said, that we leave that much more money in the consumers' pockets with which to bid for nonavailable consumer goods.

Mr. Bowles himself admits that it adds to the national debt. Mr. Bowles says in a letter, a copy of which I have here:

> Of course, there are arguments against subsidies the validity of which I recognize. They will add to the tax burden and increase the national debt.

Of course, those are inflationary tendencies, nothing to the contrary notwithstanding. He goes on further to say:

> They introduce new principles into the American economy which have never before been experienced.

Thereby dissipating the argument that subsidies of this nature which we prohibit in this bill have been paid for the last 8 or 10 years. These are new subsidies which introduce new principles into the American economy, as Mr. Bowles says.

We anticipate this bill will be vetoed and we anticipate that in the veto message the claim is going to be made that unless we pay these subsidies we are going to have inflation. I have covered that, but I would like to have you all bear in mind the statement by Mr. Bowles and the allegations made by these economists who are not on the Federal pay roll when you listen to the arguments as to why we should pay consumers' subsidies. Personally, I feel so keenly that there is a fundamental question involved in this issue that if this Congress fails to override the President's veto we must effectuate a temporary strategic retreat but only for the purpose of consolidating our lines in anticipation of a very strong counter offensive.

It will be recalled that the O. P. A. expires on June 30. This question of consumers' subsidies is more allied with the prices established under the Price Control Act than prices paid by the Credit Corporation to producers, so we might expect that the counter offensive will be in the form of attempts to limit the operation of the Price Control Act in

such a manner as to prevent the socialization of agriculture through this vehicle of paying consumers' subsidies.

The fundamental problem involved in this issue is not the $400,000,000 or the $800,000,000 involved; it is whether the Federal Government is to be given absolute control over the production, the processing, and the distribution of food, which means the socialization of agriculture. In the 1935 Banking Act, and in another act passed in 1939 known as H. R. 6971, the fundamental problem before the House was, "Shall the Federal Government socialize banking and credit?" Just as this issue is involved in some of the acts pending in Congress today which would socialize medicine, which would socialize social security, which would socialize industry and business, so the question as to whether America shall be socialized is the fundamental issue involved in this bill before us now.

There are those in the Government who insist that America become a socialistic nation in order that it may take its position in a confederation of socialized nations following this war. Perhaps they are sincere in the belief that if we do not socialize America in order that we may take our position as one of a group of Socialist nations following this war, we might find ourselves isolated economically, politically, and socially from the rest of the world. However, there are some of us who believe that America can wield greater influence in the post-war economic, political, and social world if she strengthens herself under her Constitution, thereby impelling other nations to join with us instead of our having to destroy the American form of government in order that we may join a socialistic coalition of nations combating republican democracy. That is the fundamental issue involved.

Mr. Speaker, I have said this bill has been clarified in some respects. I want to make a statement which I do not think can be successfully contradicted, that this bill in no manner prohibits or interferes with any support-price program, with any parity program, with any soil-conservation program, or any program set up to encourage the production of agricultural products. If you will read the bill, and you do not have to read it too carefully, you will find that we prevent in this bill the payment of subsidies or the absorption of losses for a definite purpose. We prohibit the payment of subsidies and the absorption of losses for the purpose of preventing a reduction in maximum prices or in lieu of increasing maximum prices.

What do we mean by "maximum prices"? If there was any question in the House bill as to what was meant by "maximum prices," then we have clarified that in this conference report by stating specifically that these maximum prices are the maximum prices established under the Price Control Acts.

So there can be no question but that what we prohibit in this bill, and the only thing which we prohibit, is the payment of subsidies or the absorption of losses for the purpose of reducing maximum prices established under the Price Control Act, or in lieu of increasing maximum prices established under the Price Control Act. It does not interfere with the operation of any price-support program either in respect to prices or subsidies where the support price is below the parity price, because the Price Control Act already provides that no maximum price shall be put on any agricultural product below the parity price. This bill does provide, however, that if the support price on an agricultural commodity is above the parity price, the maximum price shall be increased to the new support price.

I want to clarify that the term "maximum prices" in this bill has no relationship whatever to prices paid to the producers of agricultural products. They have relation solely to the maximum prices established under the Price Control Act. We forbid the manipulation of those maximum consumer prices by the payment of subsidies, and make it very definite that we continue all of the subsidy programs that are for the purpose of encouraging the maximum amount of production.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The price of which the gentleman speaks is the retail price?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is the retail price, because the maximum prices set in the Price Control Act are the prices to the consumers. That is why I have so frequently said that in order to have an understanding of this you have to be fair enough to distinguish between consumer prices and producer prices. I think we have made that very clear.

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

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

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman very plainly contends that this is not going to affect the producer as far as prices are concerned. Does the gentleman contend that it is not going to affect the pocketbook of the ultimate consumer?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have never made any such contention. I have always contended that it was going to affect the pocketbook of the ultimate consumer. It will affect him in this way. It will affect him by compelling him to pay 5 cents more per pound for butter and an average of 3 cents per pound more for meat, which means that the individual who will then pay out of his own pocket to the corner grocery that 5 cents will be relieved of the obligation of having to pay 15 cents into the Federal Treasury to reimburse the Treasury for the nickel which under existing law it pays to the corner grocery store. This means that he will make an investment of a nickel today to save 15 cents 5 years from now.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Will the gentleman explain to the House section 4 of the conference report? The reason I ask this is that the milk producers in my part of the country are going out of business. They have no way to get any help from the War Food Administration and the O. P. A. I am hopeful that this amendment will take care of that difficulty.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a statement handed to me by the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation entitled "Why Dairy Products Require Special Legislative Treatment." I think it is all found in there.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I say briefly, Mr. Speaker, that section 4 in respect to milk is in keeping with our philosophy of the bill in that it compels an increase in the price of milk to absorb increases in feed costs and labor costs and all other costs. The reason why it has to be treated differently than other foods is that the production of milk and milk products and the price of milk and milk products are determined by marketing agreements within the different milksheds. Under the Price Control Act, the Price Administrator has interpreted that act to mean that he can set only a general price. So if he is compelled to set a general price, it might be an unfair price in Texas because it might be too low, and it might be unfair to the consumers in another area because it would be too high.

As I understand this provision, it allows the milk producers to get together under their marketing agreement acts and determine upon the price and apply that price in the different milksheds throughout the country. That is in substance what I understand it to be, but I place this statement in the RECORD to supplement the statement I have made.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman made a statement a moment ago that the banning of subsidies would not affect the income of the producer. If subsidies are banned and it is decided not to raise the maximum or ceiling price to the consumer, obviously it would adversely affect the producer.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Let us analyze that. We will say that as of a few months ago the support price of butter was 46 cents and the parity price of butter was 41 cents, and for a matter of a few weeks the price of butter to the retail consumer was 46 cents. The Government came along and said, "We are going to roll the price of butter back to parity, which is 41 cents, and the Treasury is going to pay the difference, or 5 cents." If the producer of butter had been receiving 25 cents a pound from that 46-cent butter, he is still receiving 25 cents, no more and no less, because whether the Government pays it out of the Treasury or whether the consumer pays it out of his pocket has no relationship whatever to the amount the producer of butter receives. It affects your pocketbook, as I have explained to the gentleman from Missouri,

by taking from that pocketbook 5 cents which you would otherwise use to compete for unavailable consumer goods. According to the agreement the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and I have in respect to the ratio between taxes and bonds, you will have to pay 15 cents into the Federal Treasury in the future to pay back the 5 cents you allegedly save today.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I ask the gentleman if he feels in his own mind that the other half of the dairy industry, that represented by the fluid milk, is properly protected by this legislation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say that the legislation was sponsored by the dairy producers. I have been told that they have been in contact with all branches of the industry, and that this suggestion which is written into the Senate bill here is the culmination of their collective thought.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If it covers the products of milk, I think the gentleman is right.

WHY DAIRY PRODUCTS REQUIRE SPECIAL LEGISLATIVE TREATMENT

Milk and its products require special treatment as distinguished from governmental policies affecting most other farm products.

This fact was recognized by the Food Administrator Herbert Clark Hoover in the First World War when he set up a series of regional milk price tribunals to determine adequate prices for milk under rapidly shifting war conditions.

It was recognized by the British Government when the English milk "scheme" was inaugurated a number of years ago under which all of the milk for whatever purpose in England was placed in a common pool.

It was recognized by Canadian provincial governments which established milk-price control authorities especially to meet the pressing problems created by the depression.

It was recognized by the Congress of the United States as early as 1933 in the passage of the first A. A. A. legislation. In that legislation common treatment was accorded the so-called five basic commodities (cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, and rice), but special treatment was provided for milk and its products, and a special agency of government was set up to meet the particular problems of the interstate milksheds and to deal with national pricing problems of such commodities as butter, evaporated milk, dried milk, and cheese. This legislative authority, which Congress has clarified several times, is now expressed in the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 as amended.

Sixteen State legislatures have also provided special machinery for administering milk-price control.

The essential distinction between the Federal and State price legislation lies in the fact that the Federal authority only determines and maintains producer prices, whereas in most of the States the milk control agencies fix both producer prices and distributors' margins.

While much of this legislation was passed originally on an emergency basis, its administration has become so imbedded into the life of the communities that it is doubtful whether the milk industry will ever again be completely returned to private competition.

The reason why milk requires special treatment could readily be seen if one made a topographical map of milk routes feeding a group of urban markets. Because of transportation factors and urban needs, the producers supplying each city market, together with its subordinate markets, are grouped naturally into what is called milksheds. These milksheds do not differ greatly in their nature from watersheds. Just as the water drains according to the contour of the land through creeks and rivers into the large water basins, so milk is gathered along country lanes and moves down the great highways and by rail to where it can be most economically consumed. These milksheds today are well defined throughout the Nation, and generation after generation of milk producers have customarily supplied the same markets and rarely change except for extraordinary conditions. In fact, there are points between adjacent milksheds where the milk flows in different directions just as water would from the divide of a mountain range.

These milksheds differ as to volume and cost of production and as to pricing policies. In one community milk may be quoted by the 100 pounds and in the other by the quart. In communities of high production costs, milk sells at a much higher price than in communities of lower costs. For example, historical price differentials have nearly always prevailed as between the high cost production of the Atlantic seaboard and the low cost production of the Middlewest. Likewise, the Intermountain Region, the Pacific coast and the southern States have their particular and peculiar milk market problems.

In consequence, there is no such thing as a national price for milk either at the producer or the consumer levels. There may be national competitive prices for evaporated milk but producers in different regions receive different prices. There are regional price differentials on the wholesale price of butter and butterfat. There are similar regional price differentials on American cheese.

Production of milk also is unlike that of the other great agricultural commodities in that it is a twice a day job whereas no other farm production even approaches this rate except the poultry flocks.

Because of this regularity of production and the advanced work which has been done by many agricultural colleges, it is now a matter of fairly scientific accuracy to measure the changes in production costs in the various regions. This would not be possible if there was not a dependable regularity of production yields and production trends. In any region the dairymen can forecast the week in which production will begin to rise, when the peak will be crossed and the low level again be reached.

HOW EASTLAND-M'CLELLAN AMENDMENT REVITALIZES PRICE LAWS

In the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and in the Price Control Acts of 1941 and 1942 Congress provided for flexibility of price treatment for milk and its products (in the first especially and in the second generally). Had the administration of these two laws been allowed to function in the spirit intended, there would be little further reason for enacting the Eastland-McClellan amendment as a part of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill. But the President by Executive order of April 8, 1943, froze existing prices and paralyzed price administration in both the O. P. A. and in the W. F. A. The real reason then for inclusion of the Eastland-McClellan amendment is to break the "log jam" in the pricing of milk and its products and which is causing a steady decline in the total production of milk for all purposes. That decline is impeding the war effort. Meantime production costs have continued to rise.

With respect to milk and its products, the Eastland-McClellan amendment would revive the active administration of these two acts but would make some changes in the procedure necessary. Such changes include:

1. Four legislative standards to guide the administrative authorities are provided. These standards are so phrased as to permit considerable leeway in the preparation of findings.

2. The public hearing method developed over the years is revived but the hearings are to be conducted jointly by W. F. A. and O. P. A.

3. The territorial scope of the hearings is expanded to cover regions in which both interstate and intrastate markets are located.

4. The producer referendum which in peacetime is an important feature of the Federal milk order system, set up under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, is set aside during the life of the Price Control Act.

5. Maximum prices may not be below support prices.

6. Determination of the need of price changes must be made at least twice a year (under normal competitive conditions the price of milk to producers and to consumers historically changes more frequently than by 6-month periods in many communities. In almost every milkshed representatives of producer cooperatives and distributors have been accustomed to meet monthly to discuss changing conditions of production and changing market needs).

Administrative authorities are given 120 days from the time of the enactment of the bill to reestablish their hearing and price-adjustment machinery. In view of the fact that the country has already been divided by the War Food Administration into 24 representative regions for purposes of industrial rationing of the fluid-milk supply, the time limit of 120 days is deemed sufficient. The technique of the public-hearing method is well developed and very few additional employees will be necessary to swing flexible price administration back into action.

WHY THE LEGISLATION IS NEEDED NOW

Price adjustments on milk and milk products in lieu of subsidies are specifically provided for in this amendment for the following reasons:

1. Milk is perhaps the most widely produced of all farm commodities—normally being produced on more than 75 percent of all farms in the United States.

2. Of all major farm-commodity groups, prices of dairy products have risen least since the 5-year period immediately preceding the war

3. The cost of producing milk has increased considerably more than have the prices of dairy products.

4. Milk production has increased much less on a percentage basis during the war period than other competing farm commodities, notwithstanding that it is a critical war commodity.

5. Since the middle of 1943 both milk and butter production have been declining at an accelerating rate as compared to 1 year earlier.

6. Dairy products are now bearing more than one-third of the entire food-subsidy burden (about $441,000,000 annually) and their removal would be disastrous to future dairy production if substitute machinery, such as this amendment, is not provided.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the frankness of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is appreciated. Of course, he could not have answered my question honestly other than to admit that the provisions of the bill, as agreed upon by the House and Senate conferees, maintains the producers' price, but on the other hand it increases the consumers' price. That has been my contention all along. The gentleman's view means that the housewives would increase their budget when the price of the necessities of life, which he named, goes up.

I believe that the producer is not only entitled to the cost of production but he is likewise entitled to a fair return on his labor. I have always contended that, but what happens to the people that I represent, the consumer? When you abolish the food subsidies you automatically increase the cost of living. What is the inevitable result? It will be a demand for an increase in wages. That statement cannot be honestly disputed.

There is one class of people, especially in the large cities, who have been practically overlooked insofar as increase in wages is concerned. That is the so-called white-collar worker. Unorganized, he has not benefited, his salary envelope contains practically the same, and he has had trouble in trying to maintain a proper standard of living. Under the terms of this bill, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] admits, the cost of his meat, butter, milk, bread, and so forth goes up. In other words, the cost of food subsidies is transferred to the pockets of the consumers. Who can deny that statement? I say, Mr. Speaker, this is no time to disturb a program which has proved successful.

Time and again I have stated on this floor that I try to legislate from a national rather than a local standpoint. I think in casting my votes of all the people of the United States and not those residing in my community. That was my attitude when a few days ago I supported by voice and vote a bill appropriating nearly $40,000,000 to import farm labor into this country. Not one cent of that money will be spent in my congressional district. However, when you take that money out of the general fund of the Treasury to be used to supply the farmers with much-needed labor, at least part of that money came from the pockets of my constituents in the form of taxes. The money used for food subsidy came from the pockets of all the taxpayers of the United States. That is freely admitted. I have heard the pleas of those who represent the dairy farmers. I have heard the pleas of those who represent the producers of beef, cattle, wheat, corn, and other necessities of life. I have listened to those pleas, but it seems that those who represent the farmer are unwilling to listen to the plea of those who represent the people who reside in the urban centers. The great farm organizations of this country favor subsidies for farm labor, favor parity prices, favor an increase in the price of milk and other farm products, and at the same time they flood us with resolutions opposing food subsidies. The wholesaler and the retailer will be unable to absorb the increase in price that will result if food subsidies are discontinued. They will pass it down to the consumer.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is unfair and I cannot support this conference report. I hope that the President will veto the bill. I will vote to sustain the veto.

Under the permission granted me, Mr. Speaker, feeling that it is an excellent contribution on advising the people of this country what will happen if food subsidies are discontinued, I am placing in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the New York Post of February 15, 1944, reproduced in the Washington Post this morning at the expense of the International Latex Corporation of Dover, Del. This corporation feels it is rendering a public service in reproducing this editorial. So do I. The editorial follows:

The Senate has just kicked subsidies out of the food picture and opened the door to inflation. Unless its action is reversed, the American consumer can expect the price of the family meat and potatoes to start a fast uphill climb that will leave the family dollar away behind.

An argument that opponents of subsidies have been making lately is that subsidies don't save us anything since "we pay for them with higher taxes, anyway." We might as well pay higher prices directly to the grocer, the argument goes, as pay higher taxes to the Government to support subsidies. It all goes to the same place.

This argument is a fake from start to finish. There are two clear answers to it:

First, we don't pay nearly as much in subsidies as we would pay directly over the grocery counter. The fact is that a billion or a billion and a half dollars spent in subsidies saves eight to thirteen billions on the total food bill.

HERE'S HOW IT WORKS

How? Well, let's say that the dairyman finds that his feed costs have increased, that he must charge a cent more on a quart of milk to break even, or to make his usual profit. He raises his price to the jobber by that cent.

The jobber, in turn, does not increase his price by just 1 cent. When the milk leaves his hands, it has risen not by a cent a quart but by a cent and a half, or perhaps 2 cents.

When it gets to the groceryman, he'd be less than human if he did not announce that henceforth, due to the higher prices he has to pay, milk will now cost the consumer 3 cents more per quart. It is a law of inflation that an increase in price at the origin of the product always means a doubling or tripling of that increase to the final purchaser.

Under the food-subsidy program, the Government pays the dairyman that extra cent he requires in order to break even. But the price then stays the same to the jobber, to the groceryman, and to the consumer. The snowballing of prices is stopped. The price rise is quarantined at one level; the infection is localized.

That's only one argument for subsidies. Here's the second: While it is true that the $1,000,000,000 used for subsidies may be tax money, not all of it is the tax money of the average consumer. Only a small part of it may, in fact, come from his specific taxes.

The rest may be excess profits collected by the Government from war-profits-swollen firms. The Government thus redistributes these profits, takes them from those who have made too much and uses them to keep down the food prices of the millions who have made too little.

SUBSIDIES ARE GAINING FRIENDS

When the Senate killed subsidies, it counted on the rapid march of the war to dull the keen interest of a few months ago in the subsidy debate. But along with soldier voting, subsidies have been the great issue of the year.

A measure of the rightness of the people's fight is that even the New York Times has shifted its position to come out carefully for a few subsidies. Those two stalwarts of stalwart Republicans, Senators VANDENBERG and TAFT, have also joined with the prosubsidy forces.

These men are not innovators. They simply acknowledge, as most Republicans and fewer Democrats (mostly Southern) will not, that subsidies are an established part of the wartime food picture. They know that in the past year, 25 food subsidies have been operating, holding down prices all the way from tomatoes to milk.

They know that there is nothing new about subsidies; that, indeed, there is something new and dangerous about a wartime economy that does not subsidize its food prices.

We call upon all Americans to join together to save a working part of their economy. Their very bread and butter is at stake here.

Let your Senator and your Congressman know how you stand. If you don't fight hard and at once, you and your children, after June 30, 1944, will be eating less and paying more.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this conference report. I was opposed to the bill when it was originally presented to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I opposed the bill when it came to the floor.

As a conferee, I refused to sign the report or the statement, for the reason that the amendments offered and finally accepted from the other body exceeded the provisions of the House bill.

I am opposed to the bill in toto. I shall vote against the conference report. I shall also vote to sustain a veto if the bill is vetoed.

My reasons are simple but fundamental. I am convinced that this bill if enacted would open wide the gates to a torrent of inflation that would disrupt the war effort and defeat all efforts to stabilize prices to consumers, while guaranteeing to producers not only a floor or a support price but permitting price increases in all essential food products. It would cost the consumers hundreds of millions if not billions of dollars.

The proponents of this measure say that subsidies to consumers is a new and dangerous philosophy.

Just how much more dangerous is it than subsidizing producers? If we follow that to its logical conclusion we should say to every manufacturer that if his product costs too much, we will enable him to sell at less and pay him the difference.

The subsidies to consumers is a war measure to black inflation. The subsidies to farm producers is and has been for some years a permanent subsidy.

So that opposition to consumers subsidies is not a philosophy at all. It is merely a hate-Roosevelt phobia. The farm bloc and its supporters must shoulder the responsibility if inflation engulfs the Nation.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, misadministration by many of the Federal war agencies has caused much confusion and misunderstanding in the minds of our citizens on the home front.

An understanding and a workable solution is possible. We suggest the O. P. A., W. P. B., and U. S. D. A. summon to Washington one or more representative citizens from each congressional district in the Nation and get a clear picture of how impracticable many of their directives and regulations are in operation.

Possibly members of the local rationing boards serving their towns and counties without pay, and farmers and cattlemen directly from the grass roots could offer more light on the subject than could any other groups, for the rationing board members hear the story of every individual in their respective boundaries, and the farmers and cattlemen know first handed.

The foremost question in the minds of the average citizen from the rural regions—which include all of the Third District—is how Washington continues to grant the demands for higher wages of strikers in war industries and holds fast upon their ceiling prices on farm products and livestock. When a wage increase is granted, it is elementary that the cost of farm products should increase to equalize the purchasing price of the dollar, but this has not happened. To the contrary, millions have been paid for subsidies in the industrial sections of the country, which is simply a hidden wage increase for many of those who have been receiving higher wages by striking. A small amount has been paid to the producer, which is very negligible and not a drop in the bucket by comparison with the amount received by organized labor as a wage increase.

Remember this. In the words of organized labor, every person who is not a dues-paying member of a union is just a "scab." Remember further that we so-called scabs outnumber the members of these present-day privileged organizations by eight to one.

The cost of transportation and hotel bills of 1,000 citizens coming to Washington would be an act of economy and not an additional expense.

If the question of subsidies were put to a popular vote, the margin would also register eight to one against subsidies.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I want to draw a little parallel at the outset in calling the attention of the House to a very interesting cartoon by Mr. Berryman in today's Star. Two United States bulletins are on a board and a Yankee doughboy is looking at them. The top bulletin starts out with a statement by Vice President WALLACE: "Vice President WALLACE says American Fascists are trying to gain control of delegates."

Just below the bulletin board has on it: "Alf Landon declares fascism is here in America and its name is the New Deal."

This is what the doughboy says: "If these American leaders are telling the truth, why are we fighting over here?"

The scene is somewhere out at the front. That has a very interesting connection with the matter which is drawing to a close here now; the question involved is whether or not we are to be faced in this country by the action of the Congress with the financing of continued confusion, confusion in excess of that which troubles the doughboy. We have seen enough concerning both confusion and the failure on the part of certain agencies whose edicts, regulations, and requested directives without the sanction of this body are extraconstitutionally taking away from the American people their right to function and produce as they know how, their right to function and produce under a system which that flag stands for. This is not a partisan question, gentlemen. I stand here as a Democrat. I want to read to you a little matter that comes from another man who was a Democrat, the Democrats elected him a long time ago as President of the United States. His name is Grover Cleveland. He had this to say on the occasion of the Centennial of the Constitution of the United States:

> As we look down this past century to the origin of our Constitution, as we contemplate its trials and its triumphs, as we realize how completely the principles upon which it is based have met every national peril and every national need, how devoutly should we confess with Franklin, "God governs in the affairs of men"; and how solemn should be the reflection that to our hands is committed this ark of the people's covenant, and that ours is the duty to shield it from impious hands. We receive it sealed with the tests of a century. It has been found sufficient in the past, and in the future years it will be found sufficient if the American people are true to their sacred trust.
>
> Another centennial day will come and millions yet unborn will inquire concerning our stewardship and the safety of their Constitution. God grant that they may find it unimpaired; and as we rejoice in the patriotism and devotion of those who follow us rejoice in our fidelity and in our jealous love for constitutional liberty.

The difference in cost to an American consumer between the continuity of a system of government referred to in that famous Centennial, of between 5 and 15 cents is too cheap a price for such a conversion. I am for this conference report. It is the very best that could have been wrought, I think, in the face of a tremendous and inconceivable confusion which has surrounded this measure and the diabolic and misdirected efforts by many well-intentioned men to confuse this issue and bring the American people to their knees as degenerate dependents. Some time ago in talking to a Member of this body, I was reminded of the words of the present President of the United States in which he said, "It is better that we should die on our feet than live forever on our knees." I agree with him. When this message confronts him as to whether or not he shall veto it, in case he may have forgotten that he said that, I call his attention to it here on the floor of the House as one who shares with him and with all Americans the obligations and duties which we are sworn to defend and carry on.

