activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended and extended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 4391. A bill to amend section 409 (e) of the Social Security Act approved August 14, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 4392. A bill to create an office of demobilization, establish general policies for the operation of that office, provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, prescribe the jurisdiction of courts in connection therewith, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 4393. A bill authorizing the Shoshonee-Goship Bands of Shoshone Indians to sue in the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 4394. A bill authorizing the Western Bands of the Shoshone Nation of Indians to sue in the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 468. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4134, a bill to reestablish the grade of admiral of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

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 Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 4003; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memoralizing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass Senate bill 1617; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 4395. A bill for the relief of Glassell-Taylor Co., Robinson & Young; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4396. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alberta Harvey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. R. 4397. A bill for the relief of W. S. Burleson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4398. A bill to authorize Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson to accept decorations and orders tendered them by the Government of the United States of Brazil; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4399. A bill authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Royal E. Ingersoll, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4400. A bill for the relief of the Transit Investment Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 4401. A bill for the relief of Verge McClure; 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:

5235. By Mr. DOUGLAS: Petition of 1,560 citizens of the Thirty-third Congressional District of the State of New York, protesting against any legislation which will prohibit or restrict the sale or manufacture of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5236. By Mr. FELLOWS: Petition of Mabel Hamlin and 35 others, and Stuart K. Stairs, of Caribou, Maine, and 21 others, favoring enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5237. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of Mrs. B. L. Haug and many other residents of Marshalltown, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5238. Also, petition of Alletta L. Dillon and many other residents of Cedar Falls, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5239. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 21 residents of Butler, Pa., requesting the enactment of House bill 2082 which would stop the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and during demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5240. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Carl H. Hammack, of Bryan, and Mrs. Mabel Robertson, of Austin, Tex., favoring House bill 4269; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5241. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of members of Harry Higgins Post, No. 83, the American Legion, Ashland, Ohio, to immediately enact the Legion omnibus bill now pending on World War veterans' legislation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5242. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of Genevieve Parlor, No. 132, Native Daughters of the Golden West, regarding evacuated Japanese; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5243. Also, petition of the San Francisco Auxiliary, No. 1, B'nai B'rith, urging abrogation of Chamberlain White Paper; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5244. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of the Ladies Aid Society, of Bremen, Maine, urging enactment of House bill 2082, for greater efficiency and less absenteeism in defense plants, and better protection of men in training camps from effects of alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5245. Also, petition of Alma Bishop and 50 other signers of Skowhegan, Maine, urging action to stop the manufacture, sale, and transportation of beverages for the duration by enacting into law the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5246. Also, petition of Hattie White and 27 other citizens of Wayne, Maine, urging favorable action on House bill 2082 for greater efficiency and less absenteeism in defense plants and better protection of our men in training camps from effects of alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Hunter M. Lewis, B. D., associate minister, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious Lord, who didst come to save all men, redeeming them out of tawdriness into beauty, and out of heaviness into joy: Look, we beseech Thee, with the eyes of Thy mercy, upon a war-torn world forgetful of Thy redemptive love. Though it has failed Thee in Thy purpose, help it to confront failure with courage, and to find in imperfection, not disillusionment but opportunity, not a fact in which to acquiesce but a problem to be solved under Thy guidance, knowing that because of Thy grace no failure need be final.

Thou knowest, O Lord, the enemies that surround us, the temptations that beset us, the darkness that engulfs us. Increase our valor in all conflicts of this mortal life. Renew our courage after every failure, that we may rise from the dust with a double portion of Thy grace to rededicate our lives to the ideals of justice and mercy, peace and love, with which Thou hast ennobled us, until as sons of God we come at last to Thine eternal Kingdom. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, March 13, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 13, 1944, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 78) to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities.

NOTICE OF ADDRESS IN COMMEMORATION OF THE LATE SENATOR McNARY

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that when the Senate convenes on Thursday I shall hope to be recognized to speak briefly about the services of the late Senator from Oregon, Charles L. McNary.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PETROLEUM RESOURCES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, upon the recommendation of the respective chairmen of the committees as will be indicated, appoints as members of the Special Committee to Investigate Petroleum Resources, authorized by Senate Resolution 253, agreed to March 13, 1944, the following:

From the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]; from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE]; from the Committee on Commerce, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]; from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]; and on his own initiative the Chair also appoints the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] members of the special committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AMENDMENT OF THE CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1923

A letter from the President of the Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for the purpose of making the present salary advancement law operate more effectively as a work incentive (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS, THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an amendment covering the personnel requirements of The National Archives for the quarter ending March 31, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States S. 1617, a bill sponsored by the American Legion providing legislation for the benefit and protection of veterans of World War No. 2; and

"Whereas S. 1617 provides that the Veterans' Administration shall be an agency of the United States, vital and essential to the successful prosecution of the present war, and as such will be accorded priorities for personnel, equipment, supplies, construction, and matériel, and will grant the Administrator authority to place in Army and Navy installations Veterans' Administration personnel for adjudication of claims of men and women about to be discharged from the service, and also provides that a man or woman shall not be released from active duty until his or her certificate of discharge and final pay, or a substantial portion thereof, are ready for delivery; prohibits the system of requiring statements from men and women about to be discharged regarding the origin, incurrence, and aggravation of their disabilities; provides that accredited service officers of veterans' organizations be permitted to visit and assist hospitalized men at any time; reenacts section 23 of World War Veterans' Act that provides for review by the Administrator of the case of any person discharged from active service by court martial to the end that if the Administrator determines that at the time of the commission of the offense resulting in the court martial the person was insane, such person may have his rights restored; provides for mustering-out or demobilization pay; provides for educational allowance, including such vocational, professional, or technical refresher courses as may be approved by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; provides for a loan system operated by the Veterans' Administration through the several States to aid veterans in the purchase of a farm or home; providing for a veterans' employment service to be vested in the Administration; provides for unemployment allowances for veterans during a reasonable period of unemployment, authority over such payments and operation of the plan to be vested in the Veterans' Administration; and

"Whereas S. 1617 is necessary and essential for the protection of the rights of veterans of World War No. 2: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, in second extraordinary session assembled, endorses the principles and purposes of S. 1617 and recommends them to the earnest consideration of our representatives in the National Congress; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States, and to the chairman of the Veterans' Subcommittee of the Senate Finance Committee of the Congress of the United States."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of Washington; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition your Excellency and honorable bodies as follows:

"Whereas documented reports of our State Department and continuous despatches from Europe, while telling a horrible story of the atrocities to which the conquered peoples of Europe are being subjected, definitely reveal that the Jewish people of these occupied countries have been specifically earmarked for utter annihilation; and

"Whereas until now the world has, with great horror, learned that more than 3,000,000 of innocent Jewish men and women and children have been subjected to death by tortures unparalleled in human history in lands where their fathers and forefathers have lived for centuries; and

"Whereas there now remains, in these occupied countries, many millions of those who escaped these mass annihilations by the generosity of their non-Jewish friends; who are engaged in heroic underground activities to defeat our common enemy, and who are waiting for the hour of liberation; and

"Whereas the President of the United States of America, on behalf of civilized humanity, initiated the War Refugee Board, a governmental agency, to do all it can to save those who can still be saved; to find for them havens of refuge; and

"Whereas we must recognize that while it is our duty to secure the rights of each individual to return to his or her former residence, hundreds of thousands of these Jewish victims will be unable to return to their former countries which inevitably will recall to them the horrible death of their loved ones, thus clearly demonstrating the urgent need to end the homelessness of the Jewish people; and

"Whereas we have observed with admiration the reconstruction of the Jewish homeland in Palestine, resulting from the Balfour Declaration and the League of Nations' mandate entrusted to Great Britain with the sanction of our country, and have watched with pride the great role played in the upbuilding of Palestine by the Jewish people, a community which contributed greatly to the war efforts of the United Nations and simultaneously absorbing hundreds of thousands of refugees from European countries; and

"Whereas Palestine possesses, through modern irrigation and industrial development, the absorptive capacity, and Palestinian Jewry is willing to assume the responsibility of resettling their brethren, victims of the Nazi persecution, in large numbers; and

"Whereas a resolution has been presented in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States of America on this subject, and reads as follows:

"'Whereas the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922, unanimously resolved, "that the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected"; and

"'Whereas the ruthless persecution of the Jewish people in Europe has clearly demonstrated the need for a Jewish homeland as a haven for the large numbers who have become homeless as a result of this persecution: Therefore be it

"'*Resolved*, That the United States shall use its good offices and take appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization, so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth': Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Washington State Legislature now in special session at Olympia, Wash., hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to reaffirm the unanimous stand of the Congress in June 1922, and adopt the above-mentioned bipartisan resolution, which will bring succor to the victims of Nazi persecution by keeping the doors of Palestine wide open and enable the Jewish people to reconstitute there a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of Washington; to the Committee on Immigration.