In 1936 the President of the United States said this:

> In 34 months we have built up new instruments of public power. In the hands of a people's government this power is wholesome and proper. But in the hands of political puppets of an economic autocracy such power would provide shackles for the liberties of the people.

There are many Members of this body who heard this statement. I hope he will remember that. When you go down through the long list of evidences in the American forum of reason, and the ideologies back of them, which make their appearance without limitation, a clear and definite conflict is shown to exist between our form of Government and a proposal that the American people are unwilling to pay for their own meals today and are willing to charge them to future generations. The immediate past record of the operations of the O. P. A. and the known confusion which inevitably will come out of the administration, under directives without the sanction or knowledge of the representatives of the people, of a wide- and far-flung subsidy program, which this bill prevents, is sufficient within itself to warrant your support. I hope the President will react in accordance with what I believe all Americans should do in a like emergency.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, there have been many statements since this subsidy question was first considered, that the advocates of the continuation of subsidies are trying to lead America along the path of state socialism. Nothing could be further from the truth. As the Speaker so well said here in his address the other day, "America is not going socialistic unless the voters at the polls vote to make America socialistic." If we continue these subsidies we will not be any more socialistic or communistic than Canada is or Great Britain, who have been using the subsidy program and I do not think they have been incorporated in the United Soviet Republics. What we are trying to do is to save the value of the American dollar. We are trying to keep the cost of living from soaring sky high and thus oppressing the poor, unorganized people and the white-collar workers and those who live on a fixed income. We are also trying by preventing the rise in prices, to keep wages at a reasonable level so that the war will not cost us increased billions of dollars which would be saddled upon the American taxpayers in this generation and generations to come.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] 10 minutes.

THE ROLL-BACK-SUBSIDY FALLACY

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, those who advocate the payment of roll-back

subsidies argue three principal propositions. One is that roll-back subsidies will prevent inflation. The second is that roll-back subsidies will substantially take those who are in the economic squeeze out of their unfavorable situation. The third is that roll-back subsidies will hold down the cost of war by preventing increases in wages and a consequent rise in the prices of goods purchased by the Government.

I emphatically deny that roll-back subsidies will serve either of those purposes. Now let us look at the situation for just a moment. Roll-back subsidies will not prevent inflation. I submit as evidence in support of that statement a very scholarly address made by the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System at the Tax Institute Symposium in New York just a few days ago, February 8, where, I understand, he appeared at the direct request of the President of the United States to deliver this address to show that the inflationary forces are moving toward the point where the situation will get out of our control and that in order to prevent the inflationary destruction which is potentially ahead of us, certain steps must be taken with respect to increasing the tax levies in order to prevent the inflationary forces from doing their dirty work. Quoting directly from Chairman Eccles we find these words:

I shall not undertake to restate my views on war finance, but in discussing the problems of inflation control after the war, we must realize that the chances for success at that time will be vitally affected by fiscal policies during the war. Our tax effort so far has been entirely inadequate in relationship to our huge wartime expenditures and it has lagged far behind that of our allies.

Further quoting from the statement of Mr. Eccles we find:

Our home-front fight against inflation will have to continue for a considerable time after the war ends. The eventual answer to the inflation problem must be found in the production of goods in quantities sufficient to meet all the demand. * * * Another difficulty which will confront us in the postwar period will arise from the huge amount of purchasing power held by the public. This will largely be the result of our heavy reliance upon borrowing in the financing of our war expenditures, and, in particular, upon borrowing from the banks.

In the 2 years from January 1, 1942, to January 1, 1944, the public debt increased by $105,000,000,000, and of this increase the commercial banks and the Federal Reserve banks have absorbed $48,000,000,000. Of the total of $169,000,000,000 of Government debt outstanding at the end of 1943, $72,000,000,000 were held by the commercial banks and the Federal Reserve. This extensive borrowing from the banks resulted in a corresponding increase in our money supply. Including currency as well as demand deposits, the total money supply held by the public at the close of the year amounted to over $80,000,000,000, or nearly twice as much as 2 years ago. To this must be added over $30,000,000,000 of time deposits and the many billions of United States Government securities held by the public. This huge volume of liquid funds is the basis for the inflationary problem in the transition period.

Nowhere in that address did the chairman contend that roll-back subsidies would alleviate the situation which we now face. He preached the sound theory of the necessity for the production of goods, and what is likely to happen when the people have at their command as free economic agents a great excess of buying power as related to a scarcity of goods.

In support of my statement I also refer to the address of Mr. Bell, Under Secretary of the Treasury, December 16, 1943, before the Worcester Economic Club, Worcester, Mass., in which he said, among other things:

What then, it may be asked, is the role of war borrowing? The answer must be that war borrowing is a method of postponing, not the cost itself, but the final allocation of the total burden of the war to some future date, when the costs now paid for through the sale of bonds are finally assessed in the form of taxes—at which time it is inevitable that a much larger portion of them will be paid by the persons now in the armed forces than if they were assessed today. When this fact is seen in its stark reality, it is clear that the money cost of the war should be met as far as possible by taxes, and so be paid for once and for all by today's civilians at the same time that the men in the service are paying their much higher price in human cost on the fighting fronts.

Mr. Speaker, here the Under Secretary of the Treasury speaks my language. Why in the name of common sense are Members now advocating that we sell more bonds, increase the debt, make heavier the tax load on service men and women when they return from the war to pay—for what—for a portion of my grocery bill which I should pay myself, or to contribute to the payment of the grocery bill of every Member of this House, and through the hidden machinery of the "roll-back" subsidy program as it ties directly into the ration food coupons we have in our homes or in our pockets? Shame on us for advocating such a rotten scheme. Further quoting Mr. Bell, he says:

At the present time the Federal Government is purchasing about one-half of the total volume of goods and services being produced, while the remaining 50 percent is being purchased for private use. Federal taxes, however, are bringing in only about 20 percent of the gross income generated by production, leaving about 80 percent in private hands. There is, thus, a discrepancy equivalent to about 30 percent of the value of total output which makes up the Federal deficit on the one hand and the corresponding necessary private savings on the other. To the extent that total borrowing exceeds the aggregate amount of savings consciously and intentionally undertaken, we are placing liquid assets in the hands of persons who may use them to put added pressure on price ceilings.

And in the face of these hard facts, Mr. Speaker, men stand on this floor and advocate further borrowings, greater deficits, and more debt in order to assist in paying the grocery bills of those who have excess buying power at this very hour.

And Mr. Paul, of the Treasury Department, in his address before the Indiana State Bar Association, Claypool Hotel, Indianapolis, January 7, 1944, last, gave us some keen thoughts on this question of inflation, taxation, and debt. Mr. Paul, General Counsel of the Treasury, said:

I want to say unequivocally that the revenue bill of 1943, as it is about to be debated on the Senate floor, is a tragic failure. It fails to meet the three principal tests of a wartime revenue measure. First, it does not raise enough revenue. Second, it fails as an instrument to reduce inflationary pressure. Third, it denies to more than 50,000,000 taxpayers the simplification of tax law to which they are entitled. We may as well face the facts at the outset. With war expenditures of $92,000,000,000 in the current (1944) fiscal year, a revenue yield from existing taxes of $41,000,000,000, we are running a deficit of $57,000,000,000. With all this spending the American people have saved more than ever before. They have accumulated in the last 3½ years liquid savings of more than $55,000,000,000, of which fully half is in increased currency and bank accounts. Is it not clear that they could afford to pay $10,500,000,000 of additional taxes? I, for one, believe they would have been willing, if not glad, to do so. One might understand a refusal to be taxed, if it meant more purchasing power in the pockets and bank accounts of taxpayers. But the grim fact is that as a people we gain nothing by refusing to pay taxes. On the contrary, we stand to lose a great deal. Inflation very well may take what we do not pay to the tax collector.

I need not go to any higher authorities than those three gentlemen, because they speak for the administration. But they do not advocate roll-back food subsidies to prevent inflation. Their views are too sound to follow such a fallacy. They speak for the President of the United States, who I understand may perhaps veto this bill if it is approved by the two Houses. We could give plenty of other authorities, but why go any further?

When you step over into the field of those who advocate roll-back subsidies, oh, they advocate roll-back subsidies to prevent inflation. The O. P. A., to prevent inflation; the War Food Administration, to prevent inflation; the Economic Stabilizer, to prevent inflation. And why do these planners all advocate the roll-back subsidy scheme? Oh, if we only had the answer to that question. Herein lies the plan to further control, to further govern our people by permissive orders; to further dictate and control every move we make in the field of economics. This group of planners all know, just as well as anybody, that roll-back subsidies will not be a great factor in preventing inflation.

Now, will roll-back subsidies take the unfortunate people out of the economic squeeze? They will not. The maximum you can possibly hope to get out of this is a benefit of 2¾ cents a day per capita of 12 cents a day for an average family, or let us say, the price of a glass of beer. Does any Member of this House believe that the sensible families of this country will have their economic appetite satiated in the form of a mess of pottage amounting to 12 cents per day for a family? If you were the father of a group of children, the head of a home, would you let your birthright be purchased with a roll-back subsidy that amounted per day to no more than a glass of beer? Would you, therefore, not ask for an increase in wages or salaries if you had to continue in the economic squeeze after roll-back subsidies were ap-

plied? The people in our factories, on our farms, in our white-collar jobs have got too much sense to be purchased by that kind of a proposition. They just will not go along with it.

Another thing: The coupon book which you carry in your pocket or which your wife carries, these little brown coupons entitle you to your cut on whatever appropriation is made by this Congress for the purpose of paying roll-back subsidies. The prayer is prayed in the name of the fellow who is in the economic squeeze, but the man who is not in the economic squeeze gets his cut of the appropriations, because of the food right that the coupon gives to him. There is the fallacy of this proposition of taking the poor fellow out of the economic squeeze. If you want to pray a prayer in his name, do so, but in the name of God and of humanity and justice see that he gets the benefit of the appropriation after it is made, instead of spreading it to us people who do not need it and who protest against it.

One other point: Will the roll-back subsidies prevent the cost of the war advancing, and an increase in the debt? Of course, they will not. I contend that the charts which have been presented to us on this floor and which will probably be presented again, will not stand a scientific and economic analysis. They are prepared to mislead those who look upon them. I have not been misled. Those charts will not hold water. They will not stand on their own feet. I do not have time to argue that. We cannot bring them in here, and we cannot fight that out, but I did not want that argument to be left unanswered.

Now, if these prices or costs of war are to continue, they will continue even after you pass roll-back subsidies and put them into operation. There is no question about that.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have found that the advocates of roll-backs and consumers' subsidies are not interested in securing the maximum production of essential foods.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think that is correct. See what Chairman Eccles says about that. This roll-back subsidy proposition and this program under which we are operating does not conform to that of Canada and England, as has been argued on the floor awhile ago. Get your facts and put them down and square them up and you will find that my statement will stand by the evidence that can be put before you.

The Government did increase milk prices in Chicago, and they have enough milk. The increased production brought more milk—what they wanted. The question which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] raised is, "Do you want production of foodstuffs?" If so, you pay the price and get the production. If you do not want that production and will be satisfied to go with a hungry gut, then go without food, post your beautiful low prices, and let the population cry for food—but along with this, be prepared for revolution.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. There should be a distinction made between this country and a country that is getting lend-lease from us.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Surely.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a further fact that if we do get an abundance in the production of these essential foods, the abundance itself will hold down the price to the consumers?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is either true or else our economy has been false since 1776. We can take our choice on that proposition.

Now the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] says we want to hold these prices down. Well, cut your prices and put them on the walls of the grocery stores in gold letters—beautiful low prices—and let the people walk in and live on the low prices, with no goods to buy. You have got no moral right to ask the farmers of this country to produce foodstuffs below the cost of production, and in the same breath give the manufacturer whatever price is necessary to get implements of war produced, on the basis of cost plus a profit. The farming people of this country do not propose to be subjected to that kind of straitjacket, and they will take care of this situation in due course, make no mistake about that.

I shall support the conference report as has been submitted, with pleasure. If the President vetoes the bill I shall vote to override his veto with a great deal more pleasure.

I agree with the gentleman who submitted the proposition that we do move toward a Fascist state as the Government more and more takes over control of the forces of production and distribution, those forces which deal with such matters, and the flow of capital, and all administered under the policies and personnel of a single political party. If that is not fascism, what is it? We move away from the private enterprise system as we move more and more to Government control, and the farmers of this country fundamentally object to this kind of operation being imposed upon them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 16 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I have not yielded myself any time, but I wish to go on record as supporting the conference report.

PRICE AND STABILIZATION PROGRAM HAS SAVED TAXPAYERS $65,000,000,000 ALREADY ON WAR COST ALONE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the generosity of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] in yielding his time to me. Obviously, I cannot yield to everyone in the short length of time I have. Practically all the speeches that have been made, have been made in opposition to subsidies and I hope and trust the Members will not ask me to yield until I have finished my statement.

I am not going to talk about 5 cents on a pound of butter or 3 cents on something else. I am going to talk about billions of dollars in savings in our national debt, by reason of our stabilization and price-control program. We have some facts and figures to back up what we say.

Briefly, this chart [indicating] has been carefully prepared and can be relied upon. For the last 9 months the stabilization line has been held. There has been no increase in the cost of the war. There has been no increase in the cost of living. During the last war we had no price-control program, and the price of steel went from 187 to 695 percent above what it was before the war. During this war it has not gone up 1 penny. Neither has the price of tin, nor cement, nor other basic commodities that largely enter into the cost of this war.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I do not yield. I stated that I hoped Members would not ask me to yield until I finished my statement.

Now, we have a similar period of time that we can compare the period of time we have recently gone through with. That is an example that is on all fours. During the first 51 months of World War No. 1, when we had no price control or stabilization acts, we can compare those prices with prices during the 51 months of this war. If we do that, and if we had paid the same prices as were paid during the same period of time in the First World War, our national debt would be $65,000,000,000 more today than it is.

FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS SAVING FOR EVERY MAN, WOMAN, AND CHILD

That is a saving of $500 for every man, woman, and child in America.

FIFTY MILLION DOLLARS SAVED EVERY 24 HOURS

It represents a saving of $50,000,000 every day of 24 hours on war cost alone. So we are not talking about 5 cents on butter, or 3 cents on something else. We are talking about a stabilization and price-control program that is saving the American people, the taxpayers, on war cost alone, not counting the cost of saving in their living expenses, but on war cost alone, $50,000,000 every day around the clock.

PROGRAM WORTH SAVING

Is that kind of stabilization program worth working for? Of course it is. You can always pick out little insignificant things and criticize any program. It is easy to criticize. But this program has worked. It has absolutely worked, and we have the proof here to demonstrate that it has worked.

Maybe your plan is a better plan. Maybe it is. I do not know. Maybe I have a plan that is better. But I am not willing to try it. I am not willing to destroy a program that has absolutely worked and is now saving us $50,000,000

a day in war cost alone. I am not willing to scuttle that kind of a program and try out some plan of some other person, not even my own plan.

Let me state that in this program it does not make much difference how much money is put up here [indicating] above this price-control dam whether it is used to pay subsidies or anything else. So long as that dam holds we are saved and we are not going to have inflation.

SUBSIDIES IN PRICE-CONTROL DAM

During this war we have more money in circulation than we ever had before in history. When the war started we had six and one-half billion dollars, today we have twenty billions in actual money in circulation in the pockets and tills of the people of this country compared with three and one-half billions at the beginning of the First World War, and only six billions at the end of the war. We have more inflationary pressures today than ever existed in the history of this country against this price-control dam. There is one main cornerstone in this price-control dam and that is subsidies. If you tear that stone out you run the risk of destroying the program that is saving the American taxpayers $50,000,000 every 24 hours in this war program alone. So I plead with you not to destroy this program just because you do not like some little part of it. It is too substantial and too effective for us to run any kind of risk like that.

BILL TO INCREASE COST OF LIVING AND CAUSE INFLATION

I am going to vote against the conference report. When the President vetoes the bill, and certainly he will have to veto it to be consistent for he knows that this will jeopardize the whole stabilization and price-control program, he knows this will greatly increase the cost of living, he knows it will cause inflation and he will certainly have to veto this bill, and when he does I expect to vote to sustain the President's veto.

CONGRESS HAS NOT COOPERATED IN FIGHT AGAINST INFLATION

I think it is the duty of this Congress to support the administration in any program to keep down inflation; but this Congress has not cooperated—this Congress has been an inflationary Congress. We have too many votes against us to prove otherwise. It is an inflationary Congress. The President had a program that Congress helped to give him and then Congress takes away from him the means, the vehicles, and the weapons with which to stop the inflation that we have asked him to arrest. Inflation is too serious.

SUBSIDIES AS PRINCIPLE NOT INVOLVED

Do not get it in your minds that this bill prevents subsidies; it does not. The question of subsidies as a principle is not involved in this bill. It is just like this Congress saying that we want to pass a law to make it a penitentiary offense to steal in the District of Columbia. The House would take up the bill for consideration and pass a bill, saying, in substance, that it is a violation of law to steal and amend it so, as it states, except you can steal automobiles, motorcycles, and bicycles; that is all right. Then we send it over to the Senate and the Senate says that it is all right, that the House passed good amendments but we think it should be extended, that it is all right to steal motorcycles, automobiles, and bicycles but there should be some amendments to exempt people for stealing horses, cows, and hogs. That is exactly what has happened in this bill.

We had a bill under consideration here that was supposed to prevent subsidies but the House went ahead and enumerated—it will aggregate about 50 things if you analyze all that it includes—it includes 50 things here on which roll-back subsidies or any other kind of subsidies are all right. We are against subsidies but we are willing to accept these 50 things. Then we sent the bill over to the Senate and the Senate said: "Well, the House accepted these things; all right, we want to add about 50 more." And the Senate did. So the question of subsidies as a matter of principle, Mr. Speaker, is not involved in this bill. It recognizes and condones subsidies all the way through. It is just a matter, I think, of some people wanting to get back at the Commander in Chief or the President of the United States on a few things they are opposed to. Let them do it, but let them do it in a way that will not jeopardize the whole stabilization and price-control program. We have too much at stake. We are saving a billion and a quarter dollars a month, we are saving $50,000,000 a day compared with another definite similar period in our history which we all remember. That involves too much for us to run any risk of destroying because there are certain minor matters in the program that we do not like.

DO NOT RUIN COUNTRY TO GET BACK AT O. P. A.

There are things about O. P. A. that I do not like, but I am not willing to run any risk of destroying this program in order to get back at O. P. A. There are lots of annoying and irritating things about O. P. A. Maybe a lot of people do not receive enough in rents, rents are too low; maybe prices in some cases are too low; maybe their wages are too low; but I say to you in all seriousness that they are better off and our country is better off by receiving dollars although an insufficient number of dollars, but dollars of a kind that will buy something that is substantial and worth what things are worth today rather than to receive twice as much in dollars which will buy only one-quarter as much.

INFLATION NO. 2 PROBLEM

And may I warn you that the most serious problem that faces our country on the domestic front today is that of inflation. We can destroy our country from within while our sons are winning this war on the 55 battlefronts of the world fighting the enemy. We have a chance here to help hold the line, we have a chance to help prevent inflation, we have a chance to save this country on the domestic front, and I hope this Congress cooperates with the President even though it requires an about face, a turning about of views in order not to run any risk. Remember the $50,000,000 per day saving now just on war cost alone.

INFLATION CAN STOP PRODUCTION

Inflation can break down our domestic front, it can stop work, it can stop production. Suppose we have a race between prices on one side and wages on the other; and that is the kind of race you will have if you break this line. Wages will rise, prices will rise, one trying to outrun the other. It will not be long until the money the wage earners receive will purchase so few goods and necessities of life that the wage earners may be inclined even not to want to work for that kind of money. Then we would be reduced to barter. Do you believe a country like ours with one-hundred-and-thirty-some-odd million people can survive on a barter basis? Of course not. But if our money becomes worthless we are likely to stop production in this country because our workers will not work for that kind of money, so we have a serious decision to make and there is no more important decision to make than right here on No. 2 problem confronting this country. No. 1 problem is that of winning the war on the battlefields; No. 2 is that of preventing inflation here at home. So, I beg you to consider this problem not from a partisan political standpoint but from the standpoint of our country, realizing that sometimes we have to take some things we do not like. I do not say I approve of everything in this stabilization price control program; I do not by any means, but I am willing to take a lot of things I do not like in order to keep from taking a lot of things that are much worse than what I am having to take. I know of nothing that would be more serious, more injurious, and more detrimental to the war effort, to the boys on the battlefront, to their dependents here at home, and to the civilian population than for us to make the awful mistake of breaking this line and causing inflation to engulf us here in America.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired; all time has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their own remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PATMAN) there were—ayes 151, noes 74.

Mrs. NORTON and Mr. COCHRAN demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 249, nays 118, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 31]

YEAS—249

Abernethy	Andresen, August H.	Auchincloss
Allen, Ill.	Andrews	Baldwin, Md.
Andersen, H. Carl	Arends	Barden
Anderson, Calif.	Arnold	Barrett
		Bates, Mass.

Beall
Beckworth
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Bennett, Mo.
Bishop
Blackney
Bolton
Bonner
Boren
Boykin
Bradley, Mich.
Brehm
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Brumbaugh
Bryson
Buffett
Burgin
Busbey
Butler
Camp
Cannon, Mo.
Carlson, Kans.
Carrier
Carson, Ohio
Case
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clark
Clason
Clevenger
Cole, Mo.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Compton
Cooley
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cox
Cravens
Crawford
Cunningham
Curtis
Day
Dies
Disney
Dondero
Drewry
Durham
Dworshak
Eaton
Elliott
Ellis
Ellsworth
Elmer
Engel, Mich.
Engle, Calif.
Fellows
Fisher
Fulbright
Fuller
Gallagher
Gathings
Gearhart
Gibson
Gilchrist
Gillette
Gillie
Goodwin
Gore
Gossett
Graham
Grant, Ala.
Grant, Ind.
Gregory
Griffiths
Gwynne
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Hancock
Harness, Ind.
Harris, Ark.
Harris, Va.
Heidinger
Hendricks
Hess
Hill
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holmes, Mass.
Holmes, Wash.
Hope
Horan
Howell
Jarman
Jeffrey
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Anton J.
Johnson, Calvin D.
Johnson, Ind.
Johnson, J. Leroy
Johnson, Luther A.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Ward
Jones
Jonkman
Kean
Keefe
Kerr
Kilburn
Kilday
Kinzer
Kleberg
Kunkel
Lambertson
Lanham
Lea
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lemke
Lewis
Luce
McConnell
McCord
McGehee
McGregor
McKenzie
McLean
McWilliams
Maas
Mahon
Mansfield, Tex.
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Mason
May
Merrow
Michener
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Mo.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, Pa.
Mills
Monkiewicz
Morrison, N. C.
Mott
Mundt
Murray, Tenn.
Murray, Wis.
Norman
Norrell
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara
Pace
Peterson, Ga.
Phillips
Pittenger
Ploeser
Plumley
Poage
Pratt, Joseph M.
Ramey
Rankin
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Rivers
Rizley
Robertson
Rockwell
Rodgers, Pa.
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Rolph
Rowe
Sauthoff
Schiffler
Schwabe
Scott
Scrivner
Shafer
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Slaughter
Smith, Maine
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Wis.
Sparkman
Springer
Stanley
Starnes, Ala.
Stearns, N. H.
Stefan
Stevenson
Stewart
Stockman
Sumner, Ill.
Sumners, Tex.
Sundstrom
Taber
Talbot
Talle
Tarver
Thomas, N. J.
Thomason
Tibbott
Treadway
Troutman
Vincent, Ky.
Vorys, Ohio
Vursell
Wadsworth
Ward
Weichel, Ohio
West
Whitten
Whittington
Wickersham
Wigglesworth
Willey
Wilson
Winstead
Wolcott
Wolfenden, Pa.
Woodruff, Mich.
Woodrum, Va.
Worley

NAYS—118

Allen, La.
Anderson, N. Mex.
Angell
Baldwin, N. Y.
Barry
Bates, Ky.
Bland
Bradley, Pa.
Brooks
Buckley
Bulwinkle
Burchill, N. Y.
Burdick
Byrne
Canfield
Cannon, Fla.
Capozzoli
Carter
Celler
Chapman
Cochran
Coffee
Crosser
D'Alesandro
Davis
Delaney
Dickstein
Dilweg
Eberharter
Ellison, Md.
Fay
Feighan
Fernandez
Fitzpatrick
Fogarty
Folger
Forand
Ford
Furlong
Gale
Granger
Green
Harless, Ariz.
Hart
Hays
Hébert
Heffernan
Herter
Hinshaw
Holifield
Hull
Izac
Jackson
Johnson, Lyndon B.
Judd
Kefauver
Kelley
Kennedy
King
Klein
LaFollette
Lane
Larcade
Ludlow
McCormack
McMurray
Madden
Magnuson
Maloney
Mansfield, Mont.
Marcantonio
Merritt
Monroney
Mruk
Murdock
Murphy
Myers
Norton
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Connor
O'Konski
O'Neal
O'Toole
Outland
Patman
Patton
Peterson, Fla.
Pfeifer
Poulson
Powers
Priest
Rabaut
Ramspeck
Randolph
Robinson, Utah
Sabath
Sadowski
Sasscer
Satterfield
Scanlon
Sheppard
Snyder
Somers, N. Y.
Spence
Sullivan
Thomas, Tex.
Tolan
Towe
Voorhis, Calif.
Walter
Wasielewski
Weaver
Weiss
Welch
Wene
White
Wolverton, N. J.
Wright

NOT VOTING—61

Bell
Bloom
Burch, Va.
Cullen
Curley
Dawson
Dewey
Dingell
Dirksen
Domengeaux
Doughton
Douglas
Elston, Ohio
Fenton
Fish
Flannagan
Fulmer
Gamble
Gavin
Gerlach
Gifford
Gordon
Gorski
Gross
Halleck
Hare
Hartley
Hobbs
Hoch
Kearney
Kee
Keogh
Kirwan
Knutson
Landis
Lesinski
Lynch
McCowen
McMillan
Manasco
Morrison, La.
Newsome
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Leary
Philbin
Pracht, C. Frederick
Price
Reed, Ill.
Richards
Robsion, Ky.
Rogers, Calif.
Rowan
Russell
Sheridan
Smith, Va.
Smith, W. Va.
Taylor
Vinson, Ga.
Whelchel, Ga.
Winter
Zimmerman

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Douglas for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Fish for, with Mr. Philbin against.

Mr. Elston of Ohio for, with Mr. Lynch against.

Mr. Gross for, with Mr. Price against.

Mr. Fenton for, with Mr. O'Leary against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Cullen against.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. C. Frederick Pracht for, with Mr. Hoch against

Mr. Hobbs for, with Mr. Morrison of Louisiana against.

Mr. Gavin for, with Mr. Sheridan against.

Mr. Robsion of Kentucky for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. McCowen for, with Mr. Bloom against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bell with Mr. Dewey.

Mr. Manasco with Mr. Reed of Illinois.

Mr. Burch of Virginia with Mr. Dirksen.

Mr. Kee with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Curley with Mr. Landis.

Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Gerlach.

Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Doughton with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Gordon with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Newsome with Mr. Knutson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HANDBOOK FOR SERVICE MEN AND WOMEN

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the handbook which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has prepared for the service men and service women. It will be carried up to date with the mustering-out-pay bill in it. If any of the Members want it, they can get it for $17.50 a thousand by notifying the Joint Committee on Printing or the Public Printer at once. If it is not ordered at this time in this printing, they will cost 10 cents each.

GRANTING ADDITIONAL POWERS TO THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 2644, to grant additional powers to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from West Virginia explain the bill?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The day before yesterday, when the House considered the District legislation, this measure was withdrawn at the request of the distinguished Member from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia. He felt that the provisions of the bill might infringe on the work of that committee. It is a proposal to simply give to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia certain powers that they do not now possess so that we, as a legislative committee, will not constantly come to Congress and ask for the designation of streets and similar regulatory matters and administrative functions that should be placed within the jurisdiction of the Commissioners.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain that I have looked over the bill very carefully and I think it should pass. I have no further objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and empowered within their discretion—

(a) In accordance with such regulations as they may make, to provide for the waiver of payment by any person in the military service of the United States of any annual or other periodic fee required by law to be paid to the District of Columbia or to any District of Columbia board or commission as a condition to retaining or renewing any license or permit to engage in any business or calling or to practice any profession in the District of Columbia.

(b) To make, adopt, and enforce regulations requiring persons, firms, and corporations, other than utility companies, engaged within the District of Columbia in the business of plumbing or gas fitting, or of installing, maintaining, or repairing heating, ventilating, air-conditioning, or mechanical refrigerating apparatus, equipment, appliances,

systems, or parts thereof, or of installing, maintaining, or repairing apparatus, equipment, fixtures, appliances, or wiring, using, or conducting electric current, to furnish and keep in force a bond running to the District of Columbia with corporate surety authorized by the United States Treasury Department, and by the Insurance Department of the District of Columbia to do business in the District of Columbia in an amount not exceeding $5,000, conditioned upon the performance in accordance with law and regulations in force in the District of Columbia of all such work undertaken by such person, firm, or corporation, and to keep the District of Columbia harmless from the consequences of any and all acts performed by said person, firm, or corporation in connection with such business during the period covered by the said bond.

The surety on any such bond may terminate its liability under such bond by giving 30 days' written notice thereof, served either personally or by registered mail, to the principal and to the Commissioners; and upon giving such notice the surety shall be discharged from all liability under such bond for any act or omission of the principal occurring after the expiration of 30 days from the date of service of such notice. Unless on or before the expiration of such period the principal shall duly file a new bond in like amount and conditioned as the original in substitution of the bond so terminated, the license of the principal to engage in such business shall likewise terminate upon the expiration of such period. Upon making any payment on account of its bond, the surety shall immediately notify the Commissioners.

In the event the surety becomes insolvent or a bankrupt, or ceases to be authorized by the United States Treasury Department, or by the Insurance Department of the District of Columbia to do business in the District of Columbia, the principal shall, within 10 days after notice thereof, given by the Commissioners, duly file a new bond in like amount and conditioned as the original and if the principal shall fail to do so the license of such principal shall terminate. If a recovery be had on any bond the principal shall restore the bond to its original amount.

Any person aggrieved by the violation of any law or regulation in force in the District of Columbia relating to such business shall have, in addition to his right of action against said person, firm, or corporation, a right to bring suit against the surety on said bond, either alone or jointly with the principal thereon, and to recover in an amount not exceeding the penalty of the bond any damages sustained by reason of any act, transaction, or conduct of the principal which may be in violation of law or regulation in force in the District of Columbia relating to such business.

The Commissioners shall furnish to anyone applying therefor a certified copy of any such bond filed with them upon the payment of a fee to be fixed by the Commissioners therefor, and such certified copy shall be prima facie evidence in any court that such bond was duly executed and delivered by the person, firm, or corporation whose name appears therein.

(c) To rent any building or land belonging to the District of Columbia or under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners, or any available space therein, whenever such building or land, or space therein, is not then required for the purpose for which it was acquired, and to rent any used personal property belonging to the District of Columbia which is not then needed for the purpose for which it was acquired: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this paragraph shall have the effect of changing in any manner Public Law No. 732, Seventy-fourth Congress, entitled "An act to authorize the operation of stands in Federal buildings by blind persons, to enlarge the economic opportunities of the blind, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1936.

(d) To grant revocable permits upon such terms, conditions, bonds, and rentals as the Commissioners may impose for the construction of tunnels, and the laying of conduits and pipes in the alleys, streets, and avenues in the District of Columbia under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners.

(e) To suspend, with or without pay, any officer or employee appointed by them and, under such rules or regulations as they may prescribe, to delegate this power to any officers or employees of the District of Columbia.

(f) After public hearing to name and change the name of any highway, bridge, building, or other public place or property in the District of Columbia under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners.

(g) To fix, assess, and collect fees for copies of orders, regulations, permits, certificates, and transcripts of records furnished by the District of Columbia, such fees to be paid to the collector of taxes and deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia.

(h) Where not otherwise specifically provided, to prescribe a penalty upon conviction of a violation of any rule or regulation authorized by this Act by a fine of not more than $300 or imprisonment of not more than 90 days.

SEC. 2. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to appoint such number of employees of the District of Columbia as they shall consider advisable as contracting officers, who, under the direction of the said Commissioners, may exercise any powers with respect to making and entering into contracts on behalf of said District of Columbia and administering said contracts that are now vested by law in the said Commissioners, except as herein otherwise provided; but no contract of $1,000 or more entered into on behalf of said District of Columbia by any contracting officer appointed pursuant to this act shall be binding upon said District of Columbia, or give rise to any claim or demand against said District of Columbia, until approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or a majority of them, sitting as a board.

All contracts entered into by any contracting officer in which such contracting officer or any of the Commissioners shall be personally interested shall be void, and no payment shall be made on any of such contracts by the District of Columbia or by any officer thereof.

That with respect to all contracts of the District of Columbia which contain stipulations for liquidated damages for delay the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and empowered to remit the whole or any part of such damages as in their discretion may be just and equitable.

SEC. 3. That the Commissioners may transfer to, impose upon, and vest in the Director of Inspection of the District of Columbia all or any of the duties imposed upon, and all or any of the powers, rights, and authority vested in, the Inspector of Buildings of the District of Columbia, the Inspector of Plumbing of the District of Columbia, and the Electrical Engineer of the District of Columbia, by any law, and the Commissioners may authorize the said Director of Inspection to delegate any or all of such powers to the Chief Engineer of the Department of Inspection of the District of Columbia and to the Chief of Inspection of the Department of Inspection of the District of Columbia and to their respective deputies when acting for them.

SEC. 4. The Commissioners and other responsible officials, in expending appropriations provided for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia, so far as possible, shall purchase material, supplies, including food supplies, and equipment, when needed and funds are available, in accordance with the regulations and schedules of the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department or from various services of the Government of the United States possessing materials, supplies, passenger-carrying and other motor vehicles, and equipment no longer required. Surplus articles purchased from the Government, if the same have not been used, shall be paid for at a reasonable price, not to exceed actual cost, and if the same have been used, at a reasonable price based upon length of usage. The various services of the Government of the United States are authorized to sell such surplus articles to the District under the conditions specified, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided*, That this section shall not be construed to amend, alter, or repeal the Executive order of December 3, 1918, concerning the transfer of office materials, supplies, and equipment in the District of Columbia falling into disuse because of the cessation of war activities.

SEC. 5. The Commissioners may, in their discretion and when they deem such action to be in the public interest, effect settlement with owners of real estate authorized to be acquired by purchase or condemnation for District of Columbia purposes, through such title company or companies in the District of Columbia as may be designated by the Commissioners, and to pay from appropriations available for the acquisition of such real estate reasonable fees to cover the cost of the services rendered by such title company or companies.

SEC. 6. The power and authorities conferred by this act are to be construed as in addition to and not by way of limitation of the powers now vested by law in the Commissioners.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 13, strike out the words "United States Treasury Department" and insert "Secretary of the Treasury to do business pursuant to section 3 of the act of August 13, 1894 (28 Stat. 279), as amended (U. S. C., title 6, sec. 8)."

On page 3, line 16, strike out the words "United States Treasury Department" and insert "Secretary of the Treasury to do business pursuant to section 3 of the act of August 13, 1894 (28 Stat. 279), as amended (U. S. C., title 6, sec. 8)."

On page 4, line 11, strike out the words "may be" and insert the word "is."

On page 4, line 20, insert:

"The Commissioners are further authorized to provide, in accordance with such regulations as they may prescribe, for the examination of the qualifications and fitness of all applicants for licenses to engage in any of the businesses herein enumerated by a board, consisting of not less than two persons who have been actively engaged in the District of Columbia for at least 5 years next preceding their appointment in the business for which license is sought (one of whom shall have been an owner or manager and one of whom shall have been an employee competent to superintend the performance of work) and not less than one official of the District of Columbia, appointed by the said Commissioners: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall repeal existing law relating to the examination and licensing of master plumbers and gas fitters."

On page 6, line 8, strike out subparagraph (f) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(f) To name highways and to name and change the name of any circle, bridge, building, or other public place or property in the District of Columbia under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners, and after public hearing to change the name of any highway under the jurisdiction of said Commissioners."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to see if we can find out what the program is going to be for the next few days.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad that the gentleman has asked that question.

The appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Commerce, and Justice will be brought up. I understand they have agreed to 5 hours' debate. If the bill is disposed of tomorrow and passed then I will ask unanimous consent that the House adjourn over until Monday, which I would do anyway. But if it is disposed of, then I will ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar on Monday be dispensed with and that it be in order to call it on the following Wednesday. Therefore on Monday there will be no business and on Tuesday there would be no legislative business. So if the bill which we are about to start debate on now is disposed of by tomorrow afternoon or sometime tomorrow there will be no business until Wednesday of next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There will be nothing of a controversial nature?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. There will be nothing of a controversial nature, except what can be brought up by unanimous consent only.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Stars and Stripes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WORK OF COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS NO. 3

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to call attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the Committee on Elections No. 3, of which I have the honor to be chairman, has finished all of the business before this committee and has reported to the House the results of its various issues decided.

During this Congress four contested election cases have been disposed of by this committee. All four of these contests were highly controversial and three of the contests were vigorously prosecuted before our committee.

The members of our committee have proceeded in a strictly nonpartisan spirit in considering these contests, feeling that the right to a seat in this great body as reflected by the wishes of the electorate of the respective congressional districts should be scrupulously protected as an essential element of our Government, regardless of the party affiliations of the parties to the contest or the members of this committee.

Numerous meetings of the committee have been held and I here commend the members of the committee for their attendance at these meetings. I know that no committee of the House has a better record of attendance and I doubt that any committee has a record that will equal it.

The members have been studious in their consideration of the issues involved in each case and have attempted to reach a decision in each instance with all the speed that it could wisely act.

In each case the decision of the committee has been a unanimous decision of all the members, and each report and resolution brought to this House by our committee has been adopted by the House without controversy.

At a time when there is a tendency to criticize Congress for failue to expedite the issues before it, I call to the attention of this body and the American people the fact that this committee has handled its business with dispatch, has disposed of all the business before it, and now has a clear calendar. As chairman of the committee I thank each member of the committee for the splendid attendance upon the committee and for the able, fearless, and loyal service they are rendering the American people as members of this committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a speech by the Vice President of the United States given in Seattle last week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the debate on the conference report and to include statements by Messrs. Eccles, Bell, and Paul.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include some testimony given before the Committee on Foreign Affairs by Mr. Neuman, of New York.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Albuquerque Journal.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars; in one to include an editorial from the Jewish Veteran, and in the other, a letter from Norman H. Davis, of the American Red Cross.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MURDOCK was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the Appendix.)

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, February 16, in the State of Maryland, is officially proclaimed Republic of Lithuania Day. I would like to take this opportunity to publicly acknowledge the great contribution made to the State of Maryland and to the United States of America by citizens of Lithuanian birth and ancestry, especially the sincere loyalty which they have manifested to the land of their adoption by their wholehearted support of the war effort, both by sending their children to serve in our armed forces and by subscribing so generously to the various War bond drives.

Just as Americans of Lithuanian extraction contributed to the progress of the United States, so also, it is an established fact, did the Republic of Lithuania contribute to the cultural progress of Europe, a right which she has been deprived of by her aggressive neighbors. During her period of independence she justified the trust placed in her and proved to the civilized world her capacity to properly govern herself, true to the established principles of democracy.

Lithuanians, ethnically, are neither Slav nor Teuton. Therefore, any allotment of her territory to, or subjugation by, any of her neighbors would prove to be a disturbing influence upon the future peace of Europe.

It will be a happy day when civilized nations are rid of the Nazi hordes and are rehabilitated economically and politically, and the freedom that they enjoyed before the war has been restored. A complete victory for the United Nations will assure all of the smaller nations, including Lithuania as well as the larger nations, their rightful place in the sun.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a message from the Government of China regarding the recent action of the House and Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] displays a painting drawn by an artist of a dam to illustrate his argument, and the gentleman's argument is like the design of his dam. It is designed wrong to meet pressure. The arch is on the opposite side and away from the

water. The shoulders rest away from the anchor and can easily be drawn from place. The effect of pressure on his subsidy dam would be to pull instead of compress. It is apparent to an engineer that the designer knew little about dams and damn little about pressure. It is indeed an ideal design for an argument favoring subsidies.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4204) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

Pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be continued for a period not to exceed 5 hours, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from California, the ranking minority member [Mr. CARTER], and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, up to the present time I have a number of requests, but I believe by keeping those requests down as much as possible, we can close debate in 5 hours or less. Therefore, I have no objection to the agreement.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4204, with Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is recognized.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 40 minutes.

GENERAL

I wish to begin my statement with a word of commendation for the members of this subcommittee who worked so assiduously and tirelessly during approximately the 3 weeks in which the committee had under consideration over 100 appropriation items contained in this bill for the fiscal year 1945. Each appropriation item was scrutinized very closely, and reductions were made wherever it was felt that such reductions would not impair any of the functions directly or indirectly connected with the war effort. In a number of instances, particularly in connection with items of appropriation less directly connected with the war effort, reductions were made to the extent that the amounts allowed are below the estimated requirements for the current fiscal year, leaving the bureaus affected with but one alternative, and that is the reduction of personnel with corresponding reductions in other objects of expense.

The total amount recommended by the committee for the three departments encompassed by this bill for the fiscal year 1945 is approximately $231,300,000. The Members of the House are familiar with the fact that the 1945 estimates contain amounts necessary to defray the cost of war overtime, whereas appropriations in the estimated amount of $22,700,000 are still to be made for war overtime for the current fiscal year. Accordingly, when this additional amount is added to the appropriations of $211,615,000 already made for the current fiscal year, we arrive at a total of approximately $234,300,000 for 1944, as compared with $231,300,000 for 1945, or a net decrease of approximately $3,000,000.

The reduction of approximately $6,000,000 under the Budget estimates effected by the committee reduces the funds for these three departments for the fiscal year 1945 to the minimum need, and it is strongly recommended that no consideration be given to additional reductions. While the three departments covered by this bill are old-line agencies, they have nonetheless felt the impact of the war to a very great extent. Most of the bureaus and divisions of these three departments are directly concerned with the war, and the rest of the bureaus are indirectly concerned with the war through the performance of services for war agencies, for which services the war agencies would otherwise have to establish organizations of their own.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The amount of approximately $44,234,000 is recommended for the Department of State for the ensuing fiscal year. When the cost of war overtime still to be appropriated for the current fiscal year is added to the 1944 appropriation, the amount allowed is an increase of approximately $5,189,000 over the current year's requirements. Of this amount, approximately $898,000 is for the Domestic Service, $3,615,000 is for the Foreign Service, and $676,000 is for the items contained under the heading of "International obligations."

The work of the Department of State in this crucial period in international affairs is directed to two main objectives: First, the maintenance of international cooperation essential for the united war effort involving, among a vast number of functions, the supervision of wartime restrictions and controls to insure operation with a minimum of international conflict, and the protection of long-time policy objectives of this Government; and, second, the laying of groundwork for sound international policies to follow the war in the light of the position of the United States in international affairs, which places upon it a tremendous responsibility for leadership.

The Department operates in an advisory, coordinative, and servicing capacity with respect to some fifty-odd departments and agencies of this Government; its advisory and cooperative relationship with intergovernmental bodies and groups, exclusive of direct relations with representatives of foreign governments, is practically incalculable. This point is directed not so much at the volume of the work but particularly at the breadth of subjects and problems which must be studied, understood, and dealt with. We cannot afford at this time not to have a strong Department of State.

The increase allowed by the committee for the domestic activities of the Department was for two purposes: First, the amount of $430,000 for the Division of Communications and Records; and, second, approximately $397,000 to cover the cost of 94 positions considered necessary and authorized by the Department. With respect to the first item, the tremendous increase in the volume of work in the Division of Communications and Records has forced the Department during the current year to borrow employees from the War Department, and also to use personnel charged to the Foreign Service activity of the Department. The committee considered it vital for the Department to use every means to keep its international telegraphic traffic operating and otherwise to maintain all records on an absolutely current basis so that there will be no delay in actions which it may be necessary for the Department to take in connection with any of the economic and political problems which are facing the Department daily.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The amount of $28,770,000 is recommended by the committee for the Foreign Service activities of the Department of State. This as I have previously indicated, represents an increase of approximately $3,615,000 over the requirements for the current fiscal year. Approximately one-half of this increase, or $1,618,000, results from the proposed transfer during the fiscal year 1945 of certain functions heretofore performed abroad under the supervision and guidance of the Office of Foreign Economic Administration to the Department of State. These funds have heretofore been appropriated to the Office of Foreign Economic Administration, but were transferred to the State Department for the purpose of augmenting the Foreign Service Auxiliary to perform work for the Office of Foreign Economic Administration. The Department of State and the Bureau of the Budget felt that this money should be appropriated directly to the State Department in view of the fact that the work, in any event, was performed by the Foreign Service officers of that Department. The balance of the increase allowed of approximately $2,000,000 is primarily for, first, the purpose of defraying the cost of transportation of the Foreign Service officers, which has increased considerably because of the increased activity in the foreign field and because of the increased cost in transportation; second, the cost-of-living allowances for the Foreign Service made necessary because of the slightly increased personnel and the inflationary spiral which is taking place throughout the world at the present time; third, miscellaneous salaries and allowances for the purpose of granting to alien employees certain small increases in compensation in lieu of overtime granted to American employees and for additional

salary requirements in the courier service necessary for the adequate safeguard of confidential communications; and, fourth, the Foreign Service Auxiliary, for the purpose of augmenting the present staff. The importance of this last-named item cannot be overemphasized in view of the fact that the economic nature of the functions in which this Service is engaged is such a vital part of our effort to bring this war to an early and successful conclusion.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The reason the office was changed to the State Department was that responsibility might be fixed in one office and the State Department handles our foreign affairs. I am very glad it was transferred.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is correct.

A strong Foreign Service, especially at this time, is a national necessity. It plays a vital role in counteracting enemy influence in neutral countries. A diplomatic tug-of-war is going on continuously and the outcome in various countries affects the course of the war itself profoundly. Whether a strategically placed neutral state joins the Axis, remains neutral and favors the enemy, or decides to aid the cause of the United Nations can affect the length of the war and involve costs measured in billions of dollars and priceless lives. Then there are the great responsibilities in the field of foreign relations in the postwar world, which should not find us unprepared. It would not be good statesmanship to spend billions to win the war and not make adequate provision for our State Department and for our diplomatic and consular establishments abroad, which must play a leading part in the conduct of this Government's foreign relations during and after the war.

Vital decisions on foreign policy are of course made by the President, but they must be based on accurate information garnered from every part of the world, which is correlated and interpreted by the Department of State and other agencies of the Government in Washington. The Foreign Service is the field force through which the necessary contacts with foreign governments are established, and on which we depend for an interpretation of the official acts and public opinion of foreign countries. It submits a tremendous volume of material for distribution to all departments of the Government. During the past year such factual and interpretative material has reached the rate of some 28,000 reports per month distributed to 54 departments and agencies.

In addition to reporting, our diplomatic and consular officers perform under the guidance of the Department of State a very large volume of this Government's day-to-day business abroad, involving negotiations with foreign countries, the protection of American interests, furtherance of friendly relations and solidarity with other countries, the promotion of trade and commerce, and an infinite variety of services for American citizens and the public.

INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS

The amount of $7,046,000 is recommended for the international obligations of this Nation, which amount represents an increase of approximately $676,000 over the requirements for the current fiscal year.

This appropriation is, first, to provide funds for payment by the United States of its annual share in the expenses of certain international commissions, congresses, bureaus, or other associations of which it is a member and from which it receives certain benefits, and to the maintenance of which it is committed to contribute annually by reasons of treaty provisions or law; second, to provide funds necessary to defray the cost of international conferences, proposed and undetermined, in which the United States Government will be a participant; and third, to provide funds necessary for carrying into effect the established cooperative program with the South American republics as enunciated and agreed to in the resolutions and declarations adopted at the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace at Buenos Aires, Argentina, in 1936, and at the Eighth International Conference of American States held at Lima, Peru, in 1938.

Although reductions in other items included under this heading result in a net increase of approximately $676,000, one item, namely, the cost of "international conferences," not heretofore carried in the bill, accounts for $1,500,000 of the total appropriation. The need for this item is more or less uncontrollable as the number or extent of conferences in which the United States might participate during the fiscal year 1945 is not known at the present time. It should be noted that, in the event this amount proves to be more than adequate, funds appropriated for this item can be used for no other purpose; on the other hand, if the amount proves to be insufficient, recourse may be had to deficiency appropriations.

The amount of $3,450,000, a reduction of $1,050,000 under both the current year's appropriation, and the budget estimate, is recommended for "cooperation with the American republics."

The program for which this appropriation is recommended is the result of several years of careful thought and actual experience in developing those types of activities which will benefit most our present and future relationships with the other American republics. This is not an emergency program worked out for any temporary purpose. It is a long-range endeavor in which the facilities of our Government are joined with the effort and support of the other American countries.