"Senate Joint Memorial 1

"To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas United States Representative RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, has introduced a bill in Congress, being H. R. 4003, which would grant full citizenship to Filipinos resident in the United States prior to May 1, 1934, upon certain conditions therein named; and

"Whereas under the present law the Filipinos are considered aliens for certain purposes but owe allegiance to the United States and by their services in the armed forces of the United States and by their services in industry and their purchase of War bonds and full cooperation in the war effort have demonstrated their patriotism, loyalty, and allegiance to the United States; and

"Whereas H. R. 4003 is intended to clarify this anomalous situation and to settle legal, racial, and marital status of resident Filipinos;

"Now, therefore, your memorialists pray that the Congress of the United States speedily pass and that the President sign H. R. 4003; be it

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States

House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress from the State of Washington."

A telegram in the nature of a memorial from R. T. Harris, president of the Chamber of Commerce of Morgan County, Ala., and sundry other citizens representing counties in Alabama served by the Tennessee Valley Authority, remonstrating against the adoption of the so-called McKellar amendments relating to the Tennessee Valley Authority to be proposed to the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the table.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mr. TRUMAN (for Mrs. CARAWAY), from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on March 13, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 391. An act for the relief of Jack Lecel Haas;

S. 393. An act for the relief of William Kovatis;

S. 397. An act for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Svend J. Skou;

S. 617. An act for the relief of Homer C. Chapman;

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;

S. 1427. An act to authorize the appointment of Gregory Boyington a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps;

S. 1549. An act for the relief of Vern M. Stanchfield;

S. 1563. An act for the relief of W. E. Dowdell and June Dowdell; and

S. 1668. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 1775. A bill to provide for restoring real property acquired by the United States for military purposes to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 1776. A bill for the relief of L. T. Gregory; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. TAFT introduced Senate bill 1777, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1778. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, for the purpose of enabling former members of the armed forces who are not covered under the old-age and survivors-insurance provisions of such act to secure coverage thereunder; to the Committee on Finance.

SMALL BUSINESS FINANCE INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill for appropriate reference, and in connection therewith I request that a statement prepared by me relating to the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the statement presented by the Senator from Ohio will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1777) to establish a Small Business Finance Insurance Administration in the Department of Commerce, to aid in financing small business enterprises by insuring loans to and purchases of stock in such enterprises, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. TAFT in connection with the bill is as follows:

Nothing is more important for the maintenance of employment and the increase of the national income and prosperity in the post-war period than the revival and encouragement of small business enterprise. There must be a constant birth of small businesses and a constant growth of small business to big business. Unfortunately, tax requirements and other circumstances make it very difficult for new small businesses to get started. There is no longer any incentive to a wealthy man to take the risk involved. The small saver should not risk all that he has saved in one venture. I believe that the capital-gains tax should be repealed to give the man with capital the incentive to take a chance in a number of different companies. The act I am introducing is intended to make it possible to attract the money of small savers into enterprises which have an element of risk.

A number of bills have been introduced providing for Government loans to small business. I have two objections to this approach. First, I don't believe the Government ought to be in the business of making direct loans, and I think it ought to get out of that business just as soon after the war as possible. Second, the need of small business is not so much for loans, which are usually available when deserved, but for more equity capital, men who will buy stock in the concern.

The bill I am introducing proposes a Government insurance fund, similar to that of the Federal Housing Administration. It is proposed that this fund insure investment companies, registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940 and subject to S. E. C. control, against 50 percent of any loss they suffer by investing in the common stock of small business enterprises, and against 65 percent of any loss they suffer by investing in the preferred stock of such enterprises. Such stock must have been issued at least one-half to provide new capital, and, of course, each investment must be approved by the Insurance Administrator before it is insured. In the case of manufacturing companies, the preferred stock cannot be more than one-half of the total capital after the money is invested, and in the case of retail concerns it cannot be more than one-third of the total capital. The total investment in common stock cannot exceed 60 percent of the total common stock in a manufacturing concern, or 45 percent of the common stock of a retail company.

The bill also provides for insuring banks against 90 percent of the loss on capital loans to manufacturing companies, which capital loans cannot exceed 50 percent of the equity capital already invested.

Adequate premiums will be charged for the service of insurance, and it is hoped that the fund may be self-supporting.

The project would necessarily be experimental, but I hope that it may at least lead the way in providing a method by which the small savers will assist in the development of new enterprise. In the future there may be no savings except those made by men and women with limited income. We have seen recently a number of investments by insurance companies in large-scale housing projects. This is one method by which small savings in the form of life-insurance premiums assist in providing capital for a limited type of business enterprise. I hope the Federal insurance fund may do the same for the capital requirements of progressive and promising ventures in the field of manufacturing and merchandising.

TWENTY-SEVENTH MONTHLY MESSAGE TO THE PEOPLE OF JAPAN BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD his twenty-seventh monthly radio message to the people of Japan, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KILGORE BEFORE CHARLESTON BRANCH, UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator KILGORE before the Charleston branch of the United Nations Association at the Thomas Jefferson Junior High School Auditorium on March 8, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR IRRESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT—ARTICLE BY CHARLES A. BEARD

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Our Irresponsible Government" written by Charles A. Beard and published in the Progressive of March 6, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOUTHERN MILK VERSUS OLEO—ARTICLE FROM HOARD'S DAIRYMAN

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Southern Milk versus Oleo," together with an accompanying table, published in Hoard's Dairyman of September 25, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMPETITION BETWEEN OLEOMARGARINE AND BUTTER—EDITORIAL FROM HOARD'S DAIRYMAN

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Who Cries?" published in Hoard's Dairyman of September 25, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

SAVE THE SOIL—STATEMENT BY JERRY EDDINGS

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Save the Soil," prepared by Jerry Eddings, a member of the Mound Valley 4-H Club, of Hominy, Okla., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WORLD-WIDE BROADCASTING FOUNDATION—ARTICLE BY ERIC UNDERWOOD

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The World-Wide Broadcasting Foundation—A Record of Achievement," written by Eric Underwood and published in the magazine World-Wide Listener, winter issue of 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

BONUS FOR VETERANS—UNEMPLOYMENT AND TAXES AFTER THE WAR

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials, one entitled "The Bonus Bill" and the other entitled "And Taxes After the War," published in the Washington Times-Herald, and an article published in the same newspaper entitled "Twenty-five Million Idle Seen at Post-War Peak," which appear in the Appendix.]

ARMY CAMP LIFE—ARTICLE BY PRIVATE IGOR CASSINI

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article dealing with Army camp life, written by Pvt. Igor Cassini and published in the March 7, 1944, issue of the Washington Times-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL PROPAGANDA

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Propaganda Plot Laid to United States Bureau," published in the Washington Times-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

GROWTH OF THE AIR MAIL SERVICE—ARTICLE FROM THE POSTMASTERS' ADVOCATE

[Mr. GREEN (for Mr. MEAD) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Amazing Growth of the Air Mail Service," published in the February 1944 issue of the Postmasters' Advocate, which appears in the Appendix.]

LETTER FROM THE POSTMASTER GENERAL TO WASHINGTON COLLECTORS' CLUB

[Mr. GREEN (for Mr. MEAD) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Postmaster General Walker to Mr. William M. Stuart, vice president of the Collectors' Club, Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR EXPORT LUMBER PROBLEMS—STATEMENT BY CHARLES E. DANT

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Charles E. Dant Answers Some Questions and Expresses His Opinion on Various Phases of Post-War Export Lumber Problems," which appears in the Appendix.]

STUDIES OF FOREIGN TRADE AND FOREIGN-TRADE POLICY

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Joint Inquiry," published in the Washington Post of March 14, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

MONOPOLIES AND CARTELS—EXTRACT FROM PROCEEDINGS OF THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from Hansard, the official report of proceedings of the British Parliament, of January 25, 1944, dealing with the subject of monopolies and cartels, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHRISTIAN SERVICE—STATEMENT BY HARRY G. HOGAN

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a leaflet entitled "Christian Service," by Harry G. Hogan, general warden, Fort Wayne (Ind.) Civilian Defense, which appears in the Appendix.]

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House Nos. 9, 11, and 12, and the amendment of the House No. 3, and the Senate amendment thereto, to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. EASTLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Gerry	Pepper
Andrews	Gillette	Radcliffe
Austin	Green	Revercomb
Bailey	Guffey	Reynolds
Bankhead	Gurney	Robertson
Barkley	Hatch	Russell
Bilbo	Hawkes	Shipstead
Bone	Hayden	Stewart
Brewster	Hill	Taft
Bridges	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Jackson	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Kilgore	Truman
Bushfield	La Follette	Tunnell
Byrd	Langer	Tydings
Capper	Lucas	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	McFarland	Walsh, N. J.
Cordon	McKellar	Weeks
Danaher	Maloney	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	Wherry
Downey	Moore	White
Eastland	Murray	Willis
Ellender	Nye	Wilson
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	
George	Overton	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] is detained on public business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in this morning's Baltimore Sun there appears an editorial entitled "Congress Debates the Newest Service Vote Bill." The editorial is not long. It is very illuminating, and in my opinion presents most cogently the meat of the whole controversy. I ask that the editorial be read from the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

CONGRESS DEBATES THE NEWEST SERVICE VOTE BILL

After protracted debates in the conference committee, the Federal service vote bill has at last been reported out and is now being considered in the Senate.