The results of this program are to the very direct benefit of this country. Let me cite two illustrations. We are cooperating with several countries in agricultural experiment stations for the development of such present-day strategic products as rubber, quinine, and manila hemp. The Western Hemisphere is the native habitat of the rubber tree, yet this country let itself become dependent for its rubber on importations from the other side of the world. These agricultural experiment stations are developing strains of rubber than can resist the disease of the Tropics of the Americas. They are developing strains of rubber that will greatly exceed the yield of the rubber trees of the Far East. There is no reason why we cannot get all of our natural rubber needs from our neighbors in the Americas. The same goes for quinine of which there is a shortage for our soldiers, and for manila hemp which is essential for the ropes that every warship must carry. For a mighty small expenditure, we are laying now one of the foundations of our future security.

Take another illustration. Under this program we are training airplane pilots and mechanics and meteorologists from the other American republics. Upon their return to their own countries, they insist upon cooperation with the United States in aviation matters. They want our air lines to cooperate in the extension of air services. They want our planes and equipment. They want to work with United States aviation.

Another very important aspect of this program is that it is worked out on a cooperative basis. In some projects the contribution of other countries is a direct financial one which in aggregate exceeds our own. That is the case regarding some of the agricultural experiment stations I referred to. In other cases, they furnish equipment and facilities. In others, they provide a certain share of the expenses concerned in the training of technical personnel. For example, I can tell you that our Government is very anxious to improve radio-communication facilities within this hemisphere, and the other countries are equally eager to do all they can toward that end. However, their ability to cooperate depends not only upon the existence of sufficient technical equipment but also upon trained personnel to use this equipment. We are, through this program, rendering needed assistance to train these technicians.

Each of these individual projects is carried out by that agency of the Federal Government which is best qualified to deal with the program. However, the entire program is under the guidance and direction of the Department of State. This method of administrating the program was put into effect at the recommendation of Congress and has proved to be of extreme value in insuring that all the activities, regardless of their individual merit, contribute the maximum to the policies of the United States Government as interpreted by the Secretary of State.

Although this program is of a long-range character, it has already clearly demonstrated its value. The small expenditures made are being compensated many times over in ways that appeal to your sound judgment and mine. It is the sort of program that merits full support.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Considering the amount of estimated overtime still to be appropriated for the

current fiscal year, the requirements of this Department in 1945 will approximate the requirements for 1944. The total amount recommended by the committee is approximately $116,500,000, representing an increase of about $800,000 when compared with the current year's requirements. The functions of the Department are divided into four major subdivisions, namely, Legal Activities and General Administration, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Federal Prison System.

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

The first item, as the title implies, handles the legal work of the Federal Government, the functions being allocated to some 21 offices and divisions. Testimony presented reveals that the work load in all the divisions has been increasing steadily primarily as a result of the war and the many wartime statutes that are now in effect. The principal item under this heading is one covering appropriations for the Lands Division. It should be noted that the Lands Division is purely a service organization, having little or no control over the amount of work delegated to it by other agencies of the Government engaged in the process of acquiring land and structures for Federal use during the war emergency. The amount of $4,275,000 is recommended for this Division for 1945. It was testified that on the basis of the present rate of progress, if no new requests for acquisitions of lands are received, it would require approximately 3 years to dispose of 74,000 tracts of land now pending in condemnation.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Almost one-half of the total amount contained in this bill for the Department of Justice represents appropriations to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for which the amount of $49,850,000 is recommended. During the past year, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has continued to perform its work with such efficiency that even though we are now in our third year of war no foreign-inspired sabotage or espionage plots have been successfully culminated.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BENDER. I am very favorably impressed with the excellent work that the gentleman's subcommittee has done in connection with this bill, and I want to especially commend the gentleman and his committee for their support and encouragement with reference to the work of J. Edgar Hoover, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. However, I notice there is a certain sum of money not allowed. Will the gentleman explain why there was a cut to the extent of $230,000?

Mr. RABAUT. The amount the gentleman mentions when compared to the total sum appropriated is infinitesimally small and we felt it could be absorbed in the general turn-over of the Department.

To John Edgar Hoover and his staff must go the credit for effectively throttling such abortive attempts of enemy infiltration as have been planned. All complaints of suspected espionage and sabotage are thoroughly scrutinized by special agents of this Bureau.

I wish to point out that during the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 there were 56 convictions for violations of the espionage statutes, and 90 convictions of violations of the sabotage statutes. None of these crimes of sabotage was foreign inspired.

Since the outbreak of war approximately 15,000 alien enemies have been apprehended. Searches of dwellings of reported alien enemies were conducted in 26,000 cases, resulting in the seizure of tremendous quantities of contraband articles such as firearms, ammunition, explosives, and other nefarious devices. These results attest to the vigilance and thoroughness with which Mr. Hoover and his staff are protecting our country from the enemy within our borders.

The report your committee received of the handling by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of violations of the criminal provisions of the Selective Service Act was most heartening. We have had no mass dragnets looking toward the apprehension of selective-service violators, yet many thousands of such violators through the efforts of the Federal Bureau of Investigation have complied with the provisions of the statute and have become available for induction into our armed services. Although the true worth of this particular activity cannot be measured by the number of violators who have been convicted, yet since the passage of the act there have been almost 7,000 persons convicted and sentenced for such violations.

Although the bulk of investigative effort is rightfully channeled into internal security matters by the Federal Bureau of Investigation the investigations of violations of other criminal statutes such as kidnaping, bank robbery, automobile theft, and other comparable crimes are being closely supervised to eliminate the possibility of any such crime waves sweeping our country either now or in the coming post-war period such as have been experienced in the years past.

The identification activities in Washington reveal a continued increased work load. During the fiscal year 1943 approximately 27,000,000 sets of fingerprint records were received for handling, an increase of approximately 12,000,000 sets over the previous fiscal year. The handling of these records has been of undisputed assistance not only to our law-enforcement organizations but to our entire war industry.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation continues to render most valued assistance to other war agencies. In its files section alone on an average of 35,000 names are searched each week at the request of other war agencies so that valuable information which may be in the Federal Bureau of Investigation files can be made available to such agencies.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

With reference to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the amount of $28,300,000 is recommended. This is approximately the same amount as will be required for this service for the current fiscal year. Reductions in certain of the activities in this service, resulting primarily from a recent reorganization, will enable this subdivision of the Department to expend approximately $1,470,000 additional for alien enemy detention in 1945. Most of the credit for this reorganization is due Mr. Earl G. Harrison, Commissioner, who, according to testimony, has instituted some very needed reforms. At approximately this time last year the Service had in operation 12 key facilities with an internee population of about 6,000 aliens. At the present time the Service is operating 16 detention facilities with an estimated population of 9,000 aliens. It is the sense of the committee that further reductions in the amount of appropriations cannot be effected without seriously jeopardizing this activity. As a matter of fact, the estimates for 1945 were predicated on an internee population of 8,000; whereas, as I have already indicated, the population at the present time is 9,000.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

The total amount recommended in the bill for the Federal Prison System is $15,930,000, representing an increase of about $600,000 over the current year's requirements. The System is responsible for the custody of a daily average population of 17,000 prisoners in 25 Federal penal and correctional institutions. In addition, it is responsible for a daily average population of about 3,500 Federal prisoners housed in some 700 non-Federal institutions. Whereas there has been some decrease in the regular peacetime offenses, these have been more than offset by the influx of wartime offenders, principally violators of the Selective Service Act and violators of other national defense laws. Furthermore, as our Army has increased, there has been an increase in inmates as a result of military court martials.

The number incarcerated in Federal institutions dropped to a low point of about 15,200 in September 1943 from a high point of over 19,000 in December 1939. It now appears, however, the Federal prison population is again on the upgrade because since September there has been a steady increase until, at the present time, there are approximately 16,000 prisoners in Federal institutions, an increase of 800 in the past 4 months. It is estimated the number of Federal prisoners will average 16,400 during the fiscal year 1945, upon which these estimates were based. It should also be pointed out that the cost of items necessary for the Federal prison system to purchase in maintaining the prison population has gone up somewhat in price, resulting in an estimated cost per man per day of 81.7 cents for 1945, as compared with 78.5 cents per man per day for 1944. I wish to state for the information of the Members of the House that the Federal prison institutions are now producing war materials to the approximate value of $19,000,000 per year, with the average value of goods produced per employed inmate per year at $5,300 as compared with approximately $1,500 per man per year in 1939. During the past year one carload of war materials was shipped by

Federal prisoner industries every 44 minutes of each working day. Also, on the prison farms commodities to the value of nearly $1,000,000 were produced during the past year. This, incidentally, goes a long way toward supplying food for the prisoners and feed for the stock necessary to operate the institutions.

What I am about to say has nothing to do with the amount of appropriations required for the Federal prison system for 1945. I must tell you of the great interest in the war effort that is being manifested by the inmates of our penal and correctional institutions and of the spirit of cooperation that has existed in connection with the purchase of War bonds. Up to December 31, 1943, the prisoners in our Federal institutions had invested over $375,000 of their meager earnings in War bonds—an average of nearly $250 per inmate. Many of them have been donors to the Red Cross blood banks, and great numbers have expressed earnest and sincere desires to serve their country in the armed forces. Approximately 400 prisoners have already been released for the purpose of going into the Army or Navy. This is, indeed, a commendable record and a record which exemplifies, better than I could otherwise describe, the unity of this Nation at the present moment.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The bill before you contains the amount of approximately $70,600,000 for the Department of Commerce—a reduction of approximately $2,000,000 under the appropriations already made for the current fiscal year, but a reduction of approximately $9,000,000 under the total requirements for the current fiscal year, or after the inclusion in the 1944 requirements of approximately $7,000,000 still to be appropriated for war overtime. Although the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and subsidiary corporations have been considered in connection with the estimates for this Department, no withdrawals from the Treasury general fund are made for this organization. By law, the Congress fixes the amount that may be used from corporate funds for administrative purposes. Accordingly, the total amount given excludes the administrative costs of this organization. This Department is very closely related to the war effort, particularly through the work done by the Census Bureau, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Coast and Geodetic Survey, National Bureau of Standards, and the Weather Bureau. Prior to the war, the Department had accumulated a mass of data and general information that has been of immeasurable value to all of the agencies of the Government directly concerned with the prosecution of the war.

The amount of $5,665,000 is recommended for the Census Bureau—an increase of approximately $1,400,000 over the current year's requirements. A large part of the increase granted is for the purpose of maintaining permanent nucleus staffs in the various divisions of the Bureau for greater efficiency and economy of operation. Heretofore, large staffs were employed as and when required for each of the censuses which must be taken according to law. The resulting uncertainty of job tenure has caused disruptingly high turn-over of employees. Furthermore, it is the thought that much necessary information which is needed in connection with these censuses can be developed in between census periods, which will result in an over-all reduction in the cost of each census. The remainder of the increase is for additional salaries and expenses in connection with the customs statistics activities. Specifically, the funds will be used for the conversion from the commodity classification system now followed to a standard commodity classification in order to place all such statistics on a uniform basis. Much confusion has resulted heretofore because of the different methods of classification of export and import commodities employed by the different agencies of the Government and it is felt that this system should be standardized because of its important post-war aspects.

The amount of $33,844,000 is recommended for the Civil Aeronautics Administration for the establishment and maintenance of air-navigation facilities and for the enforcement of safety regulations. Although civilian flying has decreased in volume considerably during the past 2 or 3 years, this decrease has been more than offset by the increase in military flying and, in view of the fact that this activity was established for civilian purposes, it is incumbent upon the organzation to maintain our Federal airway system which at the present time approximates 40,000 miles. The amount of the decrease of approximately $11,000,000 under the current year's requirements is due principally to the inclusion in the 1944 appropriation of an item of almost $10,000,000 for the development of civil landing areas, and a reduction of approximately $1,000,000 in requirements for technical equipment to be installed in the various airports throughout the country.

With respect to the Coast and Geodetic Survey, this is primarily all war work. This service is engaged in three major functions, namely, the production of marine charts, the production of aeronautical charts, and the execution of geodetic surveys along our coasts and throughout the interior of the United States and Alaska. Of the total amount of $5,625,000 recommended in the bill for this bureau, 66 percent will be spent for marine charts, 21 percent for aeronautical charts, and 13 percent for geodetic surveys.

The amount of $1,905,000, recommended by the committee for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, is slightly less than the estimated 1944 requirements for this activity. It is felt that this Bureau should be strengthened because of its close touch with the economic fabric of this country, which will no doubt make it a very important activity after the war period. The matter of small business was discussed at some length during the hearings, and I for one feel that any organization that is making an effort to aid and preserve small business in this country should have the support of the Members of this House.

With respect to the National Bureau of Standards, for which the amount of approximately $2,900,000 is recommended, and the Weather Bureau, for which the amount of $12,700,000 is recommended, there is little to be said. The former is engaged almost exclusively in war work, involving the mechanical construction of a great many instruments and special devices, and the testing and inspection of materials for war use. The results of the work of the Weather Bureau has shown its effect not only in this country with respect to our aviation and food crops, but in other countries and areas of the world as well, with respect to our military operations.

I feel very strongly that the bill should be passed as presented.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us making the regular appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce has been very well summarized by the chairman of our committee. There are some important items in the bill which I plan to discuss when we read the bill for amendment. At this time, however, I wish to confine my remarks to the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Civilian Pilot Training.

You will observe that the bill now before us carries no estimates for Civilian Pilot Training, but the estimates for this item for the fiscal year 1945 will be submitted in a supplemental budget.

Many questions have been asked whether these large appropriations for the training of pilots through Civilian Pilot Training program have been justified. I will endeavor to give you a report on the activities of not only the C. P. T. but also of the C. A. A. I believe when I complete this statement that you will all agree with me that the appropriations were more than justified, and the record will show that these appropriations resulted in tremendous value to our war effort.

I want to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues on the committee for their great interest in civilian pilot training and especially for their serious work on the program from its inception. I especially wish to commend our chairman the gentleman from Michigan, the Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT; the gentleman from California, the Honorable ALBERT E. CARTER; the gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable JOHN H. KERR; the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable BUTLER B. HARE; the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable ROBERT F. JONES; and the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, who early realized that aviation would be the means of winning the war and realized the necessity of training civilians to fly in order that the Army and the Navy would have a large reservoir of pilots when the need came. That need arose and was met by a program for which this committee had previously provided substantial appropriations.

WAR RECORD OF C. A. A. AND C. P. T.

We on the home front have a job to do that transcends everything else—winning this war as quickly and economically as possible. Today our soldiers, sailors, and marines are slugging their way forward on battlefields all over the

world. They are enduring the dangers and hardships that try men's souls, and they are meeting the test superbly, though not without heartbreaking cost.

At this very moment American boys are falling—your sons and mine, the father of the little boy down the street, the brother of the corner grocer, the sweetheart of the girl next door.

Thinking of this and everything our men in uniform bear so cheerfully, I get somewhat impatient with those who sit by their fireplace, warm and comfortable, complaining about their hardships and sacrifices. But these will not divert us. We can and will see that our men at the front get everything they need to smash on to final victory—food, clothes, ammunition, guns, ships, tanks, and planes—above all, planes, more and better planes, with all the facilities needed to get them up and keep them up in the air. We will make quite sure that our advancing troops and hard-hitting ships are never without a protecting umbrella.

Air power is the key to victory. It is not only the key to victory now but to our national security and prosperity in the future.

Air power truly conceived consists of more than planes on the battle front. Its roots lie deep in the civilian home front. To be strong, it must be based on a sound civilian aviation structure. Without any exaggeration whatever, aviation is everybody's business. More particularly, it is the business of the Congress, which by the policies it adopts can make or break it.

To illustrate what I have said and to bring the basic problems of air power into sharper focus, I want to speak here of an outstanding civilian contribution to the war effort, one that has forwarded air power in every respect. It is about time, I think, that credit should be given where credit is due—to the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

The C. A. A. has marshalled the civilian aviation resources of the country and forged them into an instrument of the greatest value. Through its bold and realistic approach to the basic principles of air power it has provided a leadership difficult to match in any other field.

In 1938, when war clouds loomed dark and large on the horizon, the far-sighted men in C. A. A. proposed a civilian pilot training program designed to make this country air-minded and provide a reservoir of trained airmen in case of sudden emergency. We in the Congress studied the proposal and authorized such a program, first on an experimental basis, later on a country-wide basis, and the dividends of that policy are beyond calculation. It was one of the most effective measures of national preparedness ever undertaken.

Months before the Nazis fell on Poland, the C. P. T. program was under way, turning out pilots—not military pilots but skilled airmen ready to be taught the tricks of fighting in the air. We appropriated $4,000,000 for the initial program. After it had proved itself we upped the figure to $37,000,000 and appropriated $25,000,000 the next year—in both cases voting larger funds than recommended by the Budget. And never was money better spent.

By Pearl Harbor, within less than 3 years, the number of licensed civilian pilots in this country had jumped from less than 25,000 to more than 100,000. At the same time the number of civilian planes more than doubled, rising from 12,000 to almost 25,000, with a corresponding stimulus to the aircraft-manufacturing industry. More than 65,000 of these pilots were graduates of the C. P. T. courses offered at more than 600 colleges and flying schools throughout the country. Thousands more young Americans were inspired to win their wings by the widespread interest in aviation aroused by the C. P. T. program in all the 48 States.

That program, wisely, was a decentralized program. It did not involve Federal duplication of already existing facilities. Rather, it organized local colleges and flying schools into a great cooperative endeavor to serve the public interest, not only in the immediate vicinity but for the Nation as a whole. Consequently, it was a grass-roots program, reaching out into every corner of the land, and I know from experience in my own State that it brought aviation to country crossroads where it had never been before.

It did more than teach American youth to fly. It made aviation and its problems a lively subject of discussion everywhere—at businessmen's clubs, chambers of commerce, college faculty meetings, college dormitories, local school boards, women's clubs, Pullman smoking rooms, country clubs, trade-unions, the Grange and farmer cooperatives, fraternal organizations, meetings of parent-teacher associations—everywhere that people were alive to present developments and thinking about the future.

That is one fundamental of air power—wide public interest in aviation, and the widest possible public participation. We can never become a nation on wings, as we must, if we make a cult of flying—if the country as a whole does not become air-minded. That was one of the primary aims of C. P. T., and it accomplished that purpose beyond the expectations of its most enthusiastic supporters.

But what about the ground and flight instruction offered by C. P. T.? Did that measure up to standard? How have its graduates fared since graduation? What are they doing now?

By the summer of 1941, 6 months before Pearl Harbor, they were streaming into the armed forces at the rate of 1,000 a month. Bear in mind that at the beginning of 1941 the Army Air Force had approximately 6,000 pilots, with some 7,000 cadets in training. By the end of the year the Army had perhaps 20,000 flyers who had reached or passed the training received by the 65,000 C. P. T. graduates. The Navy had perhaps 10,000 such pilots. The exact figures necessarily still are maintained secret.

This great reservoir of C. P. T. graduates immeasurably speeded up the building of our now incomparable Air Forces. As General Arnold declared in his recent report—I quote:

> The Civilian Pilot Training Program of the Civil Aeronautics Administration constituted a valuable pool from which personnel could be drawn.

TUFTS COLLEGE AN EXAMPLE

I have here before me a list of the C. A. A. pilots trained at Tufts College near Boston, Mass., between the fall session of 1939 and the spring session of 1942. Of the 111 graduates, 54 went directly into the Navy, 32 into the Army, and 25 into the aviation industry at some job requiring special aviation skill. In sum, every last one of these boys volunteered for services directly forwarding the war program. This list is a very interesting and significant document, and I give it here as an outstanding example of this great program:

SUMMARY OF PRESENT STATUS OF MEN WHO TRAINED AT TUFTS COLLEGE UNDER THE CIVILIAN PILOT TRAINING PROGRAM—PRIOR TO JULY 1, 1942, EXTRACURRICULAR

PRIMARY, FALL 1939

Parker M. Bartlett, lieutenant, junior grade, United States Naval Reserve, Washington, D. C.

Robert Bertagna, chief carpenter's mate, construction battalion, United States Navy.

E. Arthur Bonney, technical adviser to Flight Engineering Department of Army Air Corps at Sheppard Field, Tex.

Richard J Coar experimental test engineer, Pratt & Whitney.

Aaron Garber, Boston Navy Yard, electrical engineer.

Everett F. Kimball, private, Army Air Force.

Charles A. Lister, General Electric Co., design engineer.

Forrest G. Parker, Jr., lieutenant, junior grade, United States Naval Reserve. Assistant Officer in Charge of Air Station, Creeds, Va.

Raymond W. Peach, ensign, United States Naval Reserve, instructor in instrument flying, Naval Air Base, Atlanta, Ga.

James Robinson, industry.

Albert A. Schaal, ensign, AV-(N) United States Naval Reserve.

Norman R. Sherman, captain, United States Marine Corps.

Delmont J. Sylvester, lieutenant, Army Air Corps (overseas duty).

Herbert S. Wight, lieutenant, United States Naval Reserve, Washington, D. C.

PRIMARY, SUMMER 1940

Gerald E. Achin, lieutenant, junior grade, United States Naval Reserve, Air Station, Glenview, Ill.

Laurence C. Bommarito, lieutenant, United States Marine Corps Reserve, Parachute Battalion, demolition unit.

Joseph L. Cafarella, Tufts College Medical School.

Edward M. Chamberlain, ensign, United States Naval Reserve Air Force.

Gordon C. Hart, naval aviation cadet.

Edward W. Jervis, Jr., ensign O-V(S) United States Naval Reserve.

Edward Kalustian, engineer.

Guy M. Mitchell, Jr., naval aviation cadet, Corpus Christi, Tex.

Richard B. Mitchell, lieutenant, Army Air Force. Took part in raids on Tunisia.

Arthur N. Olive, Jr., lieutenant, United States Naval Reserve. Construction Corps volunteer specialist.

William R. Page, Atlas Powder Co., chemical engineer, Paducah, Ky.

Paul D. Pfanstiehl, ensign E-V(S) United States Naval Reserve. Naval Torpedo Station.

Charles J. Ross, Jr., copilot, Air Transport Command, North Atlantic Division; technical adviser on radio blind-landing and direction-finding; multi-engine and instrument flight instructor; chief ground instructor, Pilot Training Division, Burlington, Vt.; instruction staff of radio operators' training program, Burlington; director of research, Northeast Airlines.

Leonard S. Rubin, naval aviation cadet.

Ralph C. Runels, naval aviation cadet, Corpus Christi, Tex.

William K. Woodard, Tufts Medical School. Navy.

Llewellyn A. Young, contract engineer working with Navy.

SECONDARY—FALL 1940

Robert T. Holland, General Electric Co., application engineer, aviation division.

Aaron G. Olmsted was second lieutenant in Army; now test pilot for Pratt & Whitney.

Raymond W. Peach.[1]

PRIMARY—FALL 1940

John Allyn, lieutenant, junior grade, United States Naval Reserve; active duty in the Aleutians since November 1942; pilot of bomber.

Frank E. Bennett, Jr., lieutenant, junior grade, United States Naval Reserve; Naval Air Corps; instructor.

John J. Burke, lieutenant, Army Air Force; reconnaissance squadron.

John O. Cimaglia, captain and operations officer in Army Air Corps; Africa.

Sidney A. Edwards, lieutenant, Army Air Corps; fighter squadron; killed in accident July 1, 1943.

Charles E. Griner, Jr., supervisor, tool and gage planning and scheduling.

Bennett D. Katz, captain, Army Air Corps; piloting new planes to overseas destinations.

David W. Kinney, ensign, United States Naval Reserve; on a destroyer.

Leon E. Kruger, Army aviation cadet.

Robert B. Overstreet, lieutenant, United States Marine Corps Reserve; instrument instructor (multiengine)

Harold H. Ricker, transition instructor for the Army Transport Command.

John J. Santosuosso, ensign, United States Naval Reserve; Pacific duty.

Richard G. VanGundy, lieutenant, junior grade, United States Naval Reserve; Corpus Christi, Tex.

Carl E. Wartchow, ensign AV(S), United States Naval Reserve; Alaska.

George R. West, second lieutenant, Army Air Force; instructor.

William R. Mitchell, General Electric Co.; aircraft equipment.

PRIMARY—SPRING 1941

Robert J. Franklin, Army aviation cadet; Louisiana.

Harry W. Hollmeyer, second lieutenant, United States Marine Corps Reserve; marine fighter squadron, Solomon Islands.

Manuel S. Lato, second lieutenant, Army.

Allan M. Morton, ensign, United States Naval Reserve; overseas.

James D. Nisbet, metallurgist.

Vernon H. Sherman, second lieutenant, Army; Wendover Field, Utah.

Harold Weldon, lieutenant, junior grade, United States Naval Reserve; torpedo bomber pilot; overseas.

Douglas Wilson, Army private; accidentally killed by drowning at Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Md., July 15, 1942.

SECONDARY—SPRING 1941

Leopold Ackerman, lieutenant, Army; Africa.

[1] See primary.

Robert B. Aldrich, ensign, United States Naval Reserve; fighter pilot aboard carrier.

Frank E. Bennett, Jr.[1]

Edward M. Chamberlain.[1]

Gordon C. Hart.[1]

Robert B. Overstreet.[1]

Harold H. Ricker.[1]

Thomas E. Stretton, ensign, United States Naval Reserve, Naval Air Station, Pensacola.

Richard G. Van Gundy.[1]

George R. West.[1]

PRIMARY—SUMMER 1941

Frederick C. Bowen, lieutenant, Army Air Force; instructor.

Fred S. Card, Jr., lieutenant, junior grade, Naval Aviation.

Emilius R. Ciampa, second lieutenant, United States Marine Corps Reserve, Marine Aviation.

Herbert P. Culp, supercharger engineer.

Hector G. Gai, Jr., lieutenant, United States Marine Corps Reserve.

John G. Hayward, naval drydock, South Boston; associate marine engineer.

Francis R. Kitchell, Jr., lieutenant, United States Naval Reserve.

Abraham Klaiman, Naval Aviation Cadet.

William P. McIntosh, captain, Army.

John L. Quigley, private, United States Marine Corps Reserve.

Ross H. Reynolds, Jr., lieutenant, Signal Corps. Active duty since 1941; spent in connection with radar equipment. In England almost a year.

Leonard S. Stone, Army aviation cadet.

Mario Tamburino, chief draftsman.

Henry C. Young, Dallas Aviation School.

SECONDARY—SUMMER 1941

Edward W. Jervis, Jr.[1]

John C. Kelleher, Jr., lieutenant, junior grade, United States Naval Reserve. Flight leader on carrier in Pacific.

Allan M. Morton.[1]

Charles J. Ross.[1]

PRIMARY—FALL 1941

James A. Brickett, Jr., ensign, United States Naval Reserve.

William F. Haneman, lieutenant, junior grade, United States Naval Reserve.

Charles D. Kimball, ensign, United States Naval Reserve. Naval air base.

John P. Lacy, lieutenant, junior grade, United States Naval Reserve.

Oliver A. Parker, second lieutenant, Army, pursuit pilot.

Kenneth E. Perry, ensign, United States Naval Reserve.

Thomas J. L. Redmond, ensign, United States Naval Reserve.

Richard W. Russell, ensign, United States Naval Reserve, instructor, air station.

Stanley I. Skelskie, private, Army, Reserve Officers Training Corps.

David Stiles, Navy, V-5.

Richard F. Tobin, lieutenant, Army Air Corps, overseas duty, awarded the Air Medal.

Orme Wilson, Jr., ensign, AV-(N) United States Naval Reserve, flight instructor.

Jason L. Wolfson, lieutenant, Army Air Force, flight instructor.

SECONDARY—FALL 1941

Alden I. Avery, lieutenant, Army Air Corps, Ferry Command.

Robert J. Franklin.[1]

Milton Green, second lieutenant, Army Air Corps.

Malcolm P. Murphy, copilot, Pan American-Grace Airways, Inc.

John M. Oldsman, pilot, Army Air Corps.

Charles R. Plum, General Electric Co. and Boeing Aircraft.

Aaron Tenenbaum, civilian flight instructor.

[1] See primary.

PRIMARY—SPRING 1942

Vernon A. Allen, ensign, United States Naval Reserve Air Corps.

Salvatore J. Bagnulo, aviation cadet, United States Marine Corps Reserve.

Robert P. Brown, naval aviation cadet.

James L. Grandfield, second lieutenant, Army Air Corps, flight instructor.

George H. Heshion, Jr., naval aviation cadet.

Malcolm E. Johnson, second lieutenant, Army Air Corps.

Stanley Mackey, naval aviation cadet.

Hugh D. McQuillan, aviation cadet, Marine Air Corps.

Gerald F. Meehan, flight instructor, Army Air Corps.

Thomas B. O'Leary, Jr., lieutenant, Army Air Corps, flight instructor.

Ferdinand A. Oliverio, naval aviation cadet.

Williams J. Plummer, Jr., completed four C. C. A. courses, waiting assignment.

Robert F. Upton, Watertown arsenal.

Franklin Walter, second lieutenant, United States Marine Corps Reserve, flight instructor.

SECONDARY—SPRING 1942

Stanley N. Bjurback, ensign, United States Naval Reserve, naval aviation instructor.

James A. Brickett, Jr.[1]

Harold F. Kedian, second lieutenant, Army Air Corps, flight instructor.

Herbert F. Meyers, second lieutenant, Army Air Corps, Ferry Command, accidentally killed in plane crash June 26, 1943.

Richard W. Russell.[1]

Leonard S. Stone.[1]

Jason L. Wolfson.[1]

Once in the Army and Navy, these C. P. T. boys did better in advanced flying courses than those who had not had the advantage of their training, as the records prove. Less than 12 percent of them, or approximately 1 in 10, washed out in Army primary training. The rate for non-C. P. T. trained was more than 43 percent, or approximately four times as high. While wash-out totals were not so large, the ratio in the Navy was about the same.

And these C. P. T. graduates have gone on to make names for themselves wherever American planes are flying—in combat, in the grasshopper squadrons of the Field Artillery, in the far-flung operations of the Army Air Transport Command, and the Naval Air Transport Service.

Three-fourths of the famous American Eagle Squadron which fought with the R. A. F. in winning the crucial Battle of Britain were American boys whose first taste of flying came at our small civilian flying schools.

Across the world in China several of the famous Flying Tigers were boys from your home town and mine who learned to fly at the local airport.

Ten minutes after the war started at Pearl Harbor, two C. P. T. graduates were in the air downing Japs—Lt. George Welch, of Wilmington, Del., and Lt. Kenneth L. Taylor, of Hominy, Okla. They took to the air under a rain of Jap bombs, and each shot down two attackers. They landed, under fire refueled, stocked up on ammunition, and again took off, Welch shooting down two more Japs before the battle was over.

[1] See primary.

Nineteen of the seventy-nine men who slashed at Tokyo with Gen. Jimmy Doolittle were products of the C. A. A. contract schools, and some suffered the tragic fate of those that were captured.

The Ninety-ninth Pursuit Squadron has an impressive string of victories to its credit. This is an all-Negro unit, from mechanics to pilots, and many of the pilots and other personnel are C. P. T. graduates.

Six of the 19 members of a Navy squadron in the battle of Midway that shot down 27 enemy planes were C. P. T. graduates. So were 5 of the 12 crew members on the 3 ships that recently came back to Washington after the amazing raid on the Ploesti oil fields.

I could go on reciting the names and exploits of hundreds and hundreds of air boys—all equally heroic—who got the first spark of interest in flying through C. P. T. at their home-town airports. I could give almost every man in this Congress the name of someone from his district—probably a hero decorated for bravery in action—who was started on his way to a flying-fighting career by a civilian instructor at a civilan flight school working with the college or university in his home town or nearby.

I like the story of Milton Tootle, of Missouri, trained at St. Joseph College. "The youngest and most inexperienced pilot on our carrier," proudly say his fellow pilots. But he took off and as he left the flight deck he heard the radio say that a dive bomber was coming in to attack from the port quarter.

"I wasn't thinking of much," said Tootle later, "except that I wanted to get myself a Jap." So he plunged into his own antiaircraft barrage to do it, bagging the dive bomber, but his plane was hit by his own flak.

Tootle bailed out and was picked up later, to be told by his commanding officers that he had saved the huge carrier with its precious freight of men and machines.

Now, who are our outstanding aces in this sky-fighting business? At the very top stands Maj. Joe Foss, of the Marines, from Sioux Falls, S. Dak., with 26 Jap planes to his credit; Capt. Richard Bong, of the Army, from Poplar, Wis., with 21 Japs to his credit; and Capt. Walker Mahurin, of the Army, from Lafayette, Ind., who has shot down 12 Nazi planes. All learned to fly at Civilian Pilot Training Schools, veritably the breeding place of aces, the mother of heroes of the air.

Now take a look at the over-all picture of these kids you and I knew back home, who were trained by the commercial pilots you and I knew back home, and the colleges which you probably attended back home.

I have here a list—and it is only a partial list—of the graduates of these hundreds of civilian flying schools who have gone into battle and been decorated for their exploits. Here are your home-town boys, the 672 of them who, at the last count, were wearing heroes' medals.

There are 5 who have received the Medal of Honor, the highest and most rarely awarded decoration conferred by the United States; 10 of them have been awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the next highest honor we give our fighters; 51 the Navy Cross; 121 the Silver Star; 250 the Distinguished Flying Cross; 30 the Purple Heart; 4 the Navy and Marine Corps Medal; and 354 the Air Medal.

One of these 672 heroes received 18 decorations, another 9, another man was given 7, to another went 6, 13 received 4, 40 were given 3, 98 received 2, and 516 were given 1.

I think you will be interested in seeing this complete list, and the folks back home will want to see it, so I am going to include it at the conclusion of my remarks.

I am not saying that these men received their full training in this civilian program. That is not the fact. Everyone of these boys, after he had learned to fly, went on to Army and Navy schools to receive advanced training in swift pursuit ships or heavy bombers, to be instructed in gunnery, tactics, formation flying, and so forth—all of the specialized things a man must know before he can blast the enemy from the air.

But I am saying that in the beginning, when these boys were novices, no one knew whether they were loaded with TNT or would prove to be duds. Some skilled instructor had to assay their flying ability and put them through their elementary instruction to determine whether they were good pilot material or not. This C. A. A. screening process saved the armed forces millions of hours of precious time, releasing planes and personnel for advanced training needs.

The greatest credit is due to these instructors and to the C. A. A., which recruited or trained the vast majority of them.

When the C. P. T. program started, instruction was largely in the hands of the "old timers" at local airports, veterans of the last war and of barnstorming days, men who so loved aviation that they refused to give it up even though financial returns were practically nil and occasionally they had to skip a meal or two. To make sure that their skills were not rusty, the C. A. A. examined and rerated all instructors. This was of the greatest importance and was immediately reflected in the amazing safety record of C. P. T. That record so impressed the hard-boiled insurance underwriters that they made six voluntary reductions in premium rates for C. P. T. students. These rates fell from $20 to $4.90 within less than 3 years—or more than 75 percent. At the same time insurance rates on planes were reduced, which put money into the pockets of every private flyer in the country, thereby stimulating aviation by so much.

To assist these instructors, the C. A. A. made invaluable studies to standardize ground and flight courses, developing improved technical devices, better texts, and new visual aids. Most of these have been taken over and adapted by the armed forces for their own needs, thus assuring a uniform high quality of training. How many people know that C. P. T. texts have become best-sellers? Since 1939 almost 2,000,000 copies of these technical manuals have been sold, spreading knowledge of aeronautics and the gospel of aviation far and wide.

As the C. P. T. program expanded, the supply of veteran instructors was soon exhausted and the C. A. A. began training its own. All of these men have made a vital contribution in building up our military air forces. Many went into uniform to teach at Army and Navy air bases. More than 10,000 have been employed as civilians at schools under contract to the armed forces or working under arrangements with the C. A. A. That the C. A. A. trained an overwhelming majority of these instructors is evident from the fact that up to Pearl Harbor it graduated more than 9,000 and since then has added 11,000. Thus the C. A. A. has provided a teaching force capable of turning out 150,000 pilots a year. If pilot production has reached the seemingly impossible figure we set for it a few years ago, it is thanks primarily to C. P. T.

With the outbreak of hostilities, of course, the C. P. T. was wholly geared to meeting military needs, devoting all of its time, acquired skills, and accumulated facilities to the purpose, turning out pilots by the tens of thousands in accord with specifications laid down by the Army and Navy. Late in 1942 it became the C. A. A. war training service.

C. A. A. AND FIELD ARTILLERY

Early in 1942 the C. A. A. undertook an interesting war job for the field artillery, teaching artillery officers to use light planes as elevated and movable observation platforms.

Here is a perfect example of the way skills learned in civilian flying can be applied to the military machine with which we are winning the war. First, the Air Corps and the Field Artillery discussed who should fly the planes. As the Field Artillery insisted on having a trained artillery observer in the plane, its own officers were taught to fly the planes and maintain them in the field.

A school was set up at Fort Sill, and civilian instructors were supplied from the C. A. A.'s training program. These men, long experienced in flying light planes, taught the artillerymen to do things which the C. A. A. would never countenance in private flying. They took off from small fields, climbed as fast as they could to 500 feet, made their observations, got back on the ground, and hid their planes as fast as possible. Thus every battery had its aerial eyes above it while it was firing, getting instant accurate reports on where its shells were landing, instructions for change of aim and elevation.

These pilot-mechanics were trained in all phases of operating light planes, including maintenance in the field. They were taught how to swing an airplane motor to the limb of a tree and give it a complete overhaul in the field.

These pilots have made amazing contributions to the war. They swarm over the line of guns in the field; they carry messages; they often encounter the enemy's pursuit planes, and some of them have been shot down. One of these pilots, Lt. Julian W. Cummings, who had

learned to fly in the C. P. T., took off from the deck of a small L. S. T. boat before dawn on the day of the north Africa landings and flew throughout the day observing enemy movements, spotting artillery fire, and carrying messages. At one time he landed beside a road, borrowed some gasoline from surface vehicles, and hopped off again, being decorated for his exploit.

Another pilot in one of these "Grasshopper Squadrons" was chased one day by a swift and murderous Messerschmitt. But he so maneuvered his slow light plane that the eager German overshot his mark, crashed into a mountainside, and went up in flames.

When the Fort Sill school started in 1942 it had 24 training planes. Today 300 airplanes are in use at the field. All of the instructors are field-artillery officers and technical men trained by the original C. A. A. instructors, many of whom were invited to join the field artillery as commissioned instructors and still are doing yeoman service.

SERVICE IN LATIN-AMERICA

Another significant war job has been undertaken by C. A. A., which is conducting one of the most practical programs yet designed to forward our good-neighbor policy in this hemisphere. It has trained hundreds of pilots and mechanics to man the Central and South American air lines, thus assuring the expansion of air commerce to the south. At the present time it is training here in the United States 110 aviation students from the Latin-American republics, and examinations are now being given in 11 of these countries to select the 119 likeliest candidates to take the third course offered in 3 fields of aeronautics. Since 1941 almost 500 such students have been brought to this country.

Many were given special training as instructors, so that they could pass on their knowledge to their fellow countrymen when they returned home.

This part of the program has already borne fruit in Mexico and Brazil. In these two Allied Nations pilot training schools on the C. A. A. model have been established with the help of supervisory personnel loaned by the C. A. A.

C. A. A. SPECIAL SERVICES

In addition to all this, the C. A. A. has trained 1,536 men of the armed forces in traffic control work. This includes 605 Army enlisted and 628 Navy enlisted men trained as control-tower operators; and 303 Army officers trained as flight-control officers.

The C. A. A. has also given heavily of its own specialized personnel. Its former deputy administrator, director of safety regulation, regional manager at large, and three regional managers, and the director of its standardization center are just a few of the key people now serving in the military air forces. Approximately 1,200 C. A. A. employees have gone into the armed services, and the great majority of these have training and experience of immeasurable value to the air forces. In the Air Transport Command, in the air communications network, in the airport control towers and filter centers, in the laboratories at Wright Field, you will find ex-C. A. A. employees in important posts.

All told, since it began its pilot-training program, the C. A. A. has turned out more than 200,000 airmen. Since April 1942, all have been members of the Air Corps Reserve or on active duty as Army and Navy cadets. At the present time all Army and Navy cadets get their first flight instruction under C. A. A.

I am informed, however, that the Army and Navy plan to concentrate all of their aviation training at their own schools after June of this year. They can do this because the peak of production in pilots has been passed and it is now only necessary to keep up replacements.

OUR FUTURE AVIATION

This raises a problem of vital importance to every American citizen, particularly to those who are interested in the future of this Nation in the air. What is going to become of these civilian schools no longer needed by the armed forces? The question is all the more immediate because the original act authorizing the Civilian Pilot Training program expires at the end of this fiscal year.

We here in the Congress must soon come to some decision about it. There can be no doubt that it has more than justified itself by its achievements, as I have made plain. The question now is, Should it be continued? If so, under what auspices?

It will be said, of course, that when the men begin coming out of the armed forces we shall have plenty of trained pilots. That is perhaps true so far as immediate needs are concerned. But it is not true for our long-range needs.

What worries me is this: How are we going to assure a fresh crop of pilots each year? We cannot live long on our backlog. We cannot afford a big gap in the ranks of our airmen. Every year hundreds of thousands of youngsters come of age, almost all of them wanting to fly. Are we to tell them that we do not need them—that we have enough pilots—that they had better stay on the ground? If we do, we will pay for it later, not only in military terms but in commercial and economic terms as well. The nation of the future will be that nation which most completely provides its youth with an opportunity to fly. I do not wish to speak of any particular plan for doing that on this occasion, but I do wish to raise the question here and everywhere in the country. It will take the combined brains of all if we are not to make a mistake that may affect our far future.

What I have said is only one aspect of air power. There are others equally fundamental. A sound aviation structure requires something more than planes and pilots. It demands a well-planned airport system, ground facilities of many kinds, and a vast network of navigation aids to assist military, commercial, and private flyers in getting from here to there swiftly and safely, with no annoying delays at either end or along the way.

Before the war, at the direction of the Congress, the C. A. A. made a survey of the airport situation in the country. Based on this survey, the C. A. A. drew up and presented to the Congress a tentative program envisaging a network of 4,000 airports to meet our more or less immediate needs.

The war has caused many shifts in that original airport plan. To date, approximately $400,000,000 has been appropriated by the Congress for the national defense airport-development program, which is limited to the development and improvement of sites designated as essential to the war effort by the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Commerce. All of this appropriation is now either expended or specifically allocated.

ACTIVITY IN ALASKA

And that money has accomplished wonders, not only within our continental boundaries but in our outlying possessions. When Gen. Billy Mitchell was a young lieutenant stationed in Alaska, he said that whoever controlled that land would have the United States at his mercy. Nobody paid him much mind.

When we first felt the threat of war, officials of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, sharing Mitchell's conclusions, began extending the airways and constructing new airports in the Territory, smoothing the way for the airplane, which had already proved its usefulness in overcoming Alaska's difficult transportation problems.

Here was another great reservoir of civilian facilities, on the spot, ready and waiting for the military to tap it.

If Alaska were not strictly on the hush-hush list of the War Department, I could tell you the most engrossing stories about what happened up there. Here is one story, however, that is indicative. The C. A. A. was planning an airport in the vicinity of Dutch Harbor. The usual difficulties in getting materials, priorities, even money to do the job, were encountered. This time, however, somebody did something about it. The C. A. A. official on the job—and not too high an official at that—took his professional career in his hands and began to give orders. He had the airport under construction and well along toward a usable state before receiving any assurance that the money needed would be available, using other funds for the purpose because he realized the importance of that airport.

The field was completed just 7 days before the Japs struck at Dutch Harbor, and they got the surprise of their lives when land-based Army planes came swarming upon them from a civilian field they knew nothing about. That field probably saved Alaska, as more than one high Army officer has acknowledged.

Nowhere has the skill of the civilian been put to better use in the conduct of the war than in Alaska. Sourdough pilots who have learned from bitter experience how to operate airplanes in that bleak region have been invaluable to the Army. Airport and airway engineers, whose labors have educated them

in the terrain, weather, natural history, and other peculiar Alaskan conditions, have been a vast mine of information and a storehouse of ability for Army and Navy units defending our farthest frontier.

As soon as the Japs had been pushed off of Kiska and Attu, the airways engineers of the C. A. A. resumed their plans for an airway down the Aleutian chain, installing the radio facilities which—while it is still held secret—we know must be in use now in our occasional bombing of the Kurile Islands, part of Japan's homeland.

This sort of thing has gone on all over the world. Not long ago a radio range which first went into service near Evansville, Ind., guiding peaceful traffic through our home skies, was uprooted and planted abroad and it is now sending out its guiding signals from Ascension Island in mid-Atlantic. Scores of other radio facilities are in operation along the world routes, set up and made to work by the C. A. A. experts who developed them.

AVIATION COMMUNICATION SERVICE

In August of 1942 the C. A. A. was called upon by the Army to assist their airway communication system in the immediate establishment of urgently needed communications, weather reporting, and air navigational facilities on the northeast airway—the ferry route to Great Britain. Recruiting its own trained personnel, 21 civil and radio engineers were assigned to remote projects in Canada, Labrador, Greenland, Iceland, and the United Kingdom. Working as civilian supervising engineers and utilizing available military working crews, 7 projects were completed early in 1943 and the remaining 10 projects by August 1943.

These projects included communication circuits, both high and low frequency. The latter were provided to preclude disruption of communications during magnetic storms common to the Arctic regions. Air-to-ground control circuits were also provided at a number of points. Radio range navigational aids were provided at 13 stations, and at 5 of them equipment was furnished by the C. A. A. by dismantling domestic facilities and transferring them to foreign locations where they were reinstalled and commissioned under C. A. A. supervision.

Recognition of these services by the C. A. A. has been given occasionally by the Army. Recently, a story in Communications magazine of November 1943, by Lt. Walter W. Fawcett, Jr., of the Army Air Forces communications system, said:

> The Army Air Forces communications system also exercises operational control of six intercontinental broadcasting stations developed by the Civil Aeronautics Administration. These stations, among the most powerful radio installations in existence today, are located at strategic points for world coverage. They collect and disseminate, on both point-to-point and air-ground circuits, operational and weather information covering entire global areas. Great credit is due the C. A. A. for the outstanding cooperation given, principally along engineering and technical lines, in the development of the present colossal Army airways communications system.

These six stations encompass the world. Recently the C. A. A. intercontinental station at New York worked a big flying boat all the way from its home port of New York to a point beyond Cairo. From there to Australia, the boat was in contact with various foreign stations. On its homeward flight, it soon came within range of another C. A. A. station on a south Pacific Island, and the crew reported "it seemed we were back home again." From there on in, over 6,700 miles of ocean, a C. A. A. station was its constant companion.

TOMORROW'S AIRPORT PROGRAM

In the United States proper, the C. A. A. has been building new airways and airports to speed the winning of the war. Recent development of airports has necessarily been concentrated upon the larger fields. As a result, there has been a twelvefold increase in the number of our major civil airports—with paved runways at least 3,500 feet long and capable of handling the largest transport craft. We had only 76 such fields 2 years ago. By the end of 1943 we had 940, nor does this include many large airdromes built by the armed forces for their exclusive use.

The situation in regard to smaller airports is this. We have 1,213 class I airports, the lowest category, each with landing areas 1,800–2,500 feet long. We have 905 class II ports, with paved runways from 2,500 to 3,500 feet long. These are situated, for the most part, near smaller cities and larger towns. We shall need many more of this class for future commercial flying. Nor can it be said that we have enough larger ports, as those in many of our major cities are already overcrowded.

There are at the present time approximately 3,000 classified airports in the country. This is 1,000 short of our pre-war plan, and it now appears that our pre-war plan will not meet our post-war needs, which in spite of the war demands made on the C. A. A. are receiving serious and detailed scrutiny.

There are in this country approximately 6,670 communities containing 1,000 people or more, as recently pointed out in a searching analysis of the airport problem by Mr. Charles I. Stanton, able Administrator of C. A. A. It seems reasonable to suppose that each of these communities will wish to be accessible by air. Some of these communities can profitably make joint use of a single airport. Making that allowance, we arrive at a national total of 6,000 airports as a realistic target to shoot at in the immediate post-war years.

As we have only 3,000 ports at the present time, that means doubling our present airport capacity. Like the question of training pilots, this is also an immediate problem. At the end of the present fiscal year the authorization of the National Defense Airport Development Program expires.

Shall we let it die? Or should it be continued in some form? If this Nation is to continue in the front rank in the air, we cannot afford simply to wash our hands of it.

How are the necessary airports going to be provided? By the Federal Government? By the States? By local governments? Or by a combination of all three?

Here again the C. A. A. has been foresighted and on the job. It has suggested a tentative formula by which the Federal Government and the States might become partners in building the Nation's post-war civil airport system in much the same way that they have cooperated in building our national highway system, admittedly the best in the world. As suggested by Mr. Stanton, Administrator of C. A. A., such a formula would take account of four factors: First, the area of the State; second, its population; third, number of registered aircraft in the State; and, fourth, the existing number of accredited airports. Under this plan, as in the Federal Highway System, each State would have to match a specified percentage of its quota of Federal funds.

Decentralization of Federal operations and delegation of more responsibility to State aviation agencies should be beneficial. Airport improvements or construction projects within each State would then be selected and carried out by the State's aviation agency. Only projects included within the C. A. A. national airport plan would be eligible for Federal aid, and C. A. A. standards of location, lay-out, and construction for the class of airport proposed would have to be met.