The President's friends are said to feel that the test of the new bill is whether it would increase or decrease the number of servicemen's votes. That is to say, if they decide that the Federal voting law of 1942, already on the books, would enable more servicemen to vote than would the new Federal law, they will try to beat the new law.

But if that indeed is to be the criterion, then the new Federal bill is pretty likely to win. Pass over the point that only the new bill provides a supplementary Federal ballot (subject to State approval) for men who do not receive State ballots. Remember that the law of 1942 now on the books attempts to supersede State control of the eligibility of voters and, so, of the validity of votes cast. But, whatever the Federal law, many States will continue to resist any Federal vote program that tries to dodge around them.

This they will do under the clear provisions of the Federal Constitution. This such a State as Maryland, governed by a Democratic administration, has already done in the opinion of Attorney General Walsh which held over a year ago that the Federal law of 1942 was invalid and could not be enforced in Maryland insofar as it flouted Maryland's control over the registration of voters.

Now, it is conceivable that some States under supine officers, or under officers genuinely of the belief that the present Federal law is valid, might permit that law to supersede their States' control of the ballot. But that is much less likely now after the prolonged and detailed debate of the last few months.

For the long debate has aroused State sensibilities. It has encouraged wavering State officials to assert their old prerogatives. It has impelled many States, including Maryland, to pass legislation specifically to protect their constitutional rights. Let us remember, finally, that 26 States now have Republican Governors. Among these 26, surely, Mr. Roosevelt could expect little cooperation in any constitutionally dubious plan of voting.

The choice, then, would seem to be between a bill acceding to the rights of an aroused union of States and a statute already on the books flouting these rights. It should not be difficult to guess which law would result in the larger number of votes being cast. Certainly, there is little doubt under which law the larger number of votes would be judged valid by dutiful State election officers, who have the say on that issue.

And that, after all, is the real point of the whole debate. The feverish centralizers have stressed votes cast, without much attention to whether the votes so cast would be counted as valid or not. The States' rights people in the debate have wanted the maximum number of votes cast and they have wanted all the votes cast to be valid. Servicemen themselves will have little difficulty in detecting in which camp their true friends are to be found.

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to read into the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of this morning entitled "The Soldier Loses":

THE SOLDIER LOSES

According to Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, the measure which he presented to his colleagues yesterday as the conference compro-

mise on the soldier-vote proposals "represents the best possible bill that can be secured." But a better plan, and one thoroughly consistent with constitutional requirements, would have been to assure every soldier overseas the right at least to vote for Federal office, with the States to determine according to their own records and standards the validity of such ballots.

Under the provisions of the present bill, the service men and women overseas will receive Federal ballots only if their State governments have certified by July 15 that such ballots will be acceptable for counting. If the States do not take this action, the soldiers will have to depend on what provisions each State has made or will make. The Army and Navy Departments have warned that because of the time factor they cannot promise to get State ballots to the service men and women, even where provisions for them have been made. Those farthest from home, those facing the greatest dangers, will be the least likely to get a vote. Those in or near the United States will have a better opportunity, in case their States have a workable system of absentee voting.

The debate has shown that this is no longer an issue of States' rights. After starting off on the wrong foot, and stretching Federal authority too far, the proponents of the Green-Lucas measure were willing to leave it to the States to decide whether or not Federal service ballots for national offices should be counted. They were willing to do what could be done to get separate ballots fo. State and local offices to the service men and women, if such ballots were made available. What they asked was a simple and uniform mechanism—the only kind that will do the job—for obtaining the voting preferences of absent service people and presenting such preferences to the home election boards.

This is still what they ask. Anything less is an injustice to the very men and women whom we most profess to honor. In Italy, in the South Seas our fighters are doing their duty under circumstances whose horrors we can hardly even imagine. In Britain hundreds of thousands of American soldiers are waiting the word to attempt the most hazardous military adventure in all history. Many thousands of young Americans won't vote this fall, or ever. By what reasoning can any Senator or Congressman justify refusal or delay in the cases of those who still survive?

Mr. President, I shudder at the thought that the Congress should expect the officers in charge of our armed forces to understand the complex and complicated bill which has come from conference. I despair that the rank and file of our fighting men will ever be able to comprehend it. I am afraid that when they start studying it they will become disgusted and will feel that the Congress has let them down. I say this without in any way impugning the motives or questioning the sincerity of the members of the conference committee who brought forth this compromise proposal. I simply do not think it is workable or practicable unless we can find a way to call off the war for a month or two so that our soldiers can go to voting school.

REPORT OF W M. GARRARD ON THE NEW YORK COTTON EXCHANGE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of the Senate a report to the directors of the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association, which is one of the greatest farmer cooperatives in the United States, by its general manager, Hon. W. M. Garrard, of Greenwood, Miss. In his report Mr. Garrard states that the New York Cotton Exchange has ceased to perform its functions; he attacks futures contracts and the rules and regulations of the New York Cotton Exchange relative to such contracts, and charges a dereliction of the New York Cotton Exchange that is detrimental to the cotton farmer and to the cotton trade. He advocates that the New York Cotton Exchange be suspended unless corrective measures are taken. I read Mr. Garrard's statement, which is self-explanatory:

Has the New York Cotton Exchange ceased to function legitimately? In other words, does the New York Cotton Exchange offer a price insurance contract that can be used by the cotton trade as a hedge for shippers in the conduct of cotton merchandising, and does the contract furnish price insurance to the mill against cotton bought by the mill to be used subsequently in manufacturing?

This question is being asked in various forms by practically everyone connected with the cotton trade. In our many years of experience in cotton merchandising, there have been but few times when there has been as much criticism of the New York Cotton Exchange contract as there is today, and in our opinion this criticism is based on sound reasoning.

According to the present New York Cotton Exchange quotations, cotton for delivery on the March contract is valued at approximately $9 a bale more than the value of the same cotton if held and delivered on contract next December, and yet it will cost approximately 10 points per month to carry the cotton from March to December, 9 months, or 90 points, or $4.50 per bale. This does not take into account the normal loss in weight that will occur in carrying cotton this length of time.

It cannot be argued with any degree of soundness that anticipation of peace, or fear of world prices becoming operative, is the reason for the disparity between the present price of cotton and the price indicated by the New York futures contract as the value of cotton next December. It is a known fact that a tremendous need for cotton goods has been built up for civilian use, and even though all Government contracts were canceled, it would take at least 1 or 2 years, with mills working full time, to supply the requirements of civilian needs. Consequently, it cannot be argued that cancelation of Government contracts is a sound reason for apprehension on the part of the trade that mills will not use cotton for the next year or 2 on a full-time operating basis. Neither can it be argued with any degree of soundness that world prices will become operative, and thereby depress the price of cotton, for the fact is that next year's Government loan guarantees a price for cotton to the domestic producer even higher than the guaranteed price this year. It is reasonable to anticipate a loan price next year of approximately 20 cents per pound, which is considerably above the base loan value this year.

The cotton owned outright by the Government is of inferior quality and, to a large degree, is not competitive with the desirable cotton held by interests other than the Government. Much of the Government cotton, if offered for delivery on contract, would not meet the requirements of the contract.

In the light of the foregoing facts, we ask the question: Why, according to New York Cotton Exchange quoted values, is cotton worth less each succeeding month from March on through to December? Why does the New York Cotton Exchange value March cotton at 45 points, or $2.25 per bale, more than the same cotton will be worth in May, 2 months hence? Why does the New York Cotton Exchange value May cotton at 60 points more than the value of the same cotton 2 months later, in July?

Under such valuation, there is no way for the cotton merchant or mill to buy cotton and secure a legitimate hedge in the New York contract market. It has been argued from time to time, when investigations were held, that the New York contract was a price insurance contract, that it was not a spot cotton contract, that it was never intended to be. To this we agree. That is not true of the Liverpool market, which in operation offers a spot cotton contract, and this very fact, when the Liverpool market is in operation, has gone a long way toward stabilizing and, we might say, legitimatizing the New York contract.

If the New York contract is not a spot contract, but is supposed to be a price insurance contract, and if it does not offer price insurance to the trade, then we ask, why should not the New York Cotton Exchange be suspended until such time as its rules and regulations are amended to assure the cotton trade that it will have a legitimate price insurance contract? We all recognize the need of the Cotton Exchange services, when offered to the trade on a legitimate and protective basis. We hardly see how the cotton trade could operate on a broad basis without a price insurance contract being offered either by a cotton exchange or by some other organization or agency that would give to the operator legitimate protection in the merchandising and manufacturing of cotton.

However, we see little need for the New York Cotton Exchange as it is operating today, when it does not offer the trade any protection, and when instead of offering price insurance it only offers price destruction. There is an old saying, and a very true one, that the royal road to ruin is to hedge cotton in discounts. With the present inverted contracts, and the inversion being extreme, there is no hedge for the merchant or the mill. Naturally, without a hedge, the volume of business and the normal flow of cotton from producer to mill is restricted. Instead of having a free and a broad market for the producer, he is faced with a congestion that forces him to sell his cotton for less than it is worth, according to the New York March, or spot month, quotation; for no shipper can afford to buy on the near month and sell on the distant month. It is the exception when you find a mill that will buy on the near month, when the distant months are at heavy discounts. It has been our observation that during periods of an inverted market, the quotation for spots in the southern markets follows the quotation for the near month in New York, and not that the near month on the contract market is based on spot quotations In an extreme situation, such as exists today, with heavy discounts in the distant months, the southern spot quotations are to all practical purposes nominal quotations. This is confirmed by the falling off in sales in all southern spot markets for the past 2 weeks, since the extreme premium that has existed for the March option over the May and subsequent months.

I want to quote here from a letter I received under date of March 6, 1944, from an outstanding executive of one of the largest mill groups in America:

"It is my understanding that a big house must show that they have a short interest in spots in both March and May, in order to have the right to carry this long interest which they have in futures. I am inclined to believe that this short interest is premeditated and is done on purpose, because they sold some of the stock which they had on hand anywhere from 50 to 100 points less than competition was offering the same cotton, so as to create as much short interest as possible. I also understand that they

hooked as many mills as possible, by selling them cotton for forward shipment at a cheap basis, and I also understand again that they are at the present time offering cotton much cheaper than any other shippers. Of course, you understand that whenever they sold a mill, say, 1,000 bales, based on March or May, they immediately doubled up on their contracts by telling the mill to buy an equal amount of either March or May, and then they bought for themselves the near month and sold the distant month.

"Now, all of this has brought about a condition where the future market in New York has ceased to function, and all of the shippers and mills are just doing nothing. No one wants to buy any cotton with July selling sixty-odd points less than May, when delivery day on May is nearly 2 months in the future. It may not be so bad with the mills, excepting, of course, those that have cotton purchased on call, but it is very bad on the cotton trade as a whole because they have an enormous expense and are unable to do any business. All of this seems to have been brought on by a firm that, it looks like, deliberately planned and executed a squeeze; and I was just wondering if the cotton trade is going to sit idly by and allow such things as this to happen."

I have checked with other important mill executives, and they are equally positive in their statements that the New York Cotton Exchange has ceased to function as an organization that offers to the trade a legitimate and sound price-insurance contract.

Now, unless the New York Cotton Exchange, of its own volition, adopts corrective measures so that the Exchange will function for the benefit of the trade as a whole, and not for the benefit of a few, then, in our opinion, the time has come when the S. E. C. should suspend trading on the exchange. We should dislike very much to see this become necessary, for, as stated before, the New York Cotton Exchange can and should be of inestimable benefit to the cotton trade as a whole. If it is operated for the benefit of the trade as a whole, then it performs a vital function in the movement of cotton from the farm to the mill, but unless it does perform a legitimate and sound function, there is, as we see it, no justification or excuse for its existence.

Mr. President, I personally know Hon. W. M. Garrard. He is one of the most eminent and competent men in the American cotton trade. As I have stated, he is general manager of one of the great farmer cooperatives, probably the most successful farmer cooperative in the United States. Mr. Garrard does not go off half-cocked.

Upon receiving a copy of this report I telephoned the head of the Securities and Exchange Commission, who informed me that the Commission has no jurisdiction over the commodity exchanges, and no jurisdiction over the New York Cotton Exchange. This jurisdiction is lodged in one of the bureaus of the Department of Agriculture. I have placed this report in the hands of a high official of that bureau. He has assured me that the bureau will immediately investigate the situation to see if certain big interests are violating the law. However, he also tells me that the facilities of his bureau for investigation are very limited.

Mr. President, these are grave charges and are based upon sound reason. They set forth that in the belief of the cotton trade, through the New York Cotton Exchange, the cotton market is today being rigged by certain important interests. Because of it the cotton grower must sell his cotton for less than it is worth. The cotton merchant and the cotton mill cannot protect their purchases of cotton. The cotton trade is stagnant, and the cotton farmer is the loser. According to eminent men engaged in the cotton trade, the New York Cotton Exchange has ceased to perform a useful function, all because certain big interests are rigging the market and prostituting the legitimate functions of the New York Cotton Exchange for private gain. Those interests are depriving the cotton farmer of the real value of his product.

Mr. President, I call this matter to the attention of the Senate and of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senate itself should investigate these charges. This is an extremely serious matter. It is our high duty to protect the cotton grower and the legitimate cotton trade. The facts must be ascertained by the Congress. If this is being done within the law, then legislation is needed to correct the situation and to prevent its recurrence. After an investigation we shall have the facts on which to legislate so as to make the recurrence of this condition impossible.

I thoroughly agree with the letter which Mr. Garrard wrote to me under date of March 11, 1944, in which he stated:

In my opinion the New York Cotton Exchange performs a necessary function when and if regulatory measures are adopted which will prohibit the rigging of the market by certain important interests.

I request the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to undertake this investigation immediately. If necessary, I shall offer a resolution providing for an investigation.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House Nos. 9, 11, and 12, and the amendment of the House No. 3, and the Senate amendment thereto, to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I shall speak for a short time today on the subject before the Senate, which is the conference report on the so-called soldiers' vote bill. I have slight hope that anything I may say will affect the vote in this Chamber, but I shall speak with the idea that there will be a record of the position which I have taken with regard to the bill which, to my mind, has at this time more implications than merely the vote of the soldiers, although that is of tremendous importance.

I am one of those who do not believe in a restricted franchise. The first great advocate in this country of the restricted franchise was Thaddeus Stevens. I am one of those who believe that in order for democracy to survive there must be a vote by those who have the sovereignty of the Nation. Certainly, if our theory of government is correct, there must be a vote by the real sovereigns and a determination by them.

Because of world conditions over which our soldiers, sailors, and marines have no control, they are not now able to vote. They have been placed where they cannot exercise their voting rights. We sometimes have used the expression, "the right to vote." I think I have used it myself, and yet the right to vote is not what we are struggling for here. The servicemen have a right to vote. The question is whether they shall have the opportunity to vote.

Yesterday it came to my attention that there was being held in Washington a meeting of Republican women of the United States, and I noted that they made the statement that the Democrats were trying to play politics with the soldiers' vote bill. I do not know that that is true. It is the first time I have ever heard it said that we cannot advocate citizens having an opportunity to vote without being accused of being partisan in our voting, or in our operations.

I have before me the editorial section of the New York Times of last Sunday. I find in it the following statement:

Behind the trouble in arriving at a simple voting system for servicemen most observers saw a struggle for partisan advantage. President Roosevelt and other administration leaders, confident that the soldiers would vote for their Commander in Chief, have fought for the widest possible soldier participation in the election.

I do not particularly appreciate the implication that I would not favor soldiers voting if I thought it was a disadvantage to my party. I am one of those who believe that it is an advantage to the Government of the United States for its citizens to express themselves. The implication contained in this editorial is that the President and Democratic Senators have only one thing in mind, namely, benefit to their party. I do not think that that is a fair implication. I resent it, and I appeal to the common sense of the American people on that question. We are not giving the soldiers any right which they do not have. We are giving them merely an opportunity to vote if the Federal ballot bill shall pass.

At the outset let me say that there is absolutely no rivalry or competition between the so-called Federal ballot and the State ballot laws, because the bill, as it passed the Senate, provided that if a person should vote both the Federal ballot and the State ballot, only the State ballot should be counted. Therefore, a person could very easily and consistently favor both a Federal ballot and a State ballot.

Mr. President, I wish to read the remainder of the editorial to which I have referred, which will be found in the editorial section of the New York Times,

because it has reference to another phase of the subject. It reads as follows:

The Republicans, some of whom have frankly expressed their fear that the servicemen would vote Democratic, have taken up a constitutional position in favor of the State ballots. They have been supported in many instances by southern Democrats fearful that a wide soldier vote might endanger traditional voting restrictions in their areas.

The first question which comes to my mind is, How would that help this particular situation? If, as we are told by the advocates of the so-called State plan, everyone would have a chance to vote for the President, for Senators, and for Representatives, then what difference would it make if there were a Federal ballot if, by that means, a few more persons would have the opportunity to vote? We are told by this editorial that the Republicans favor the so-called State system because the Federal ballot would permit persons to vote who would vote for President Roosevelt. If there is anything in that assumption at all it means that they are not in favor of any State ballot which would permit voting for President, Senators, or Representatives from a particular district. There is no consistency in the contention that they favor a State ballot, which would also permit voting for Presidential and congressional nominees, and at the same time oppose a bill which would permit voting for Presidential and congressional nominees. So I am compelled to conclude that there are those on the Republican side who favor a limitation of the franchise. Those who have accused our southern friends of limiting the franchise by the poll tax and otherwise will have to remember that they were the ones who taught the South to limit the franchise when they refused to let any of the respectable people of the South vote.

Some Republicans who have frankly expressed their fear that the servicemen would vote Democratic have taken up a constitutional position in favor of the State ballot. In other words, they resort to the constitutional argument because they fear that if those in the armed services vote they may vote for the present President of the United States. This is a serious problem when we think that from one-fifth to one-fourth, and perhaps a full fourth, of the voters of the United States who are likely to exercise their right of franchise are among the armed forces.

Do we or do we not assume any obligation to give them an opportunity to vote when we take the boys from the places where they could vote? I want to remind our friends who have taken the position as to the State ballot that it was not the State that took the boys away from home; it was not the State which was responsible for this war; it was not the State that assumed the responsibility for the defense of the Nation and sending our boys into foreign countries where they have never been before in large number. New situations have arisen.