There has long been need of a clarification of the relationship between the Federal and State Governments with respect to aviation. Many have feared that the States would seek to regulate individual aircraft and airmen without regard to the problem as a whole, thus creating a mass of conflicting rules and standards, such as are found in the motor-trucking and divorce laws. This would be peculiarly disconcerting in the case of a flyer who passes from State to State in midair, often being unaware of State boundaries as he passes over them. State officials, on the other hand, have lived in fear that local needs and wishes would be inadequately considered by Federal officials.

The field of airport development offers a splendid chance for the Federal Government to work in partnership with the State authorities by establishing a policy which for more than 20 years has proved its practicability in the field of highways. Federal airport authorities would retain control of national planning and of minimum standards, just as Federal highway authorities have done. Yet local problems would be decided at the State level where such decisions should be made, and the sincerity with which State authorities advocated specific projects would be demonstrated by the dollars they put up to match Federal funds.

It may be contended that Federal aid should be extended only to airports having at least interstate significance. But the very nature of the airplane makes even the smallest airport a base for interstate operations. Moreover, the experience of Public Roads officials with Federal highway aid provides a valuable lesson. At the outset, Federal highway aid was limited largely to trunk

routes. But local and feeder traffic has become such an important factor in the whole highway picture that there is steadily growing demand for Federal aid on other classes of roads.

As I have said, this airport problem is the immediate concern of every man in this Congress, both as a Representative of his district and the Nation as a whole.

THE FEDERAL AIRWAYS SYSTEM

Lastly, a word on another aspect of air power. Too few people know about the Federal Airways System, what it is, how it functions, and what its needs are. It is the arterial system of the air. It consists of 35,000 miles of well equipped air routes with air navigation facilities of many kinds—beacon lights, emergency landing fields, radio range stations, automatic control devices, omni-directional radio markers, an elaborate weather reporting and forecasting system tied in with the United States Weather Bureau.

Here again the C. A. A. has made invaluable contributions to the war. More than 9 out of 10 planes now flying the Federal Airways are military aircraft bound for some distant point in this country or on their way overseas. Without the facilities and procedures worked out by the C. A. A. there would be a hopeless tangle in the air, particularly around congested airports. These facilities and procedures have been of the greatest use to the armed forces wherever they happen to be operating.

All this has been done by an agency set up to promote the peaceful commerce of the skies. It is a perfect example of how our democratic system works at its best. By its foresight the C. A. A. anticipated many of the problems created by the war—training pilots, extending and improving the airways, building airports, so that these were ready to be used when the emergency arose. And by its foresight again it hopes to anticipate many of the problems certain to come with the peace. It is alive to all the possibilities of the air age we have now entered. It is planning to lay down on the soundest foundations the real bases of air power. Its program deserves the fullest support.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I would like to say that I appreciate the mighty fine talk the gentleman has just delivered. I know that his subcommittee and the C. A. A. and the C. P. T. are entitled to all the praise he has given them and also the fine type of flying and fighting that our boys, who have been taught in those great institutions, have displayed in this great war.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], who is also a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and who went along with us in making these appropriations. When we realized we had to have pilots he was one who contributed a great deal to the efforts of this committee to make this program successful.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman. I want to add that I am very proud to say that the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Mr. Pogue, is a very good friend of mine. He is one of my constituents. He lives a short distance from my home town and we in Iowa, of course, are very proud of Mr. Pogue and the fine job he has been doing.

Mr. STEFAN. I wish to tell the gentleman, who comes from the State where the tall corn grows, that I, too, know Mr. Pogue very well. We, too, admire him and his vast knowledge of aviation matters.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I would like also to add a word with respect to the work which was accomplished by the civilian branch of aviation under the great difficulties about which I know something. You have not overdone the matter at all in giving the credit which you have to them and to all those instrumental in making possible what has been accomplished. I do wish to say I sent for information and learned something about that. Why I undertook to interrupt the gentleman was because he referred to an institution in New England of which I have a right to be very proud, and that is the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. But I was just going to suggest that the gentleman also say, and I will say it for him if he will permit, that while the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has made a very fine record with regard to the men whom they have turned out, and the record which those men have made for that institution, Norwich University, of which I happened to be president about 14 years, is at least a close second.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. All of these schools in which this program was conducted have done a wonderful job.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Some years ago the gentleman from Nebraska began harping about this problem. I thought it was more or less an obsession with him. But the gentleman had a lot more foresight than most of us had regarding this problem. I want to commend the gentleman for the work he has done. He has made a great contribution to the war effort in promoting this civilian aeronautical program. In that connection I would like to ask the gentleman this question, if he chooses to answer it. What does the gentleman think about placing all of the aviation departments and all of the aviation activities under one head?

Mr. STEFAN. We may have the Lea bill on the floor of the House for consideration some day. That is a very controversial bill. Aviation is too big to stop. Some compromise may be reached and some agreeable aviation legislation may result.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is in sympathy with that kind of a proposal?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; when the objectionable features have been ironed out.

Mr. BENDER. I want it to appear in the RECORD, that all of us deeply appreciate the personal efforts of the gentleman from Nebraska, and the work of his subcommittee in behalf of the general aviation problem, both civilian and war. You have made a great contribution, which we do appreciate.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I think a great tribute is being paid this afternoon by the fact that the Members have such confidence in the work of this committee and that they feel you have done such a good job that it is not necessary for a great many of them to watch this appropriation bill. I think it is something you should feel very proud of, as well as the chairman of the subcommittee, that the Members have such confidence in your work.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman very much. I am sure I speak the appreciation of the membership of our committee for his kind words.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks. I have already secured permission in the House for extending this list of 672 heroes in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LIST OF GRADUATES OF CIVILIAN FLYING SCHOOLS DECORATED FOR BATTLE EXPLOITS

Abercrombie, William W., Long Beach, Calif., Navy Cross.

Adams, Don D., Raineville, W. Va., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.

Adams, Lyle M., Novinger, Mo., Distinguished Flying Cross.

Adams, William B., Glendale, Calif., Silver Star.

Adkins, Frank E., Clarksville, Tenn., Distinguished Service Cross, Silver Star.

Adler, Arthur L., Bronx, N. Y., letter from Secretary of Navy.

Adrianse, Lyle A., Grandville, Mich., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.

Aenchbacker, A. E., Atlanta, Ga., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.

Aiken, Albert S., Cheverly, Md., Air Medal.

Albright, William H., Denver, Colo., Silver Star.

Allen, Gordon L., Lubbock, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.

Ambrose, Kenneth W., Berkeley, Calif., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.

Anderson, Andreas P., Distinguished Flying Cross.

Anderson, Charles L., Portland, Oreg., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.

Anderson, Emmet D., Jr., Lubbock, Tex., letter from Secretary of Navy.

Anderson, John W., Laurens, S. C., Air Medal.

Anderson, William T., Columbia, Tenn., Air Medal.

Arndt, Augustus L., Newton, N. C., Distinguished Flying Cross.

Arnoldus, Robert T., Summerville, Oreg., Air Medal.

Asch, Alfred C., Beaverton, Mich., Purple Heart.

Ashley, Edward S., San Antonio, Tex., Purple Heart.

Auman, Forrester C., Seagrove, N. C., Silver Star, Air Medal.

Austin, James H., Charlotte, N. C., Air Medal.

Austin, William R., Roanoke, Va., Silver Star.

Avendano, Joseph, Brawley, Calif., Silver Star.

Bailey, Kenneth D., Durham, N. C., Medal of Honor, Silver Star.

Bailey, Melvin D., Quitman, Tex., Silver Star.

Baker, Joe B., Tyler, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Baker, Robert H., Houston, Tex., Air Medal.
Baker, Ross C., Alexandria, La., Air Medal.
Baker, Wayne, Detroit, Mich., Navy and Marine Corps Medal.
Balenti, Richard P., Altus, Okla., Air Medal.
Ball, Edgar D., Nashville, Tenn., Air Medal.
Ballentine, Henry R., Summerville, Pa., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Bankhead, Heber B., Wellsville, Utah, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Bannon, John R., Rochester, Minn., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Bartels, Louis E., Clinton, Ill., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Bartholomeo, Victor H., Chicago, Ill., Air Medal, Silver Star.
Bass, Horace A., Roanoke, Va., Navy Cross.
Bastian, George F., New Orleans, La., Air Medal.
Bauer, Carl R., Santa Monica, Calif., Silver Star.
Beadle, Frank R., Grand Rapids, Mich., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Beal, Frederick R., Santa Rosa, Calif.
Beasley, William D., Tampa, Fla., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Beidelman, Frederick W., Jacksonville, Fla., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Belew, Harold E., Fresno, Calif., Air Medal.
Bellows, Donno C., Mason City, Iowa, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Bennett, Earl C., Baltic, S. D., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Benson, Robert H., San Francisco, Calif., Navy Cross.
Bergner, Karl W., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Berman, Samuel D., Terrace Park, Ohio, Air Medal.
Bestgen, Walter E., Wichita, Kans., Air Medal two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Bevins, Hiram O., Milton, Vt., Air Medal.
Bevlock, James J., Philadelphia, Pa., Distinguished Service Cross.
Bird, Clement W., Albuquerque, N. Mex., Air Medal.
Birdsong, George F., Clarksdale, Miss., Distinguished Flying Cross, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Blank, John E., Ferndale, Mich., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Blanton, Thadd H., Gainesville, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Blevins, Hilary M., Kuchorman, Ark., Distinguished Flying Cross, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Bley, Charles W., Berkeley, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Byerley, Daniel W., Seattle, Wash., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Byrnes, Robert C., Winfield, La., Air Medal.
Bobrow, Alan L., Philadelphia, Pa., Air Medal.
Boll, John J., Ironton, Ohio, Air Medal.
Boock, Robert A., Springfield, Ill., Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Booker, Dennis G., St. Cloud, Minn., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Bone, Jim K., Cresson, Tex., Air Medal.
Bong, Richard I., Poplar, Wis., Distinguished Service Cross, Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, 14 Oak Leaf Clusters.
Booth, Harry J., Charlotte, N. C., Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Borich, Nick, Portland, Oreg., Silver Star.
Bowers, Robert H., Phoenix, Ariz., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Bowers, William J., Seattle, Wash., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Boyden, James C., Colorado Springs, Colo., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Bradbury, Joe E., Bexley, Ohio, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Brainard, Ceylon H., Pasadena, Calif., Purple Heart.
Brannon, Charles E., Montgomery, Ala., Navy Cross.
Brinson, Sheldon S., Bainbridge, Ga., Silver Star, Air Medal.
Britton, William K., Plainview, Tex., Air Medal.
Brookhart, Joseph W., Hyattsville, Md., Silver Star.
Brooks, Norman E., Pheonix, Ariz., Air Medal.
Brorein, Carl D., Tampa, Fla., Air Medal.
Brown, Bryan W., El Paso, Tex., Silver Star.
Brown, Jack D., Salt Lake City, Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Brown, Llewellyn L., Jr., Malverne, Ark., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Brown, Robert J., New York City, Distinguished Service Cross.
Browning, Richard C., Buffalo, N. Y., Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Buck, Sidney E., Kensington, Md., Air Medal, nine Oak Leaf Clusters.
Bunderson, Mack V., Emery, Utah, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Burger, Arthur L., Springfield, Mass., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Burges, George D., Charleston, S. C., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Burnett, Pelham R., Baltimore, Md., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Burns, John P., Berkeley, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Burns, Ralph W., Malden, Mass., Air Medal.
Burr, Albert H., Coral Gables, Fla., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Butler, John C., Buckeye, Ariz., Navy Cross.
Butler, Richard D., San Diego, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Caldwell, Morris C., Nashville, Tenn., Silver Star.
Calhoun, William R., Jr., Birmingham, Ala., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, one Oak Leaf Cluster, Air Medal with three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Callender, Alvin D., Lake Providence, La., Air Medal.
Cameron, William R., Hanford, Calif., Silver Star.
Campbell, C. W., McComb, Miss., Air Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Campbell, Kendall C., Lamar, Colo., Navy Cross, Gold Star.
Campbell, Leonard N., Roseville, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Campbell, Robert B., Marshall, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Campbell, William P., San Francisco, Calif., Silver Star.
Cannon, Joseph E., Gladstone, Mich., letter from Secretary of War.
Carey, Ernest H., Gridley, Calif., Air Medal.
Carey, Henry A., Ithaca, N. Y., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Carson, Bill E., Oklahoma City, Okla., Air Medal.
Carter, George H., Norfolk, Va., Silver Star.
Carter, Irwin W., St. Petersburg, Fla., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Carter, William D., Nashville, Tenn., Distinguished Flying Cross, two Gold Stars.
Caulkett, George W., Dallas, Tex., Air Medal.
Chambers, Arthur L., Mount Tabor, N. J., Silver Star.
Check, Raymond J., Granville, N. Dak., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Cheli, Ralph, Bethlehem, Pa., Medal of Honor, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Clancy, William E., Jackson, Miss., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Clark, Charles D., McAllen, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Clark, John F., Remington, Ind., Distinguished Flying Cross, one Oak-Leaf Cluster.
Clark, Thomas J., Ligonier, Pa., Air Medal.
Clark, Walter, Lincolnton, N. C., Silver Star.
Cliburn, Charles E., Hazelhurst, Miss., Purple Heart, Distinguished Flying Cross, one Oak-Leaf Cluster.
Clifford, John K., Tacoma, Wash., Navy Cross.
Clinton, Carl C., Fort Smith, Ark., Air Medal.
Clute, George S., Watsonville, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Coe, Donald R., Humboldt, Kans., Air Medal.
Coit, Harland J., Montclair, N. J., Air Medal.
Cole, Richard E., Dayton, Ohio, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Coleman, Samuel E., Tacoma, Wash., Distinguished Flying Cross, Gold Star.
Collingworth, J. D., Borger, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Compton, George A., Pennington, N. J., Air Medal.
Compton, James E., Salina, Kans., Air Medal.
Compton, William B., Compton, Calif., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Comstock, Harold E., Fresno, Calif., Air Medal, one Oak-Leaf Cluster.
Conger, Jack Eugene, Des Moines, Iowa, Navy Cross.
Conn, Myron R., Coalinga, Calif., Silver Star.
Conrad, Earl O., Jr., Great Falls, Mont., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Coolbaugh, Walter W., Clarke-Summit, Pa., Navy Cross.
Coonan, John J., Edgewood Station, R. I., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Corry, Roy A., Santa Ana, Calif., Navy Cross.
Cramer, Charles O., Akron, Ohio, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Cresto, John G., Kansas City, Mo., Silver Star.
Cronkite, John L., St. Petersburg, Fla., Air Medal, two Oak-Leaf Clusters.
Crouch, Horace E., Columbia, S. C., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Crouchley, Edward A., Providence, R. I., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Crow, Robert C., Cleveland, Ohio, Navy Cross, Silver Star.
Currey, Douglas V., Sacramento, Calif., Air Medal, three Oak-Leaf Clusters.
Dahl, Milton R., Seattle, Wash., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Dalton, Roy Bale, Arkadelphia, Ark., Distinguished Flying Cross.
D'Arcy, Robert M., Arlington, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Davenport, John D., Landrum, S. C., Air Medal, one Oak-Leaf Cluster.
Davidson, George M., Kendrick, Idaho, Air Medal.
Davidson, James J., Winona, Minn., Silver Star.
Davidson, William K., Austin, Tex., Air Medal, Gold Star.
Davis, Eugene C., Williamstown, Pa., Purple Heart.
Davis, Lowell, L., Vina, Ala., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Davis, Nelson P., Tampa, Fla., Silver Star.
Dean, George B., Lansford, N. Dak., Air Medal.
DeBaum, Clyde E., Bicknell, Ind., Distinguished Flying Cross.
DeBlanc, Jefferson J., Martinville, La., Navy Cross, Air Medal.
Deeds, James A., Oakland, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Denault, Francis P., West Springfield, Mass., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Dennison, Ethan A., Jr., New York, N. Y., letter from Secretary of the Navy.
Detour, Buren L., San Diego, Calif., Navy and Marine Corps Medal.
Devoe, Augustus A., Jr., Spotswood, N. J., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Dibb, Robert A. M., Los Angeles, Calif., Navy Cross.
Dietrich, Alfred E., Detroit, Mich., Air Medal.
Diffley, John M., Birmingham, Ala., Air Medal, two Oak-Leaf Clusters.
Dillon, Barclay H., Jr., Birmingham, Ala., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Dillon, Stephen P., Long Beach, Calif., Air Medal, two Oak-Leaf Clusters.

Dimmitt, Robert E., San Bernardino, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Dinn, Wallace L., Corpus Christi, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Dinsmore, Samuel H., Olympia, Wash., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Disalvo, Joseph F., Batavia, N. Y., Air Medal, two Oak-Leaf Clusters.
Dittler, Donald C., Cleveland, Ohio, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Divine, Robert A., Fresno, Calif., Navy Cross.
Dockstader, Robert B., Long Beach, Calif., Silver Star.
Doherty, John J., Fort Smith, Ark., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Donnell, Earl Roe, Jr., Dallas, Tex., Air Medal.
Dorton, Randall M., Jr., Washington, D. C., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Dowie, Frank D., Jr., Des Moines, Iowa, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Doyle, M. F., Parsons, Kans., Silver Star.
Drakilich, Dan D., Superior, Ariz., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Drury, Frank C., Damby, Mo., Navy Cross.
Dutton, Albert H., Portland, Oreg., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Dwyer, William P., Randolph, Nebr., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Early, Cleland E., Sinnet, Tex., Silver Star.
Ebert, Harry W., Jr., Winchester, Va., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Eck, Walter A., Milwaukee, Wis., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Ek, Bruce H., Spokane, Wash., Navy Cross.
Eland, Stanley C., Portland, Oreg., Air Medal.
Elledge, Raymond P., Houston, Tex., Air Medal.
Ellis, Eugene B., Brownfield, Tex., Air Medal.
Ellis, Lewis N., Chattanooga, Tenn., Distinguished Service Cross.
Ellis, Sherman E., Springfield, Mo., Air Medal.
Ellison, Harold J., Buffalo, N. Y., Navy Cross.
Ely, Don L., Los Angeles, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Emerson, Donald K., Riverside, Calif., Silver Star.
Engle, Godfrey, Jr., Albany, Tex., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Erwin, James C., El Dorado, Ark., Air Medal, one Gold Star.
Erwin, Paul V. B., Miami, Fla., Air Medal.
Esmay, Carle H., St. Maries, Idaho, Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Estes, Chandler B., Athens, Ga., Air Medal.
Eubank, Robert H., Mabank, Tex., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Everett, David R., Fullerton, Calif., Air Medal.
Fairbank, Henry A., Stockton, Calif., Air Medal.
Fairfield, W. A., San Francisco, Calif., Purple Heart.
Farrow, W. G., Washington, D. C., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Faulkner, Lawrence M., Pleasant Hill, Mo., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Feightner, Edward L., Elida, Ohio, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Feldman, Jack H., Pittsburgh, Pa., Purple Heart.
Felk, Charles, Carsonville, Mich., Air Medal.
Ferguson, Joseph W., Pueblo, Colo., Silver Star.
Fields, John W., Shamrock, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Fields, Virgil C., Ventura, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Fincher, Deltis H., Waldron, Ark., Silver Star.
Fisher, Louis W., Portland, Oreg., Air Medal.
Fischer, Phillip S., East Orange, N. J., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Flaherty, Robert F., Waterloo, Iowa, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Forbes, Jimmy M., Kansas City, Mo., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Ford, Robert V., Winston-Salem, N. C., Silver Star.
Formanek, George, Chicago, Ill., Navy and Marine Corps Medal, Distinguished Flying Cross, Gold Star.
Forrer, Sam White, Griffin, Ga., Navy Cross.
Fountain, Zed D., Hattiesburg, Miss., Silver Star.
Francis, Everett R., Newark, Ohio, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Francis, Magnus W., Vallejo, Calif., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Frattali, Vincent C., Scranton, Pa., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Freeman, Charles M., Rochester, N. Y., Silver Star.
Freeman, David B., Jr., Moline, Ill., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Foss, Joe J., Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Medal of Honor, Navy Cross, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Gaede, David L., Columbus, Ohio, Purple Heart.
Gaffney, John P., Lakewood, Ohio, Soldier's Medal.
Gallagher, Thomas J., Dorchester, Mass., Air Medal.
Gardner, Richard B., Salt Lake City, Purple Heart, Air Medal.
Gaskell, Claude W., Opportunity, Wash., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Gaunt, Frank L., North Platte, Nebr., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Gentry, Wayne R., Kimberly, Idaho, Air Medal.
George, Herbert W., Missoula, Mont., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Gerry, Clark H., Tucson, Ariz., Air Medal.
Gibbs, Harry B., Wheeling, W. Va., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Giddens, John R., Inverne, Ala., Purple Heart.
Giddens, Paul O., San Bernardino, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross, one Oak Leaf Cluster, Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Gignac, Edward J., North Vassalboro, Maine, Silver Star.
Gilbert, Fred R., Bellflower, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Gish, Russell C., Waterville, Minn., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Glick, Howard L., Topeka, Kans., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Goerke, Dalton C., Burr, Nebr., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Golberg, Robert T., Blooming Prairie, Minn., Silver Star, Air Medal.
Goldstein, Otto, Norwalk, Conn., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Gowdy, William R., Cincinnati, Ohio, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Grant, Charles S., Washington, D. C., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Grashio, Samuel C., Spokane, Wash., Silver Star.
Gray, Gordon E., Kirkwood, Mo., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Gray, Robert, Killeen, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Green, Donald J., Anaconda, Mont., Silver Star, one Oak Leaf Cluster, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Gregory Lewis H., Quincy, Fla., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Greve, Thomas E., Houston, Tex., Air Medal.
Griffen, Thomas C., Chicago, Ill., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Griffith, John H., Chicago, Ill., Air Medal.
Griswold, Don T., Clarinda, Iowa, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Gustke, Russell F., Port Huron, Mich., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Haberman, Roger A., Ellsworth, Wis., Navy Cross.
Hagenback, James J., Chicago, Ill., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Hair, James M., Gatesville, Tex., Air Medal.
Halford, James A., Orosi, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross, one Gold Star.
Hall, William M., Mobile, Ala., Navy Cross.
Hamilton, Linton D., Detroit, Mich., Air Medal.
Hamilton, Merle C., Orchard, Nebr., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Hand, Clarence B., Miles City, Mont., Air Medal.
Hanna, Walter J., Jr., Gilroy, Calif., Silver Star.
Hansen, Paul M., Milan, Mich., Air Medal.
Hanson, Eugene R., Burlington, Iowa, Navy Cross, one Gold Star.
Harries, Frederick C., Hurley, Wis., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Harris, Bill, Springville, Calif., Air Medal.
Harris, Ray E., Kansas City, Mo., Air Medal.
Hartman, Elmer, Basin, Wyo., Air Medal.
Hawes, Robert E., North Dartmouth, Mass., Distinguished Flying Cross, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Hazard, Richard C., Pomeroy, Wash., Navy and Marine Corps Medal.
Heard, John J., Jr., Kerrville, Tex., Silver Star.
Heck, Edward, Jr., Oakland, Calif., Navy Cross.
Heinitsh, Reginald D., Columbia, S. C., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Helveston, George T., Tatum, Tex., Silver Star.
Henning, Richard T., Albemarle, N. C., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Henry, William Earl, Bakersfield, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross, Gold Star, Air Medal.
Herndon, Joseph T., Colorado Springs, Colo., Air Medal.
Herndon, Nolan A., Sulphur Springs, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Hickman, Cleveland D., San Francisco, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Hodges, Kenneth S., West Los Angeles, Calif., Air Medal.
Hogan, Stephen C., Chicago, Ill., Navy Cross.
Hollingworth, Lloyd D., Wilmington, Del., Air Medal.
Holmes, Walter T., Jr., Denton, Tex., Purple Heart, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Holsey, Raymond E., Altus, Okla., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Holt, Marion H., Jonesboro, Tenn., Distinguished Flying Cross..
Hoover, Fred D., Jr. Gladstone, Mich., Silver Star.
Hoover, James K., Sulphur Rock, Ark., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Hopper, George A., Jr., Banning, Calif., Letter from Secretary of Navy.
House, A. T., Jr., Long Beach, Calif., Air Medal.
Houseworth, Carl H., Harveyville, Kans., Air Medal.
Howes, Edward B., Highland, Calif., Air Medal.
Hronek, William H., Snoqualmie Falls, Wash., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Hudson, Henry D., Watervliet, N. Y., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Huey, Stanley G., Seattle, Wash., Air Medal.
Hughes, Charles E., Oakdale, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Hyland, Norman D., Mobile, Ala., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Hynds, Kermit C., Austin, Tex., Silver Star.
Ilfrey, Jack M., Houston, Tex., Air Medal.
Irwin, Darrell D., Duluth, Minn., Distinguished Flying Cross, Gold Star.
Iverson, Leroy C., Valley City, N. Dak., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Jackson, Jean D., Tulsa, Okla., Silver Star.
Jacobson, Sidney W., Shreveport, La., Silver Star.
Jennings, Wallace R., Santa Ana, Calif., Air Medal.
Jobe, Fletcher H., Chatttanooga, Tenn., Air Medal.
Johnson, Charles C., Fort Worth, Tex., Purple Heart, Silver Star.
Johnson, Clarence, Jr., San Bernardino, Calif., Air Medal.