The final paragraph of this editorial comment is:

They have been supported in many instances by southern Democrats fearful that a wide soldier vote might endanger traditional voting restrictions in their areas.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] stated bluntly just what was bothering his school of thought. He said that if the President would withdraw his name and let it be known that he would not be a candidate for President the opposition to this bill would cease in 30 minutes. That shows how much consistency there is in the idea that it is a constitutional question.

This argument should not be used against all Republicans. I was looking at the vote on the final passage of the bill in the Senate, and I find that 10 outstanding Republicans and 1 outstanding and the only Progressive in the Senate supported the bill. So there are two schools of thought among Republicans as well as two schools of thought among Democrats, because there were 11 Republicans and Progressives and 36 Democrats who supported that bill; and, on the other hand, there were 16 Democrats, 15 of them were from the South and 1 from the North, who voted against the bill and there were 22 Republicans who voted against it.

This writer comments on the position of those Democrats in the South:

They have been supported in many instances by southern Democrats, fearful that a wide soldier vote might endanger traditional voting restrictions in their areas.

I think that it is wrong, no matter which party advocates it, to favor a restricted vote. We do not know just who will be restricted next. As I suggested at the beginning of my remarks, the first great restriction on voting by arbitrary power was at the conclusion of the Civil War, when the population of the South—at least, the white population of the South—was prevented from exercising their right as citizens of the United States. At that time the results did not exactly justify the means.

I think that both Republicans and Democrats who favored this bill did so without any idea as to whether it would benefit their party or the opposition party. When I recall such stalwarts as the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] agreeing exactly on a bill, I cannot think that they were working as partisans; they were working as American citizens.

Now, let us look at the bill which has come back to the Senate in the conference report. There are in section 302 three possible classes of persons who might benefit or who might be able to vote: First, members of the armed forces outside the United States; second, persons serving with the American Red Cross and other auxiliary organizations who are attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States; and, third, members of the armed forces inside the United States.

Now, let us look at that. That is divided first into two parts.

(1) An individual referred to in paragraph (1)—

That is those serving outside the United States—

(2), or (3)—

That is members of the Red Cross and other auxiliary organizations and those serving inside the United States—

of subsection (a), if he is a citizen of a State whose Governor has certified, prior to July 15 of the year in which the election is to be held, (A) that such State has made no provision for procedure which will enable the citizens thereof to whom subsection (a) applies to vote by State absentee ballot, and (B) that the use of ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of such State.

If there is such a State I have never heard of it—a State that has not provided for any State ballot and yet has provided for a Federal ballot, and this particular Federal ballot.

(B) That the use of ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of such State.

In other words, it provides simply that there must be a certificate of the Governor of a State at a time mentioned before July 15 that such State has made no provision and yet that the Federal ballot, provided, this particular Federal ballot, is authorized by the law of that State. I do not think there is a Governor in the United States who could honestly make such a certificate, and I do not believe there will be one when July 15 arrives. That is one of the reasons why we find an editorial such as this in the Philadelphia Record, dated February 27 to March 14, a consolidation of editorials; but it is pretty interesting:

America's fighting men have been double-crossed and sold down the Potomac.

The Record urges President Roosevelt to veto the alleged "Federal ballot" compromise.

The bill as finally agreed upon by Senate and House conferees is not a compromise at all; it is a fraud. It leads servicemen to believe their right to vote has been safeguarded; actually, it is so cleverly contrived that millions of soldiers never will be permitted to exercise that right.

Better to deny our soldiers and sailors a Federal ballot openly than to cheat them with a phony.

About the only provision not included in this compromise is one requiring the serviceman to stand on his head while he marks the ballot with his left foot. Lucky he'll be if he ever sees a Federal ballot, for the compromise is so hedged about with ifs, buts, and complications to make that unlikely.

There are three swindles in this bill.

Swindle No. 1: Use of the Federal ballot would be restricted to men who had applied for a State ballot, and who could take an oath that they had not received any by October 1.

Swindle No. 2: Even a man who survived the hurdles of swindle No. 1 would be denied the vote unless the Governor of his home State certified, by August 1—

The copy which I have, and I suppose it is the right one, though I have several here, says July 15. The editorial in the Record says August 1.

that the Federal ballot would be acceptable under State law.

Swindle No. 3: No member of the armed forces stationed in the United States can vote a Federal ballot under any circumstances.

I think that is true, because I think under the first paragraph no Governor can honestly and truthfully make such a certificate.

IT'S A DOUBLE-SLICKIE

What makes this compromise a double-slickie is that it gives secretly hostile Governors a chance to make fine speeches, with no assurance their words will mean a thing.

For this bill makes State constitutionality the new obstacle to soldiers' voting.

Governor Dewey already has said the plan would require a constitutional amendment to permit New York servicemen to use a Federal ballot.

We were told yesterday, as I recall, that about one-tenth of the armed forces of the Nation would be refused the franchise, coming, as they do, from the State of New York, because in that State there is not a constitutional provision.

The same cry can and undoubtedly will be raised in many other States.

Still another hurdle resulting from this compromise will occur where Governors might certify the Federal ballot, and even when such ballots are actually cast.

It takes little imagination to forecast taxpayers' suits, filed by obscure G. O. P. obstructionists, aimed to invalidate soldier votes on the ground that such and such a Governor exceeded his power when he certified the Federal ballot.

In other words, if any person ever voted a Federal ballot in any of the 48 States it would raise a question, of course, as to whether the State law permitted a Federal ballot at all.

From all this you can figure how many soldier votes are likely ever to be counted.

First, this compromise bill screens out the votes of all men stationed in this country.

Those are screened out at the start, because of paragraph No. 1, which I have read.

Second, it throws out all votes cast overseas unless the Governor of the voter's State has certified that they will be counted.

Third, it opens wide the way to invalidation of the rest by inviting suits to throw the ballots out on State constitutional grounds.

That's why we urge a Presidential veto.

If Congress wants to let the soldiers vote it can do so under the plan proposed by President Roosevelt. A Federal ballot with no ifs and buts.

When those men are fighting for our lives it is no time to hand them this cheap counterfeit of democratic process turned out by one of the weakest Congresses in our history.

I do not know about that, Mr. President. It is suggested that it is only because we constitute a weak Congress that we produce any such bill as this. I think it is because we approach the subject, as this editorial writer in the New York Times has said, from three or four different standpoints. "If we want the soldier to vote" is one position. According to this writer, the Democratic Party wants them to vote for purely selfish reasons.

Let us look at subdivision (2) of subsection (b) on page 6 of the conference report, and find who this ballot is for. It certainly does not find anybody in the first paragraph.

(2) An individual referred to in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a), if he is a citizen of a State whose Governor has certified, prior to July 15—

Mind you, a date is inserted so that the Governor has to make his certificate at a particular time, or prior to a particular time, or he cannot make it at all, or, if he does, it has no effect.

Whose Governor has certified prior to July 15 of the year in which the election is to be held, that the use of ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of such State, even though the Governor thereof does not make the certification referred to in clause (A) of paragraph (1).

Why he should have made the certification referred to in clause (A) if he is making this one is not plain. It could not possibly be made by the same Governor, as I see it.

But only if such individual States in his oath that, prior to September 1, he made application for a State absentee ballot but as of October 1 has not received it.

I sat here yesterday and listened to the debate. I did not ask a question and did not make an interruption, but I listened to Senators who are lawyers and have made their fortunes and their reputations and their livings by practicing law, and I heard them disagree as to sentence after sentence. Some of the best lawyers seem to be the most confused; and I think that is the situation. I think if a person had no knowledge of law, he would simply say, "I don't know anything about it. What does it mean?" And he then goes to his lawyer, but the lawyers, the advocates of the bill, the writers of the bill, did not know what subdivision (2) meant. That became so apparent from the questions asked and the attempts which were made to answer, that one wondered if the question had not been studied by experts and phraseology drafted for the purpose of preventing soldiers from voting. Mr. President, I believe that is what it amounts to, and I suggest to those who are responsible for the measure now before the Senate that, instead of calling it a bill for the purpose of facilitating voting, it be given a new name and called "A bill to prevent men in the armed forces from voting."

The Senator who presented the report on the floor said he resented any implication that any individual will be disfranchised under the provisions of the measure. Well, he will find that there will be more than implications with respect to disfranchisement. Anyone who can understand what the measure means should be a law professor or in an insane asylum—I do not know which.

Mr. JACKSON. Perhaps both.

Mr. TUNNELL. Perhaps both is suggested.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] yesterday said he could not understand how anyone could imagine that a Governor would not issue the required certificate. I think the Senator was telling the truth. The Senator from Vermont is so sincere, so honorable, that when he makes such a statement I think he does not understand the implications of the measure. I do not think he understands the purpose of all the chicanery which is hidden in the language of the conference report.