Johnson, Dee A., Logan, Utah, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Johnson, Gerald R., Eugene, Oreg., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Johnson, Grove C., Omaha, Nebr., Air Medal
Johnson, Harold C., Richmond, Calif., Air Medal.
Johnston, John C., Greenville, N. C., Air Medal.
Jones, Curran L., Columbia, S. C., Silver Star.
Jones, Jack, Mansfield, Ga., Air Medal.
Jones, James F., Lake Butler, Fla., Purple Heart, Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Jones, R. M., Godley, Tex., Air Medal.
Jordan, George W., Rockford, Ill., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Judd, Daniel H., Berkeley, Calif., Air Medal.
Jurkens, Edward A., Sterling, Ill., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Kaiser, James M., Youngstown, Ohio, Silver Star, Air Medal.
Kappeler, Frank A., Alameda, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Katz, Aaron, Cleveland, Ohio, Navy Cross.
Keller, Robert F., Wichita, Kans., Air Medal.
Kelly, Robert E., Dallas, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Kelting, John A., Toledo, Ohio, Silver Star.
Kennedy, Lawrence C., Fairfax, Mo., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Kennedy, Robert D., Chicago, Ill., Air Medal.
Killian, Clinton H., Roosevelt, Utah, Distinguished Flying Cross. Air Medal.
Kinney, William E., Springfield, Ohio, Silver Star, Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Kinzer, Edward B., Beckley, W. Va., Navy Cross.
Kirk, Kenneth J., Jr., Barre, Vt., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Kirkpatrick, Donald, Evanston, Ill., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Kish, Andrew K., Nixon, N. J., Silver Star.
Kjerulff, Lauritz T., Lake Charles, La., Air Medal.
Kopf, J., Jr., Modesto, Calif., Silver Star.
Koutelas, George E., Kansas City, Kans., Navy Cross.
Kuehnast, Irving L., Badger, Iowa, Air Medal.
Kunz, Charles M., Minneapolis, Minn., Navy Cross, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Kyes, William B., Elwell, Mich., Purple Heart.
Kyle, Paul J., Arlington, Va., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Lamb, Robert A., Brooklyn, N. Y., Air Medal.
Lamm, Louis J., Vici, Okla., Air Medal.
Landers, John D., Joshua, Tex., Air Medal.
Larsen, Carl A., Renron, Wash., Air Medal.
Larson, Robert R., Albert Lee, Minn., Air Medal.
Laven, George, Jr., San Antonio, Tex., Distinguished Service Cross.
Lawrence, Claude H., Mount Airy, N. C., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Leader, Kent E., Winchester, Idaho, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Lebrecht, Royden L., Denison, Tex., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Lee, Donald H., Jr., Detroit, Mich., Air Medal.
Lee, Jack (deceased), Alamogordo, N. Mex., Silver Star, Air Medal.
Lee, Stanley, Denver, Colo., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Leland, Glen C., Jr., St. Petersburg, Fla., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Lesicka, Joseph J., Westmorland, Calif., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Leslie, Gene J., Bailey, Tex., Air Medal.
Liffner, Harry W., New York City, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Lind, Harold A., Wilmington, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Lindsey, Virgil B., Washington Park, N. C., Purple Heart.
Lombard, John D., Ionia, Mich., Silver Star.
Long, Robert H., Gainesville, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Long, Stanley A., Marquette, Mich., Air Medal, one Oak-Leaf Cluster.
Lovelace, John Wade, Commerce, Tex., Air Medal.
Lumkin, George T., Louisburg, N. C., Navy Cross.
Lundy, James T., Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Air Medal, three Oak-Leaf Clusters.
McAteer, James J., Philadelphia, Pa., Air Medal, one Oak-Leaf Cluster.
McBreen, Francis J., Spokane, Wash., Silver Star.
McCafferty, Donald E., Hempstead, N. Y., Distinguished Flying Cross.
McCarty, Martin W., Jr., Lubbock, Tex., Air Medal.
McClaran, Clarence E., Marshall, Tex., Purple Heart.
McClung, Guy H., Lawton, Okla., Distinguished Flying Cross.
McComsey, Robert M., Lancaster, Pa., Air Medal.
McCool, Harry C., Colorado Springs, Colo., Distinguished Flying Cross.
McDonald, John Bruce, Wake Forest, N. C., Distinguished Flying Cross.
McDonald, Norman L., Framingham, Mass., Distinguished Flying Cross, one Oak-Leaf Cluster.
McDonald, Robert L., Reno, Nev., Air Medal.
McDonnough, John M., Oakland, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
McEniry, John H., Jr., Bessemer, Ala., Silver Star.
McGee, John N., Spokane, Wash., Silver Star.
McKane, Edmond R., Oklahoma City, Okla., Silver Star.
McKearn, William, Beloit, Wis., Silver Star.
McKnight, Louis S., Port Neches, Tex., Air Medal, two Oak-Leaf Clusters.
McLemore, Richard M., Helena, Mont., Silver Star.
McMahon, Robert F., Mitchell, S. Dak., Purple Heart.
McMarrell, Mac M., Kendallville, Ind., Purple Heart.
McMurray, Henry S., San Leandro, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
McWherter, R. W., Paris, Tex., Air Medal.
McWilliams, Major H., Thayer, Miss., Air Medal.
McWilliams, Robert, Jr., Clarksdale, Miss., Purple Heart, Air Medal, one Oak-Leaf Cluster.
MacDonald, Ward Douglas, Fremont, Mich., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Macia, J. H., Tucson, Ariz., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Madole, Eugene P., Long Beach, Calif., Navy Cross.
Maglio, Frank J., Sanger, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Magness, Thomas M., Ventura, Calif., Air Medal, one Oak-Leaf Cluster.
Manchester, Donald D., Spokane, Wash., Air Medal.
Mangas, John H., Portland, Oreg., Silver Star.
Manning, George M., Muskegon, Mich., Silver Star, Air Medal.
Manthe, F. L., Sacramento, Calif., Air Medal.
Markley, Robert H., Nordin, Okla., Purple Heart.
Marontate, William P., Seattle, Wash., Navy Cross.
Martensen, William B., Pomona, Calif., Air Medal.
Marthey, Clarence L., Butte, Mont., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Martin, Marion T., Three Rivers, Tex., Silver Star.
Martin, Robert B., Waco, Tex., Silver Star.
Massey, John M., Athens, Ga., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Mathis, Peyton S., Jr., Montgomery, Ala., Silver Star, Air Medal.
Matthews, Winton E., Albany, Tex., Air Medal.
Maul, Elmer, Denver, Colo., Navy Cross.
Mayes, John Bernard, Newberry, S. C., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Meder, Robert J., Lakewood, Ohio, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Medford, John C., Fort Towson, Okla., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Melbraaten, Harold E., Billings, Mont., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Merrill, Milford A., Long Beach, Calif., Navy Cross.
Mickish, Albert J., Perry, Okla., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Middleditch, Lyman, Jr., Highlands, N. J., Distinguished Service Cross.
Middleton, Arthur J., Portland, Oreg., Air Medal.
Miles, Earl C., Fullerton, Calif., Air Medal.
Miller, Benton E., Los Angeles, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Miller, Carr L., Rockwell, N. C., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Miller, Chas. J., St. Louis, Mo., Air Medal.
Miller, Richard E., Fort Wayne, Ind., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Miller, Richard G., El Paso, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Miller, William E., Neillsville, Wis., Air Medal.
Mills, A. L., Lawrence, Kans., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Mills, Lloyd J., Cove, Oreg., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Mobbs, George D., Wooster, Ark., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Moody, Calvin C., Blytheville, Ark., Air Medal.
Moore, Joseph T., Clinton, Ind., Purple Heart.
Moore, Marshall W., Pontiac, Mich., Silver Star.
Moore, Pren L., El Centro, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Moore, Thomas C., Clewiston, Fla., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Moore, Thomas F., Coral Gables, Fla., Navy Cross, Silver Star.
Moose, Robert A., Omaha, Nebr., Air Medal.
Morgan, Corwin F., Gainesville, Fla., Navy Cross.
Morris, Herbert A., Durant, Okla., Air Medal.
Morris, Wm. P., Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Mowry, Emerson D., Woonsocket, R. I., Air Medal.
Muehlberg, John R., Montclair, N. J., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Myers, Duncan C., Bradenton, Fla., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Naismith, Robert E., Alhambra, Calif., Air Medal.
Neal, Charles P., Bunkie, La., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Neal, Scott H., Ranger, Tex., Purple Heart.
Nelson, Eyestein, Poulsbo, Wash., Air Medal.
Newbury Edw. S. E., Bakersfield, Calif., Air Medal.
Newman, W. A., Kansas City, Kans., Silver Star.
Ney, Robert J., Eagle Lake, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Nickerson, Henry J., Wheeling, W. Va., Navy Cross.
Nicks, John D., Indianapolis, Ind., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Nielson, C. J., Hyrum, Utah, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Oestretcher, Robert G., Columbus, Ohio, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Oliver, Bernard J., Prescott, Ariz., Silver Star.
Oliveros, Chas. G., St. Augustine, Fla., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Omohundro, Thos. T., Wagoner, Okla., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Oscar, Robert E., Cleveland, Ohio, Air Medal.
Ostrom, Dewey A., Seattle, Wash., Air Medal.

Overend, Walter J., Fennville, Mich., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Owen, Geo. Frederick, Redstone, Mont., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Owens, Joel A., Jr., Skiatook, Okla., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Oauk, Charles, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Paine, Charles J., Jr., Waycross, Ga., Air Medal.
Palmer, Phillip T., Wellington, Kans., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Parker, Ben L., San Diego, Calif., Air Medal.
Parker, George A., Riverside, Calif., Silver Star.
Parker, James E., Compton, Calif., Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Parkinson, Thos. C., Baltimore, Md., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Pebworth, Jack, Oklahoma City, Okla., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Penn, Perry H., Gotebo, Okla., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Perry, Elton S., Phoenix, Ariz., Distinguished Service Cross.
Perry, Robert L., Palo Alto, Calif., Silver Star.
Peterson, David R., Long Beach, Calif., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Pfund, Melvin G., Norfolk, Nebr., Purple Heart, Silver Star, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Pierce, Francis E., Coronado, Calif., Navy Cross.
Pierce, Russel K., Jr., Fremont, Nebr., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Planck, Carl G., Jr., Charleston, S. C., Silver Star.
Poire, Joseph C., Dubuque, Iowa, Purple Heart.
Poleschuk, Stephen, Youngstown, Ohio, Silver Star, Air Medal.
Polhemus, Edward B., Temple City, Calif., Air Medal.
Pond, Kenneth A., Jackson, Mich., Navy Cross.
Porter, Larry D., Cedar Springs, Mich., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Portmore, Gilbert S., Framingham, Mass., Silver Star, Air Medal.
Posey, Eldon E., Elk Valley, Tenn., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Potter, Henry A., Pierre, S. Dak., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Potts, Emeree W., Jr., Abingdon, Va., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Pound, William R., Alhambra, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Prchal, Louis A., Omaha, Nebr., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Presley, Frank H., Encinitas, Calif., Navy Cross.
Price, Robert Leo, Wichita, Kans., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Pringle, W. M., Jr., Greensboro, N. C., Air Medal.
Pyle, Clifton, Marshall, Tex., Air Medal, Three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Raddin, James H., Hattiesburg, Miss., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Ramsay, Robert L., Jr., Hollywood, Calif., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Raper, William S., Wheeling, W. Va., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Rauch, Carl T., Cadillac, Mich., Purple Heart.
Rawles, Robert L., Los Angeles, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Ray, Paul E., Tulsa, Okla., Silver Star.
Read, Robert R., Lawton, Okla., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Reber, Marlin E., Ypsilanti, Mich., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Reed, Bill J., Siloam Springs, Ark., Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Register, Francis R., Bismarck, N. Dak., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Reynolds, Bradley A., Helena, Mont., Air Medal.
Rice, Arthur T., Farmington, Utah, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Rice, Dixon B., Seattle, Wash., Air Medal.
Riley, Earl F., Greensbury, Ind., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Riley, Joseph A., Wahpeton, N. Dak., Navy Cross.
Ringblom, Allen H., Miami, Fla., Navy Cross.
Ritchie, Robert M., Morrison, Ill., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Roddenberry, Eugene W., El Paso, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Rodgers, William R., Rolling Fork, Miss., Silver Star.
Rogers, Arthur L., Rome, Ga., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Roitsch, Clarence A., La Grange, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Roller, Jack, Los Angeles, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Rollow, Jesse D., Jr., Washington, D. C., Silver Star.
Ross, James S., Arkansas City, Ark., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Rothenburg, Allan, Washington, D. C., Navy Cross, Silver Star.
Rouse, Arthur Jr., Oxford, Nebr., Air Medal.
Rowland, J. M., Fort Worth, Tex., Silver Star.
Royal, Francis R., Manbanola, Colo., Silver Star.
Rozzelle, Richard E., Washington, D. C., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Russell, Donald H., Lafayette, Ind., Air Medal.
Sageser, Ralph James, Chattanooga, Tenn., Air Medal.
Salter, Richard D., Elmhouse, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Sanders, John J., Corpus Christi, Tex., Air Medal.
Sandoval, William B., Walnut Park, Calif., Navy Cross.
Sandretto, Amedeo, Eureka, Calif., Air Medal.
Saxhaug, Kenneth W., Wahpeton, N. Dak., Air Medal.
Schaefer, Regis J., Pittsburgh, Pa., Silver Star.
Schmidt, Jynn, Greenville, Ill., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Schichner, Leroy A., Chicago, Ill., Air Medal.
Schill, Richard T., Houston, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Schleeh, Russel E., San Francisco, Calif., Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Schlegal, Paul W., Fleetwood, Pa., Navy Cross.
Schlendering, Harold, Pasadena, Calif., Navy Cross.
Scott, Robert R., Los Angeles, Calif., Navy Medal of Honor.
Seaman, Clarence O., Fresno, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Secrest, James LaVell, Meridian, Miss., Air Medal.
Sessler, Howard A., Arlington, Mass., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Setzer, Marvin J., Pomona, Calif., Air Medal.
Shaffer, Dale L., Decatur, Ill., Silver Star.
Shaffer, Joseph D., Long Beach, Calif., Silver Star, Air Medal.
Sheffield, Frederick, Jr., Waltham, Mass., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Sherk, James G., Beaumont, Calif., Air Medal.
Shine, Wilbur G., Delano, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Shinn, Lloyd A., Chico, Calif., Air Medal.
Shipman, Mark K., Fresno, Calif., Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Shore, Walter G., Kansas City, Mo., Silver Star, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Shriver, Philip K., North Bend, Oreg., Silver Star.
Sibert, J. W., Indianapolis, Ind., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Siegfried, William E., Lodi, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Simmons, Alva A., Portales, N. Mex., Navy Cross.
Simpson, Archie D., Round Hill, Va., Air Medal.
Simpson, Howard B., Medicine Lodge, Kans., Air Medal.
Simpson, Jerome C., New York City, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Sims, Jack A., Kalamazoo, Mich., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Skinner, John, Jr., Pilot Knob, N. Y., Silver Star.
Slaughter, Charles W., Brooksville, Fla., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Slocumb, Clyde B., Doerum, Ga., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Sloulin, Wesley C., East Williston, N. Dak., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Smith, Brandon C., Electra, Tex., Air Medal.
Smith, Henry K. Omaha, Nebr., Air Medal.
Smith, Luther P., Jr., Hattiesburg, Miss., Silver Star.
Smith, Martin L., Kidder, Mo., Air Medal.
Smith, Merton V., San Bernardino, Calif., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Smith, Russell L., Palo Alto, Calif., Air Medal.
Smith, Virgil H., McAllen, Tex., Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Snook, Allen W., New Salem, Kans., Air Medal.
Sparks, Kenneth C., Blackwell, Okla., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Spire, Harold, Los Angeles, Calif., Purple Heart.
Staples, George M., Sherman, Tex., Air Medal.
Stege, John A., Lancaster, Calif., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Stockton, Donald E., Redmond, Oreg., Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Stodghill, William E., Rayville, La., Silver Star.
Story, James B., Winfield, Kans., Air Medal.
Stover, Glenn R., Findlay, Ohio, Air Medal.
Strait, William V., Jr., Gainesville, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Strole, Francis M., Kansas City, Kans., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Sullivan, Woodruff, Jr., Norwich, Conn., Air Medal.
Sutliff, Don L., Blackwell, Okla., Air Medal.
Swan, Robert S., Middletown, N. Y., Air Medal.
Swiger, James R., Warrington, W. Va., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Swett, James E., San Mateo, Calif., Medal of Honor.
Tate, Clark A., Fulton, Mo., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Taylor, Thomas K., St. Louis, Mo., Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Taylor, Wallace C., Ontario, Calif., Silver Star.
Terrell, Jennings S., Jr., Hamblin, Tex., Purple Heart.
Thacker, Clarence L., Kissimmee, Fla., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Thal, Bernhardt N., Chicago, Ill., Air Medal.
Thomas, George R., Jr., Glendale, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Thompson, Donald V., Farmington, Minn., Air Medal.
Thompson, Lassiter, El Paso, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Thomson, John A., Webster Grove, Miss., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Thorington, W. R., Montgomery, Ala., Silver Star.
Tice, Clay, Jr., Phoenix, Ariz., Silver Star.
Tollen, James R., San Francisco, Calif., Air Medal.
Townsend, Guy M., Houston, Tex., Air Medal.
Traylor, Melvin A., San Diego, Calif., Silver Star.
Truelove, Denver V., Lula, Ga., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Tucker, Charles, La Crescenta, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Turner, William L., Idalau, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.

Tuttle, Ralph F., Coffeyville, Kans., Air Medal.

Uber, Clyde S., Newcastle, Pa., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross.

Vale, Charles M., Stuart, Fla., letter from Secretary of the Navy.

Vammen, Clarence Earl, Aberdeen, Wash., Distinguished Flying Cross.

Van Eeuwen, C. W., Grant, Mich., Distinguished Flying Cross.

Varlan, Bertram S., Boise, Idaho, Navy Cross.

Viens, Leo E., Pawtucket, R. I., Distinguished Flying Cross.

Vitunac, Walter C., Pittsburgh, Pa., Air Medal.

Voellmeck, Joseph, Seattle, Wash., Air Medal.

Voss, John D., San Antonio, Tex., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.

Wade, Ernest C., Bristol, Va., Distinguished Flying Cross.

Waldroup, Marvin M., Jr., Dixie, La., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.

Walker, Leland A., Jr., Salt Lake City, Utah, Purple Heart.

Walter, Donald A., Painesville, Ohio, Distinguished Service Cross, Purple Heart.

Watts, Ralph K., Compton, Calif., Silver Star.

Webber, Donald L., San Diego, Calif., Air Medal.

Weeks, Murry E., Greenwood, Miss., Air Medal.

Weiland, Charles P., Ashton, S. Dak., Air Medal.

Welch, George S., Wilmington, Del., Distinguished Service Cross.

Welch, James W., Jr., St. Augustine, Fla., Distinguished Flying Cross.

Weller, Charles E., Beaumont, Tex., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.

Werner, Richard K., Kenmore, N. Y., Purple Heart.

West, Leonard A., Hancock, Mich., Air Medal.

Wheadon, Elmer M., Los Angeles, Calif., Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters.

White, Herbert C., Lufkin, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.

White, John Howard, Kensett, Ark., Distinguished Flying Cross, one Oak Leaf Cluster.

Whitlock, Charles P., New Brunswick, N. J., Air Medal.

Whittaker, Ray E., Knoxville, Tenn., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.

Wikle, Jesse O., Jr., Madison, Ala., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.

Wildner, Carl R., Amherst, Mass., Distinguished Flying Cross.

Wilhoite, Thomas M., Guthrie, Ky.

Wilke, Jack W., Covina, Calif., Navy Cross.

Williams, Carl T., Jr., South Gate, Calif., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.

Williams, Griffith P., San Diego, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.

Williams, James M., Huntsville, Tex., Air Medal.

Williams, R. E. E., Marietta, Ohio, Air Medal.

Willis, Robert H., Oakland, Calif., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.

Wilson, Gordon H., Whitesburg, Ky., Air Medal.

Winkler, John M., Chanute, Kans., Distinguished Flying Cross.

Withee, Orville A., Minneapolis, Minn., Air Medal.

Wolf, Gomer A., Mt. Vernon, Ohio, Air Medal.

Wolfe, Merritt C., Akron, Ohio, Air Medal.

Wood, John E., Denver, Colo., Air Medal.

Woodring, Dugan W., Noble, Okla., Silver Star.

Working, William H., Nashville, Tenn., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.

Worthington, Jos. A., Kingsville, Tex., Air Medal.

Wright, Bill, Commerce, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.

Wright, John M., Hernando, Miss., Distinguished Flying Cross.

Wyllie, William P. Jr., Topeka, Kans., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.

Yates, Leo M., Ogden, Utah, Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.

Yates, William J., Calexico, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.

Yelvington, James L., San Marcos, Tex., Purple Heart, Silver Star.

Yenalavage, Anthony, Kingston, Pa., Distinguished Flying Cross.

Young, Howard N., Berkeley, Calif., Purple Heart.

Younkman, Marshall A., Tulsa, Okla., Distinguished Flying Cross.

Zant, Robert W., Grand Rapids, Mich., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.

Zuber, John W., Missoula, Mont., Air Medal.

Anderson, James A., Cleveland, Ga., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.

Hays, John E., Bakersfield, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.

Horner, Richard E., Wrenshall, Minn., Silver Star.

Lanphier, Thos. G., Detroit, Mich., Navy Cross, Silver Star, one Oak Leaf Cluster, Air Medal.

Pearsal, Edward L., Brooklyn, N. Y., Silver Star, Life Saving Medal.

Perry, John Edward, Silver Star.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] such time as he may desire.

THE VANISHING STATES

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Members of the House the report filed by the gentleman from Texas, Chairman MANSFIELD, of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, being Report No. 1000, to accompany H. R. 3961, the so-called river and harbor bill.

I call your attention particularly to the minority report, which discusses and directs attention to several matters, but particularly to the language in the first paragraph, which evidences no respect for the living or the dead, which reads as follows:

That penstocks or other similar facilities adapted to the possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam herein authorized when approved by the Secretary of War upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and of the Federal Power Commission, and such recommendations shall be based upon consideration of the proper utilization and conservation in the public interest of the resources of the region and the Chief of Engineers is authorized in his discretion to construct powerhouses and install power machinery and appurtenances for the development of hydroelectric power at any dam heretofore or hereafter authorized by any act of Congress: *And provided further*, That in any case where the total authorization for a project heretofore or hereafter authorized by Congress is not sufficient to complete plans that may have been made, the Chief of Engineers is authorized in his discretion to plan and make expenditures on preparations for the project, such as the purchase of lands, easements, and rights-of-way; readjustments of roads, railroads, and other utilities; removal of towns, cemeteries, and dwellings from reservoir sites; and the construction of foundations.

Mr. Chairman, Congress either assumes or undertakes to avoid a very great responsibility when it tries to delegate to the discretion of the Chief of Army Engineers the authority necessary to permit him to desecrate graveyards; disinter the dead; destroy towns; disrupt State highway programs; divert railroad routes, and in general, without conference with the States, to construct dams, powerhouses, penstock dams and other facilities, if and when and wherever the Secretary of War and the Federal Power Commission in times of peace may recommend. This spells the end of democratic-republican government and is the construction of a foundation for a 100 percent socialization of this Government, under a blanket purely totalitarian, dictatorial, and a military authority. It cannot be that we will allow it. It is time the people understood what is being undertaken so insidiously to destroy the ancient landmarks under the guise of an alleged progress which leads down the broad road to destruction of all they have fought for and we are now trying to preserve.