Let us see what must be done under paragraph (2). First the Governor must certify before July 15. Why it would not do for the Governor to certify before the 16th I do not know, except that by making it the 15th it would result in shutting out a few more individuals, disfranchise a few more soldiers. That would result in keeping a few more individuals from having the right to vote, as the Democrats say, for President Roosevelt, and as the Republicans say, it will prevent such a possibility. So from both standpoints apparently the object seems to be to keep President Roosevelt from receiving votes. Those who have that idea may be wrong. I do not know. The soldier boys may use their opportunities to vote against certain individuals. That is often done. The American people often vote against those they know best. At any rate, the Governor, if he is willing, as was suggested in the Philadelphia Record editorial, will make certificate that the use of ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of such State. Is there a Governor in the United States who could today rightfully say that this ballot is authorized in his State? I do not know. There certainly are not many Governors who could say so. But suppose a Governor should make such a statement. I wonder by what right, as the Senator from Michigan said yesterday, the Governor of a State becomes the chief judicial officer to determine what can or cannot be done, or what laws can or cannot be used? I wonder by what right the Governor of a State, who frequently is not even a lawyer, may certify?

Let us see what it is proposed that the Governor shall certify? He shall certify "that the use of ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of such State." The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who both favor the Federal ballot law, and who are both eminent lawyers, disagree as to what that language means.

It is just possible that some Governor might make such a certificate. Apparently, it has been felt that it will never do to leave that up to the Governor. Some Governor might forget and might make the certificate, and President Roosevelt might receive another vote or another hundred votes. Therefore something else must be inserted in the bill. Let us see what it says:

But only if such individual states in his oath that, prior to September 1, he made aplication for a State absentee ballot, but as of October 1, has not received it.

In other words, there must be a condition that was not expected at all in order to be able to get hold of a Federal ballot. After the Governor has made the certificate it must develop that the individual tried away back before September 1 to obtain a State ballot and had not been able to do so. That is what, as I understand, is called in golf a hazard. That is hazard No. 10 or No. 15.

But that, Mr. President was not enough. Someone might have been able to vote under that provision. So such a thing must certainly be prevented, because the bill is a State ballot bill, and no one must be allowed to vote under the Federal ballot bill. The so-called Green-Lucas bill must not only be killed, but an individual must not be permitted

to vote under any Federal bill unless he makes certain statements under oath.

The individual might send for a ballot, but not receive it. The individual might not make a statement with respect to it in his oath. He may forget to make the statement. The individual cannot get one of the Federal ballots unless he swears that he made application for a State ballot prior to September 1 and that the ballot had not reached him by October 1.

Mr. President, who will go around and tell the boys from the United States in north Africa, in Italy, in the various camps in the United States, that, according to the laws of their States, application must be filed before September 1 or they can never receive the Federal ballot. But one of the nicest tricks of the whole thing is that no individual can obtain his Federal ballot before October 1.

All sorts of hazards have been placed before the service men and women so they cannot get a chance to vote. This is the last one. If the individual does not file the application before September 1, or if he files it before September 1 and a statement to that effect is not made in his oath, he cannot receive a Federal ballot. If he makes the statement in his oath and he receives the State ballot on October 1, then the ballot must reach his election officers by the November election. Of course, it is not intended that he should ever receive the ballot. The editorial which I read from the New York Times gives us the reasons for it.

Mr. President, I think the time will come when the boys who are now overseas are going to examine the list of Members of Congress to ascertain how they voted. I think they are entitled to do so. Senators from States whose people believe in restricted voting can continue such voting if they pass this measure, which apparently they will be able to do.

Mr. President, I have heard many say, "The boys do not want to vote. They are not interested in the vote." I do not know about that, but I know that America is interested in their voting, whether the boys are interested or not. America needs their vote. They are entitled to the vote, and they are entitled to have all this chicanery swept out of the bill.

The Senator from Mississippi was perfectly frank when he introduced the bill. His position cannot be criticized. He has his own problem. He said the bill is one to maintain white supremacy. I desire to remind him and all those who think with him and who live with him that he is in bad company, when the Senators from the southern part of the Nation, who are interested in white supremacy, tie themselves up with and vote with the party of Thad Stevens, who was not interested in white supremacy, and who practiced what he preached.

That is the situation facing us. Let us see how a restricted franchise has worked. Under the provisions of the conference report, soldiers cannot vote at all under paragraph (1). The probability of their ever voting under paragraph (2) is very limited.

Let us examine the State vote in 1868. We find that Alabama voted for Grant, that Arkansas voted for Grant, that Florida voted for Grant, that Georgia voted for Seymour, that North Carolina voted for Grant, that South Carolina voted for Grant. Tennessee voted for Grant. Texas was not counted at all. Virginia was not counted; Mississippi was not counted. That is what came from a restricted franchise.

Let us see how that was followed up. Today we hear a great deal about constitutional government and States' rights. After the assassination of President Lincoln the country found itself with a strong Congress, a Congress led by Thaddeus Stevens, if a man who was as incapacitated as he was can be called a leader. We find that Congress decided it would get rid of the Tennessee Democrat who was in the White House. There could not have been in the Senate of the United States such a majority as there was if there had not been a restricted franchise. That is what gave Thaddeus Stevens his power. That is why we find that situation. The good citizens of the States I have named—Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and Mississippi—were prevented from voting.

Let us see how the restricted franchise worked later. In 1872 conditions were continuing much the same. Alabama voted for Grant, Arkansas voted for Grant. Florida voted six votes for Brown and three votes for Greeley, but the House of Representatives by resolution simply would not count the votes for Greeley. Georgia voted for Grant, North Carolina voted for Grant, South Carolina voted for Hendricks. Tennessee voted for Hendricks. Texas voted eight votes for Hendricks. Virginia and Mississippi were counted for Grant. That was a restricted franchise. The country had a restricted franchise, and a strong Congress.

Today we are told that the President of the United States is assuming too much power, that we are getting away from constitutional government. What do we accomplish when we take the boys away from their homes, refuse to let them vote, and set all these traps to prevent their being able to vote at the coming election? Of course, I have my preference about who shall be elected, but I am now referring to the right to have an opportunity to vote. I am in favor of a proper soldiers' vote bill; I would be in favor of any bill which would give the members of the armed forces an opportunity to exercise their right of franchise.

Within a few weeks or a few days we shall have the great poll-tax question brought up in the Senate, so we are told. Then, again, we shall hear much about constitutional government and States' rights. Let us be consistent; let us either get on the side of those who are in favor of States' rights or on the side of those who are opposed to States' rights. The States I have just named did not even have a respectable organization to put their votes in the Grant column. They were simply counted in the Grant column by the scalawag votes, the carpetbagger votes, the votes which were put in the ballot box by reason of soldier supervision. We had that situation in my own State of Delaware.

Let us consider the election in 1876. That was another great year. First there had been the attempt to get rid of the President because the Congress disagreed with him politically. Then there was the reconstruction period when the respectable people of the South were treated like so many dogs, when their property was promised to those who formerly had been their servants. In 1876 those States again had a right to vote. Alabama voted for Tilden, Arkansas voted for Tilden. They had gotten away from Grant; the citizens were voting. Georgia voted for Tilden, Mississippi voted for Tilden, North Carolina voted for Tilden, Tennessee voted for Tilden, Texas voted for Tilden; Florida, Louisiana, and South Carolina also voted for Tilden. Those who so lamented the prospect of having a Democratic President who would be strong, those who favored counting in the man they wanted, said, "We will restrict the franchise of those States; we will count out a certain number." So they counted Florida for Hayes, Louisiana for Hayes, and South Carolina for Hayes.

Mr. President, that is the party with which southern Senators are being lined up—the party which stole the votes of three States in order to cheat the United States out of its lawfully elected President in 1876.

Today they have turned around, and they tell us they want constitutional government and States' rights, and they line up with those who, according to the editorial I read, do not even want our soldiers to vote.

Let us see what happened after the Tilden-Hayes steal, in connection with which three members of the Supreme Court, three Members of the Senate, and two Members of the House of Representatives were used as willing servants. I remember that as a boy I heard much about the Force bill. Our southern friends were wild about the Force bill. By whom was it introduced? By the same man who was able to defeat President Wilson in his attempt to assure world peace. It may be possible, by disfranchising some of our voters, to retire every northern Democrat from the Senate. I can conceive how that might be done. I do not know how far our opponents are going, but if they continue they will have more than the Force bill. They will suffer more than we as individuals.

The objection was made that it was unthinkable that soldiers should be placed at the polls in order to carry elections for a particular party; and yet that was done by the party which now protests that we are about to lose our liberty. Yesterday the newspapers carried a statement by the Senator from Ohio to the effect that fourth term would mean the loss of more liberty. Liberty for whom? Not the type of freebooters who were in charge of the Government during reconstruction days.

Not even those who were of no value to the country in 1932. They say they want more freedom, and less liberty removed. If one watches the Senator from Ohio in his attitude toward a Federal vote bill he knows what the objective of those who oppose it must be. If a Senator is from the North, the objective is one thing; and if he is from the South, there is a different objective. However, both objectives mean a restriction of voting among those who are entitled to vote.

In 1940 I took a trip to the Middle West. As I went from Detroit to Philadelphia I saw the trees, fences, and houses plastered with pictures of the man whom our friends across the aisle do not wish to look at now. I saw pictures of Wendell Willkie everywhere. We are told that there was raised for that campaign between $30,000,000 and $50,000,000 to corrupt the electorate of this Nation and place pictures of Wendell Willkie on the fence boards of the Nation. He got a lot of advertising out of it, and he is still using that advertising. It did not work in 1940. No doubt it had some effect. I know it did in my State. It had its effect in placing Wendell Willkie in a position where today he is a power. I have never heard that he favored keeping the boys in the armed services from voting. He may have committed a great many sins, and I am not his attorney, but I have not yet heard that charge made against him.

It did not work in 1940. Now it is proposed to pass a bill which will perhaps accomplish the same result. I realize that Senators from the South are not doing it for that purpose. With one exception, the position of every Senator has been explained. If the boys are not to have an opportunity to vote, do not fool them. Let this bill be killed, and let them know that the Senate does not favor giving the boys an opportunity to vote; that we are afraid as to whom they will vote for; we are alarmed that the result may be to produce votes for someone whom we do not want elected. As proof, consider the statement of the Senator from Oregon that if the President of the United States were to announce that he would not be a candidate the opposition to the bill would end in 30 minutes. Constitutional government, States' rights, and white supremacy would all go out the window if we could only be assured that the President of the United States would not be a candidate.

Much can be said on a subject of this sort. It has been pretty well exhausted. The tendency today toward the restriction of the ballot is a thing to be regretted, far beyond the election or its effect upon any particular candidates. If this Government is to be conducted, and its officers are to be elected, by a portion of the voters, that is to be regretted.

I have read the figures from three campaigns—1868, 1872, and 1876—in order that Senators may realize what the result of a restricted franchise may be. It may be that you and I will fall into some prohibited class by the time of the next election. The idea of constitutional government as conceived by our opponents is such a peculiar one that I do not know who may be in the prohibited class in 4 more years.

I do not know whether we are going backward to the days of 1872-76, or whether we are going forward. I do not know what the purpose of those who have charge of this movement may be. However, the same interests which controlled the Government in that period are struggling to control the Government today. The same interests are struggling to say who shall or shall not be elected; and they are willing today, as they were then, to restrict the franchise. They are willing to take away from your boy and my boy their right of citizenship. They are willing to do that in order that the Government may be theirs. It is not the Republican Party. It is the interests behind this movement. Those interests, if they should once obtain control, would use the Democratic Party as willingly and as freely as they use the Republican Party. I warn Senators that the same interests which interfered with their States and with my State, with their ancestors and my ancestors in the exercise of their God-given rights, are ready to interfere with their children and my children in the exercise of their rights under the Constitution.

The bill before us is wrongly named. The purpose of it is concealed. The result of it can be foretold. The result of the passage of the bill will be that instead of a 100-percent vote we may have only a 75-percent vote. Instead of all the intelligent active defenders of our country in foreign lands being able to cast their vote, some will have to rely on the whim of a Governor in a particular State who may probably not be in sympathy with their right to vote.

I think that the situation confronting us is one of the most serious which has arisen in the last quarter of a century. It has arisen because of new circumstances, which could not have been foreseen, but which the writers of the Constitution thought they had covered in most general language when they gave Congress the power to reach out and do the things that would be necessary to do in order to carry into effect the purposes of the provisions of the Constitution.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I am taking this occasion to make one final observation with reference to the so-called soldiers' vote bill.

I stated early in the consideration of this bill that it was purely a partisan political measure. It still is being discussed from the standpoint of partisan politics. Members on both sides of the aisle, in the Senate and in the House, have charged that it is political. Both sides are right.

There is nothing whatever that Congress can do under the Constitution to aid the soldiers in voting, except to facilitate the transportation of the ballots to and from the places where the soldiers may be. We still have the matter with us now, in some form or other, to be discussed and voted upon. It is mostly for discussion. The matter of soldiers voting, or any other citizens voting, is purely a matter for the States, and it cannot be anything else. I have consistently voted against it. I shall still vote against it. If I have an opportunity to vote on this bill when it comes to a vote, I shall vote against it for reasons that I have heretofore stated, namely, that the Congress has no authority to change the qualifications of voters simply because we are at war. To sustain that decision I have painstakingly quoted from the decisions of the courts and from the opinions of able men in both branches of Congress.

One of the authors of this bill, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] has talked for hours and hours and hours about his concern for the soldiers' vote. He is very solicitous now to know how I may vote upon this bill. He, as well as the Senator from Rhode Island, the coauthor of the bill, has declared himself opposed to it. To ease his concern now, I am saying for the record that if and when I have a chance to vote upon this bill I will vote as they both declare they will vote—but probably for different reasons.

The pending bill apparently amends the procedure for the soldiers to vote under Public Law 712, but it does not repeal the provisions of that law, which in itself is clearly unconstitutional. It has always been my hope that I would have a chance to vote upon a measure that would repeal Public Law 712, in the enactment of which I had no responsibility. It is common knowledge that it passed through the Congress and was approved by the President with only a superficial consideration.

The Senator from Illinois recently observed what he thought to be a great inconsistency in my vote on the Taft amendment. I recognize that the Taft amendment was unconstitutional. I now assert that it was. The Taft amendment minimized the invasion of the rights of the States. I voted for it upon the theory that if it should become the law it would be the lesser of two evils. If the Taft amendment had been adopted, I would have voted against the bill, and therefore the Taft amendment.

If the pending bill shall be defeated—and I hope it will be—we shall still have Public Law 712. Any votes cast under it that do not comply with State laws will still be subject to challenge in the courts, and successful challenge, in my opinion, as to their constitutionality. But it is already the law, and it seems that this Congress will not repeal it.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] seems to have grown very much infuriated over some observations I made heretofore, and has stated that the speech I made against this measure was being circulated by the Republican National Committee. If it is being circulated by the Republican National Committee I am not aware of it. It is perfectly apparent to me that the Senator from Illinois intends to make a political issue out of this vote bill, which he has a perfect right to do. I understand he will need some issues in his coming campaign in the State of Illinois. His disparaging statements made concerning me as a Senator, because I am alleged to be a businessman, may not be too enthusiastically approved even in Illinois.

It happens to be my privilege to have an acquaintance, and to have had a good deal of experience, with businessmen in Illinois. I assume that the people in Illinois are a good deal like the people in Oklahoma, or any other State, and I believe that they are pretty well aware of what has been done to them by their Representatives in the Congress. I could never quite understand just why the Senator became so furious at my recitation of some of the political events in which he participated. All I stated was some facts of which the Nation, including his State of Illinois, is well aware. If the facts hurt, he can only blame himself for them.

I do not want any row with the Senator from Illinois. I should like to get along with him while we are both here together. If I have any occasion to participate in any discussions with reference to his reelection in Illinois it will be purely on the ground of our disagreement upon our philosophies of government. If I do have an opportunity to discuss his philosophy of government, I shall do it without any personal animosity toward him, I am sure. His invidious insinuations as to my record in Oklahoma probably will not be of much concern to the people of Illinois.

It has been said that "politics makes strange bedfellows," and apparently when the Senator from Illinois and I vote upon this measure we will further demonstrate that fact.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who desires to address the Senate, is apparently not in the Chamber at the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Pepper
Andrews	Gillette	Radcliffe
Austin	Green	Revercomb
Bailey	Guffey	Reynolds
Bankhead	Gurney	Robertson
Barkley	Hatch	Russell
Bilbo	Hawkes	Shipstead
Bone	Hayden	Stewart
Brewster	Hill	Taft
Bridges	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Jackson	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Kilgore	Truman
Bushfield	La Follette	Tunnell
Byrd	Langer	Tydings
Capper	Lucas	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	McFarland	Walsh, N. J.
Cordon	McKellar	Weeks
Danaher	Maloney	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	Wherry
Downey	Moore	White
Eastland	Murray	Willis
Ellender	Nye	Wilson
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	
George	Overton	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

C. GUY EVANS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1589) for the relief of C. Guy Evans, Garland Mineral Springs, Index, Wash., which was, on page 2, line 2, after the word "Provided", to insert "That C. Guy Evans and Garland Hot Mineral Springs, a corporation, execute documents satisfactory to the Secretary of the Treasury, releasing the United States from any further liability for the destruction of the recreation hall; *Provided further.*"

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House Nos. 9, 11, and 12, and the amendment of the House No. 3, and the Senate amendment thereto, to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the conferees of both Houses of the Congress have come forward with recommendations which, if enacted into law, will enable every member of the armed forces, who is otherwise eligible, to cast a legal ballot in the forthcoming November elections.

Imbued with a determination to make se vice participation possible, Senators and Representatives on the conference committee have worked diligently and untiringly to achieve that purpose, and they are to be congratulated for the rapidity under adverse circumstances and the thoroughness with which they discharged their responsibilities to the National Legislature and to the Nation. Their was a difficult task. They faced it squarely and courageously, with due regard for the best interests of all concerned.

Frankly, Mr. President, this issue of service voting, though quite simple, has been surrounded by such a maze of confusion, charges, and countercharges it is no wonder that the people are unable to understand its import.

From the very moment the so-called Federal bobtailed ballot proposal was presented in the Senate and House there has been a barrage of misrepresentation released by its proponents which leaves many of us astounded. Some of this false propaganda to force through the administration measure quickly and with but scant deliberation emanated from the residence at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, and from its principal occupant, who had the audacity to brand a legal State-ballot counterproposal as a "fraud."