And the minority report of the committee says with regard to that paragraph:

We oppose this delegation of power as unnecessary and unwise, especially at a time when the country is demanding that the Congress more effectively recognize and assume its duties and responsibilities as defined by the Constitution.

It is apparent that Congress will be in almost continuous session for an indefinite period and, therefore, there is no justification for such a sweeping and all-inclusive delegation of authority to any office or agency of the Government.

"GOD HELPS THOSE WHO HELP THEMSELVES"

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a matter which should vitally and intensely interest every Member of this House, the Governors and the people of every State in the Union, because it is another attempt of the gargantuan octopus of New Deal bureaucracy, federalization, and centralization to swallow what is left of the rights reserved to the States not already absorbed by this giant drunk with power.

AN UNCONSCIONABLE PROVISION

The provisions referred to are unconscionable, in derogation of, in disregard of, and also destructive of the rights of the States.

It would be a dangerous step to take for Congress to delegate so much power, if any in the premises, to the sole judgment of any Chief of Engineers of the Army.

The provision has bound up within it the dynamic power to destroy the States and to drown them off the map.

It is unbelievable to think that Congress would consider such a proposition of delegation of its powers as against the rights of the States, at least to be heard in some court, before they are executed.

A PROPOSED AMENDMENT

Think it over and be ready to vote for an amendment to be offered intended to save your State from the humiliation of being further sunk in the obscurity of totalitarianism and federalization, and all States from losing their lives as component parts of this Union, while the people lose their liberty.

It is time now to recapture some of our congressional powers and prerogatives, to stop delegating and wasting our authority again.

The States are pretty well forced out of the picture in which they should be the dominant actors in an effort to save themselves. They should be aroused to what confronts them and eager to fight to live. If they are not so aroused and do not try through their lawfully constituted representatives to save themselves, to recapture what they have lost, and to take their place in the sun to fight further Federal depredation, destruction, devastation, and confiscation, as only can be done under the totalitarian despotism now attempted, we shall wake up to find that we have no country to save.

God save us, the States, and the Government.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4204) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks, I wish to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ROTATION OF SERVICE IN THE NAVAL FORCES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to insert as part of my remarks a letter I received from the Navy Department regarding the rotation of men in service.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the following letter was received by me today from the Navy Department regarding the rotation and relief of men who have served a long time at sea and in foreign lands. It is a matter I have discussed frequently with the War and Navy Departments:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL,
Washington, D. C., February 17, 1944.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Reference is made to your telephone conversation of February 16, 1944, in the interest of naval personnel serving outside the continental limits of the United States.

The Bureau has announced the policy of rotating enlisted personnel for rehabilitation leave and reassignment, after a minimum period of service of 18 months in hazardous duty afloat or in outlying stations. However, this is promulgated as a matter of policy and not of directive, since the granting of leave or rotation must be consistent with the maintenance of the fighting efficiency of the service. The method of effectuating this policy is a matter within the cognizance of administrative commands, and the granting of leave remains the prerogative of the commanding officer.

In order that necessary personnel may be available for rotation, the Bureau has authorized interchange of personnel between fleets and naval districts and has conducted surveys of shore based personnel with a view to limiting tours of shore duty; and relief crews in excess of the actual operating force have been provided for submarine and air operations. Construction battalions are returned as units when circumstances permit and new battalions are formed using experienced ratings as the nuclei. Quotas have been assigned to the fleets to supply men for the manning of new construction, and experienced men who have served long periods at sea are returned to the United States to become the nucleus crews of new ships. Key ratings may or may not receive further schooling in addition to rehabilitation leave when returned for a new assignment.

Requests for consideration under these programs should be addressed to commanding officers for consideration by the personnel officers of the distribution commands.

By direction of the Chief of Naval Personnel.

Sincerely yours,
THOS. H. BINFORD,
Captain, United States Navy,
Director of Enlisted Personnel.

This will be good news, I am sure, and I hope to have even better from the Navy Department soon about the return of men to our shores. I have been asking the Army steadily also to try to work out a plan to return the soldiers, for a time anyway, whenever possible, to our shores after they have been on long tours of duty overseas.

I want in no way to interfere with the conduct of the war, but I do know that nothing will be of greater benefit to the service men and women and to their families than to relieve them, at least for a time, not only from the actual fighting but from the extremely bad and unhealthful living conditions under which they have to exist in certain foreign countries.

As a result of my interest I received in a letter from the War Department today information which is as follows:

TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND TROOPS RETURNED TO UNITED STATES FROM OVERSEAS AREAS

More than 200,000 troops, exclusive of sick and wounded, have been sent back to the United States from overseas areas since the beginning of the war, the War Department announced today.

Some of the personnel were sent back to the United States under the policy of rotation which is essentially the exchange of men in overseas theaters for replacements furnished from the United States in accordance with advance requisitions submitted by theater commanders.

Others were sent back under a returned personnel classification, and for them no specific replacements were furnished from the United States. In this category fall men sent back for emergency reasons, for discharge, or, in the case of officers, for the more efficient distribution of the most highly qualified individuals.

In a restatement of its rotation policy for other than air crew personnel, the War Department emphasized that those sent back to the United States will be those with the longest service in their particular overseas command or those with the longest service overseas.

"Each theater commander will prescribe for his theater the period of service which will render individuals eligible for consideration for rotation," the War Department stated. "It must be understood that eligibility does not bestow the right to be relieved from an overseas theater, but only establishes a basis for selection, the actual relief being dependent upon the personnel situation, exigencies of the service, and prosecution of the war."

To date, the minimum period for eligibility for rotation has been decreed as 18 months for service in the north African theater and 2 years in the Alaskan and Caribbean commands. Prescriptions for eligibility in other theaters, including the Southwest Pacific, are being formulated.

The availability of shipping for the transportation of rotational replacements is one of the main factors in controlling the number of eligible men who can be sent back to the United States under the rotation policy. Military exigencies and the personnel situation are other factors.

The purpose of rotation as set forth in the new policy statement is threefold:

1. To insure efficiency of a command by replacing those who do not require hospitalization, but whose morale or health has been adversely affected by prolonged periods of duty under severe conditions, and whose effectiveness cannot be restored by rotation within the theater.

2. To return to the continental United States experienced personnel for use in training and in the formation of new units, or for other purposes.

3. To return by replacement therefor, personnel considered by the theater commander as deserving of such return. Men who have been wounded in action more than once, even though released from the hospital to full duty, are to receive consideration in this connection.

For those men whose health or morale can be restored without a return to the United States, theater and similar commanders have been instructed to "use every means available to them to maintain personnel efficiency by exchange within their commands." The instructions directed that special consideration be given to the relief of personnel of this type on duty at remote or small stations.

On their arrival in the United States, personnel sent back under the rotation policy will be granted sufficient leave of absence or furlough by port or station commanders to enable them to spend 3 weeks wherever they choose. Such personnel will not be ordered to overseas commands again until they have performed duty in the United States subsequent to the furlough or leave granted by the port or station commanders.

Mr. Speaker, I shall continue to urge the War and Navy Departments to at once issue prescriptions for bringing the men back from the South Pacific and other areas which are the most trying of any theaters of war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made today the names of certain students at Tufts College.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. MANASCO, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. KENNEDY), for 1 day, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 429. An act authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously in the name of Congress a Medal of Honor to William Mitchell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 556. An act for the relief of Pedro Jose Arrecoechea; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. 616. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Vullo; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 698. An act to amend part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a); to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

S. 866. An act to fix compensation of registers of the district land offices in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 891. An act for the relief of Rebecca Collins and W. W. Collins; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1028. An act to amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1102. An act for the relief of Helene Murphy; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1112. An act for the relief of Taylor W. Tonge; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1227. An act to amend section 1 of the act providing punishment for killing or assaulting the Federal officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1232. An act to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Patents.

S. 1272. An act to amend section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended, for the purpose of making the provisions of such section prohibiting political contributions apply equally to labor organizations and management organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1323. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret M. Ross; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1326. An act for the relief of the estate of Charles A. Straka; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1335. An act to amend the fourth and fifth provisos of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, 438; 30 U. S. C., secs. 201, 202); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1340. An act to provide for the grading of restaurants in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1399. An act for the relief of Frank Knowles; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1407. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Puerto Rico and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1917, as amended, and known as the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

S. 1433. An act for the relief of Clarence A. Giddens; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1484. An act for the relief of Walter Eugene Hayes; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1517. An act for the relief of Staff Sgt. Marion Johnson, United States Marine Corps, and Sgt. George B. Kress, United States Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1539. An act to authorize the carrying of Civil War battle streamers with regimental colors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1542. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building B. O. Q. O-3 at the United States Naval construction training center, Davisville, R. I., on March 27, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1546. An act to amend an act relating to the incorporation of Providence Hospital, Washington, D. C., approved April 8, 1864; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1549. An act for the relief of Vern M. Stanchfield; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1554. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to change the name of Conduit Road in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1563. An act for the relief of W. E. Dowdell and June Dowdell; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1579. An act to amend the act entitled "An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma," approved January 27, 1933; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1589. An act for the relief of C. Guy Evans, Garland Mineral Springs, Index, Wash.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1632. An act for the relief of Capt. S. E. McCarty (Supply Corps), United States Navy; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1635. An act to eliminate a pay discrimination against the teacher of music at the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1640. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept gifts and bequests for the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1653. An act to provide titles for heads of staff departments of the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1668. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1669. An act to clarify the law relative to allowances for mileage of graduates of the United States Military Academy and transportation of their dependents on assignment to their first duty station and to the mileage allowance of persons entering the United States Military Academy as cadets; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1676. An act for the relief of Sgt. Maj. Richard Shaker, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1677. An act for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Newt A. Smith, United States Naval Reserve, for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire occurring on August 11, 1943, in quarters occupied by him in the armory of Aviation Free Gunnery Unit, Dam Neck, Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1681. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Marine Corps personnel attached to Marine Utility Squadron 152 for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in officers quarters on February 9, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 205. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons who have claims for damages or losses allegedly resulting from the construction, further development, and improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway, Miami to Jacksonville, Fla., and for other purposes;

H. R. 213. An act for the relief of Edward H. Smith;

H. R. 399. An act for the relief of John Sims;

H. R. 547. An act for the relief of Kernan R. Cunningham;

H. R. 550. An act for the relief of Mrs. Renzie Graham;

H. R. 610. An act for the relief of Pacific Dry Dock & Repair Co., Inc.;

H. R. 850. An act for the relief of George M. Louie;

H. R. 1311. An act for the relief of Dan Crotts;

H. R. 1388. An act to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the construction of a scenic parkway to provide an appropriate view of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park from the Tennessee side of the park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1442. An act for the relief of Lafayette Gibson;

H. R. 1467. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Rev. Julius Paal;

H. R. 1854. An act for the relief of Ethel Cohen;

H. R. 1872. An act for the relief of J. E. McCoy & Son;

H. R. 1934. An act for the relief of Mrs. Donald B. Johnston;

H. R. 2075. An act for the relief of Charles R. Hooper;

H. R. 2199. An act to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1898, as amended;

H. R. 2340. An act for the relief of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.;

H. R. 2580. An act to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of South Dakota and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Belle Fourche River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote the most efficient use of those waters, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2639. An act for the relief of William M. Tucker and Nelda M. Tucker;

H. R. 2690. An act for the relief of Oswald L. Sawyer;

H. R. 2691. An act for the relief of Tom S. Steed;

H. R. 2804. An act for the relief of Ruth E. P. Phillips, as executrix of the estate of Amos Russell Phillips, deceased;

H. R. 2924. An act to give effect to the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada; to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2976. An act to grant military rank to certain members of the Navy Nurse Corps;

H. R. 3001. An act for the relief of James T. Rogers;

H. R. 3076. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Arthur J. Martin, Jr., a minor;

H. R. 3153. An act for the relief of the estate of Jennie I. Weston, deceased;

H. R. 3189. An act for the relief of Thomas Lewis;

H. R. 3329. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles H. Morhouse;

H. R. 3332. An act for the relief of Spencer Meeks;

H. R. 3428. An act to amend sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 743; 48 U. S. C., secs. 440, 441, 442);

H. R. 3477. An act to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3504. An act for the relief of Wade Bros, a partnership composed of M. J., G. W., and Ovid Wade;

H. R. 3605. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in tents used as quarters by members of the Twelfth Naval Construction Battalion, Long Island, Alaska, on December 26, 1942, and May 26, 1943, respectively;

H. R. 3606. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire at the Outlying Degaussing Branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942;

H. R. 3607. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in tent L-76 at the Amphibious Training Base, Camp Bradford, Norfolk, Va., on March 15, 1943;

H. R. 3760. An act authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Lt. Gen. Thomas Holcomb, United States Marine Corps; and

H. R. 3916. An act to permit the construction and use of certain pipe lines for pneumatic tube transmission in the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 18, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold a public hearing on Thursday, February 24, 1944, at 10 a. m. to consider H. R. 3264, to amend the patent laws.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

SCHEDULE OF HEARINGS ON FLOOD-CONTROL BILL OF 1944, BEGINNING TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1944, AT 10 A. M.

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the hearings conducted in June 1943, and on amendments to existing law. The committee is definitely committed to the view that flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works and the committee plans an adequate backing of sound flood-control projects available following the war.

1. Friday, February 18: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers and proponents and opponents of projects in other regions in the United States.

2. Tuesday, February 22: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture, the Weather Bureau, Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

3. Wednesday, February 23: Senators and Representatives in Congress.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1197. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting statistics of natural gas companies for 1942; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1198. A letter from the First Assistant Administrator, War Food Administration, transmitting a report of State list of payments to payees who received $1,000 or more under the 1941 and 1942 agricultural conservation and parity-payment programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1199. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to vest title to the U. S. S. *Wolverine* (ex *Michigan*) in the Foundation for the Original U. S. S. *Michigan*, Inc."; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1200. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a list of names whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1201. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for employee health program; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1202. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend sections 4, 7, and 17 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), for the purposes of extending the time in which amendatory contracts may be made, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

1203. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1944, amounting in all to $139,719,249 (H. Doc. No. 424); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 443. Resolution providing funds for expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 346; without amendment (Rept. No. 1157). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3609. A bill to permit the United States to be made a party defendant in certain cases, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1159). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4217. A bill for the relief of sundry claimants, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DIES: Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities. Pursuant to House Resolution 282. Resolution to report on Peace Now Movement; without amendment (Rept. No. 1161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. S. 776. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Louis H. Pink, superintendent of insurance of the State of New York, or his statutory successor, as statutory liquidator of New York Indemnity Co., against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia: Committee on Elections No. 3. House Resolution 444. Resolution to dismiss election contest of James C. Moreland, contestant, against Leonard W. Schuetz, contestee, Seventh Congressional District of the State of Illinois; without amendment (Rept. No. 1158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HENDRICKS.

H. R. 4214. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the purpose of establishing a national cemetery at St. Cloud, Fla.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 4215. A bill to extend to the custodial-service employees of the Post Office Department certain benefits applicable to postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 4216. A bill to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 4218. A bill to provide for the wearing of wound chevrons and war service chevrons by members of the land and naval forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H. R. 4219. A bill to provide for the appointment of female pilots and aviation cadets in the air forces of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 4220. A bill to extend for the duration of the war, without the payment of any further premium, policies of insurance issued by the War Damage Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MERRITT:

H. R. 4221. A bill to suspend the running of the periods of limitation relating to assessment and refund of certain taxes of members of the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. J. Resolution 237. Joint resolution to amend section 3 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the purpose of promoting efficiency, for the utilization of the resources and industries of the United States, and so forth," approved February 8, 1918; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. Res. 446. Resolution directing the House Committee on the Judiciary to inquire into the facts concerning the treaty entered into between the United States and the Republic of Mexico with regard to the disposition of certain waters of the Colorado River; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation reimbursing municipalities for loss of personal property used in war production and exempt from taxation; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to relax the stringent rationing of butter; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 4222. A bill for the relief of Wallace Swenson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 4223. A bill for the relief of Rear Admiral William L. Calhoun, United States Navy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 4224. A bill for the relief of the Morgan Creamery Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 4225. A bill to authorize the presentation to Lt. Col. William J. Wilkins of a Distinguished Service Cross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 4226. A bill for the relief of H. F. Owen; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

4925. By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS: Petition of the Asbury Park liquor beverage organization, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and other prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4926. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. L. R. Sangston and 120 other citizens of Loveland, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4927. Also, petition of F. J. Taylor and 42 other citizens of Yankton, S. Dak., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4928. Also, petition of Rev. T. Garland Smith and 84 other citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4929. Also, petition of Addie Lancaster and 98 other citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4930. Also, petition of Charles W. Clark and 78 other citizens of Pella, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4931. Also, petition of Mrs. J. H. Cunningham and 329 other citizens of Roanoke, Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4932. Also, petition of Ora E. Altum and 101 other citizens of El Paso, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4933. Also, petition of Jane Miller and 108 other citizens of Bridgeport, W. Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4934. Also, petition of John W. Gilbert and 153 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4935. Also, petition of Mae Williams and 93 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4936. Also, petition of Mrs. J. Forgas and 134 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4937. Also, petition of Harry M. Ingradam and 171 other citizens of Batavia, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4938. Also, petition of Miriam Davis and 99 other citizens of Portland, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4939. Also, petition of Mrs. Palmer and 94 other citizens of the State of Washington, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4940. By Mr. CANFIELD: Concurrent resolution adopted by the Assembly of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress of the United States to use its prestige to cause the doors of Palestine to be opened for Jewish immigration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4941. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition submitted by Zollie C. Carpenter, of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, St. Louis, Mo., and signed by thousands of St. Louis citizens, petitioning Congress to pass the soldier-vote bill; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

4942. By Mr. GAVIN: Petition of W. J. Brumbaugh and other members of the Evangelical Church and church school, of Heckathorn Church, South Oil City, Pa., urging enactment of the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4943. Also, petition of C. G. Kiser and other members of the Evangelical Church and church school of Venus, Pa., urging enactment of the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4944. Also, petition of Mrs. H. C. Hulings, president, Gleaners Bible Class of Grace Methodist Church, Warren, Pa., favoring enactment of legislation restricting sale of alcoholic beverages in environs of military camps, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4945. Also, petition of the Women's Missionary Society of the First Baptist Church, Franklin, Pa., favoring enactment of Senate bill 860 and House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4946. Also, petition of H. C. Seigworth, president, and other members of the Men's Brotherhood Class of the Tionesta Methodist Church, Tionesta, Pa., urging support of Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4947. Also, petition of Clara M. Friggle and other residents of Franklin, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4948. Also, petition of Mrs. C. Lettie Wilkins and other citizens of Franklin, Pa., urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4949. Also, petition of James T. Hanna and other members of the Methodist Church and church school of Venus, Pa., urging enactment of the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4950. Also, petition of W. R. Ross, of Cooperstown, Pa., and other signers of Venango County, Pa., urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4951. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Memorial of Dr. Walter P. Taylor, president, the Wildlife Society, College Station, Tex., opposing Senate bill 1046 and House bills 3864 and 3884; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

4952. Also, petition of Robert A. Manire, State director, agricultural education, Austin, Tex., favoring additional appropriations for war-training food production; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4953. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of the employees of the Eastern Manufacturing Co., Inc., of Boston, Mass., favoring the Wright-Compton resolution and the Taft-Wagner bill; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4954. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Jewish Welfare Board, Queens area, New York, protesting against the coming into force of the white paper, and urging our Government to use its best offices with our ally, Great Britain, to bring about the abrogation of the white paper so that there may be a full implementation of the Balfour Declaration for the Jewish homeland; that the Jewish people shall have the right of free entry and immigration into Palestine; and to found colonies where the Jewish immigrants may be settled and find homes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4955. Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of the Borough of Queens, N. Y., endorsing the recommendations of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, that the Government agencies begin immediately to liquidate surplus holdings in land and real estate which are not needed for Federal activities; that consideration be given to the feasibility of assigning the operational functions of appraising, acquiring, abstracting, recording, and disposing of all real estate owned and controlled by the Federal Government to be a central unit to reduce inequity, lack of uniformity, duplication, and waste of funds in connection with Government acquisitions and disposition of real property; and that this

unit shall be a part of already existing Government machinery; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

4956. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition signed by a number of residents of the Twenty-fourth Congressional District, New York, protesting against the enactment of any or all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4957. By Mr. WILEY: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Delaware, opposing any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4958. Also, petition of sundry citizens of the State of Delaware, opposing House bill 2082 or any similar legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4959. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president of the Bradbury Heights Citizens' Association, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Benning Heights Apartments; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4960. Also, petition of the national secretary, Women's International League, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Austin-Wadsworth bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

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

O God of compassion and deliverance, enable us to forsake the taskmasters of hate and discouragement; Thou who dost know and require, do Thou endow us with a chastened sense of all men, then shall the chant of creation be Jehovah's praise. Human life is too precious and the world too fair to be darkened by the clouds of neglect and despair. Forbid that America should ever repudiate the Golden Rule and allow life to be materialized into a sham and mockery. O take our unused powers, our ideals unfulfilled, and our possibilities unachieved and let our soul breathe the breath of God.

Heavenly Father, the real crown of life is service and the finest minds covet the aim of Calvary's cross as they hear its challenging call to gallantry; O may it haunt the valiant hearts of men. In childhood's hour the paths to the altar were plain, but the tides of the world have dulled them; we have lost the wonder and the overmastering compulsion and the sight has faded and the memory of the Prince among men has chilled. O Harbinger, human and divine, when the strongholds of sin confront us, clothe us with chivalrous spirits to accept the challenge. Bless our great Republic for its genius, for its national life, teaching that no one can call Thee Father without having man as brother. "Rise up, O men of God, have done with lesser things and give mind and strength to serve the King of kings." In Thy name. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 14, 1944, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1944.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Shaner, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3997. An act to amend the code of the District of Columbia providing for the sale of fish of the shad or herring species, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4059. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to empower the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to convey land" (approved April 28, 1922).

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

H. J. Res. 192. Joint resolution to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 375. An act for the relief of the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co.; and

S. 1140. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—CONTINUING COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION (H. DOC. NO. 441)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States.

To the House of Representatives:

I received yesterday afternoon, February 17, 1944—H. R. 3477 (S. 1458)—a bill which extends the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation until June 30, 1945, but which by its restrictive provisions would compel an increase in the cost of food and the cost of living to the people of the United States.

I promptly return the bill, without my signature, and urgently recommend that the Congress take action as soon as possible to extend without hampering restrictions the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Farmers could thereby make plans for the planting of crops and know the support prices on which they can rely.

The reasons for my disapproval of H. R. 3477—my most emphatic and vigorous disapproval—must already be known to every Senator and every Representative. The issue of using Government funds to hold down the cost of living is not a new issue and my views on it have been expressed before and at some length, particularly in my message vetoing a similar bill (H. R. 2869) on July 2, 1943.

This bill, like that bill, is an inflation measure, a high-cost-of-living measure, a food-shortage measure.

This bill will raise the cost of food in the Bureau of Labor Statistics index not less than 7 percent and will raise the whole cost of living materially.

If this bill were to become law, the housewife would soon have to pay:

Ten cents a pound more for butter.

Nearly 8 cents more a pound for cheese.

One cent more for a quart of milk.

One cent more for a loaf of bread.

Seven cents more for a 10-pound bag of flour.

Hamburger would go up 4 cents a pound.

Pork chops would go up 4½ cents a pound.

Sliced ham would go up 6½ cents a pound.

Chuck roast would go up 3½ cents a pound.

Round steak would go up 5 cents a pound.

The cost of many other necessities would be increased materially.

While increasing the cost of living, the prohibition of consumers subsidies will not add one dollar to the income of the farmers.

This bill would in effect reverse the policy of the Congress; in effect, it repeals the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942.

It is clear that we cannot hold the wage line if the Congress deprives us of the means necessary to hold the cost-of-living line.

No major country at war today has been able to stabilize the cost of living without the use of subsidies.

If the wage line breaks—and I do not see how it can be held if this bill becomes law—not only will food costs rise still further but all other costs will rise—including the cost of all munitions and supplies for the Army and Navy by many billions.

Not only will it cost every American family more to buy the necessities of life, not only will it cost more to run our factories and our farms, but also the costs of conducting the war will rise proportionately day by day.

The weight of the increased burden will fall on all of us, but most of all on the unorganized workers and others who live on small and relatively fixed incomes, among whom are most of the dependents of our fighting men.

The bill presented to me would destroy the stabilization program.

I cannot accept responsibility for its disastrous consequences.

I hope the Congress will not compel these consequences.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 18, 1944.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

The question is, Will the House on reconsideration pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?