The mimeographing machines of the able Senators from Illinois and Rhode Island, who coauthored the Federal ballot bill, have been put to such extensive use that it may become necessary for them to apply to the War Production Board for an A-1 or better priority to replace them. Almost daily we witness the scene staged on the Senate floor, in which the two Senators are the principal actors, aided by others, which depicts them literally crying on the Senate's shoulder over the demis of their poor illegitimate child. Their sorrow is mingled with anger a they charge a long series of disastrous plots.

However that may be, suppose we forget the wailing and gnashing of teeth for the moment; suppose we dispel the smokescreen and consider this measure before us with the simple logic that need be applied.

This bill permits every man and woman in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, serving overseas, otherwise eligible to vote, to participate fully in the forthcoming election—that is, every member of those services would be given the right to vote the same ballot that we citizens here at home vote—for President, Vice President, Members of Congress, governors, 34 of whom will be elected several months hence, other State, county, and local officers.

The method prescribed is simple. They have merely to fill out a post card provided by the War Department requesting a ballot, and it will be forwarded them in ample time to be marked and returned to the United States. If for some unexplained reason the State ballot does not reach them before a specified date, then they may avail themselves of another form of balloting which will be provided by the Federal Government.

It is that simple, Mr. President and gentlemen of the Senate, so for heaven's sake why all the fireworks?

Can it be that the proponents of the Federal plan have an ulterior purpose in trying to force through the Congress an unconstitutional method which could and would utlimately be challenged in the courts, perhaps compelling the House of Representatives to designate the next President of the United States? Can it be that they are so out of touch with the sentiment of the members of the armed forces that they feel our military and naval personnel can be voted like a herd of cattle for the fourth term?

If the latter is the case, then my administration friends are doomed to disillusionment. Those boys and girls gladly and proudly wear the Nation's uniform, but they most assuredly are not going to wear the New Deal's collar.

When they vote they want to vote for the men of their choice, without coercion or interference from anyone; they want to vote the full ballot, not the bobtailed variety; they want to know who the candidates are, that they may vote intelligently, and they want their ballot to be constitutional so that it might be legally counted.

The recommendations brought in by the conference committee provide all of these requirements, and there is no reason in the world why the Senate should not promptly accept these recommendations in the interest of those serving our Nation abroad. Personally, I believe we should give speedy approval.

And when this measure is received at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, I trust that the President will also approve without further delay.

I warn you, Mr. President, that if the Chief Executive does otherwise—if he fails to affix his signature to the bill thus making it law, then he and he alone must assume full responsibility for the disfranchisement of hundreds of thousands, and possibly millions, of our soldiers, sailors, marines and coast guardsmen, and he and he alone must face that day of reckoning when the people of these United States will demand to know why he did not want the members of the armed forces to participate in the 1944 elections.

He cannot shirk this responsibility; the boys in the fox holes of Italy, in the swamps and jungles of the islands of the South Pacific, the boys bombing Berlin, on the ships plowing the seven seas, in planes in the air, will demand an accounting—and get one.

In my judgment, Mr. President, the conference report should be agreed to without delay.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, when this question was originally before the Senate, I voted in favor of the Green-Lucas bill, because I felt, and I still feel, that every duly qualified citizen of the United States should be permitted to cast his vote in the forthcoming elections.

The men and women in the armed forces of this Nation have every reason to expect that their right of suffrage will be recognized and made operative, regardless of the physical and legal difficulties which may be encountered. I firmly believe there is no Member of either House of Congress who would deny the right of suffrage or any other right of citizenship to those who now carry on the fight in defense of humanity and justice.

But, Mr. President, in the consideration of any legislation of this type, we who attempt to speak for the Nation are confronted with many considerations which cannot be ignored. The Federal system of government, the dual sovereignties of State and Nation, the constitutional limitations, and our own personal oaths to uphold that constitution have all entered into this question in varying degrees of intensity, with the result that a clear and unmistakable objective, unanimously endorsed by the Members of Congress, is met with certain practical realities of constitutional government which can neither be ignored, nor swept aside with utter disregard.

It is inevitable that in such a setting as this, differences of opinion will develop among sincere and honest men. These differences of opinion, Mr. President, are far too sincere, far too basic and fundamental to be described as "outrageous frauds" or "deliberate betrayals of democracy." These differences are in fact the manifestations of democracy at work, and out of these differences must be welded the final policy of this great legislative body. Those who persist in hurling the cynic's ban are contributing nothing toward the formulation of any policy.

As I have previously indicated, Mr. President, I voted for the Green-Lucas bill when it was approved by the Senate. The House of Representatives, as is their right, approved a vastly different bill.

This turn of events necessitated the appointment of a joint conference committee to which this body and the House appointed 5 Members each from their membership to agree upon a basic bill. The 10 men who functioned on that committee are men whose competence, whose sincerity, and ability are above reproach. They have labored diligently with this problem, Mr. President, and they are to be commended rather than maligned for the results which they have achieved in the face of grave difficulties.

I was particularly impressed with the remarks made yesterday by the able and distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who, in describing the work of the conference committee, pointed out that adjustments and concessions were necessary on all sides in order to prevent an impasse in this vital matter.

In his remarks yesterday the Senator from Vermont said, in part:

> I sat in amazement at the operation of the United States Senate, and I learned something, I hope, and that is that the process of legislation actually necessitates some yielding, and that the reason why the men who arrived here only after struggling against great obstacles and overcoming difficulties and thus hardening their sinews, can get together is that they recognize the necessity to yield something.

That is the essence of the legislative process, Mr. President, and no worthy or enduring piece of legislation has ever been enacted by this body in defiance of that process.

It is true that the pending conference report does not and will not satisfy everyone who has developed an opinion on this particular subject; for the varying shades of opinion on this matter are far too multiple and far too complex to be properly incorporated into any basic report.

But this report represents the best efforts of 10 respected and competent Members of the Congress—all of whom are sincerely interested in extending the right of suffrage to every American citizen in the armed forces.

The bill reported by the conferees, far from representing a disenfranchisement of any group, represents a sincere, and I feel a successful, effort to make effective the franchise and the vote of every American citizen from whatever station or walk of life he may come.

The clear, lucid, and able explanation of the conference report given by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] yesterday has convinced me that this measure can be made effective, and that the fundamental purpose of providing for the full and effective participation of the members of our armed forces in the selection of their governing officers can be fully and effectively carried out under the procedure recommended in the conference report.

Mr. President, 8 out of 10 conferees have agreed to this report, among them a number of the outstanding men in the Senate of the United States. As one who voted for the Green-Lucas bill, as one who hoped that the conference report might embody that bill, I now stand ready, Mr. President, to commend my colleagues for the report which they have submitted and to vote in favor of accepting that report.

I feel that in voting to accept the report I am keeping faith with the Constitution and the people of the United States, with the integrity of this body, and with the members of the armed forces, among whom I am proud to number my own son.

It will remain for history to determine whether or not this action is sound, but I entertain no doubt that time will prove that the report is not the instrument of evil and iniquity which some zealous souls have held it up to be.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to consume more than a very few moments of the Senate's time in discussing the conference report. I do not wish to delay a vote upon it, because I am sure we are all anxious to vote today. But, inasmuch as I have decided to vote against the conference report, I wish briefly to give my reasons. I do not do so, Mr. President, with the expectation that my reasons will affect the result of the vote. I assume the conference report will be agreed to, but I am unable to vote for it, and I wish the RECORD to show, and my constituents to know, and especially the service men and women in whose behalf the legislation is presumed to be under consideration, to know my reasons for voting against this particular conference report.

First, I wish to say that neither my vote nor anything I shall say is to be regarded in any respect as either impunging the motives of the conferees or indicating that they did not do the best they could in obtaining any sort of a report at all to bring back to the Senate. We all know with what difficulty we obtained a workable bill through the Senate in behalf of the service men and women. It seems to me that in the midst of this great war, when all the power of the Government of the United States for the purpose of waging war has been exercised or may be exercised in the raising of an army and a navy and in their equipment, and in sending them all over the world to fight for the things that we hold dear, it is most unfortunate that it has taken several months for the Congress of the United States to reach a termination of its consideration—not of the right of these people to vote, but of the opportunity to exercise their right to which I think they are entitled.

Mr. President, I am not speaking now of the Senate, I am speaking of the Congress as a whole, and we all understand the situation that confronted the conferees because of the position of the conferees representing the other House of the Congress. Speaking of the Congress as a whole, of which we must speak in determining the effectiveness and the validity or the value of this legislation, it seems to me and has seemed to me all along that more adhesive tape has been used in binding restrictions around any legislation possible of enactment, in order to prevent our service men and women from voting, than was ever brought to bear before, in my opinion,

in regard to any legislation that Congress has enacted.

I felt from the beginning that it would have been a simple matter, and that it ought to have been a simple matter to provide a way by which 11,000,000 eligible voters who have been taken from their homes and their communities and their States in order to fight the battles of democracy, should, while fighting for that democracy, be permitted to vote for it.

I do not know how the soldiers or the sailors or the marines or those in the Coast Guard, or the women, or individuals in any of the other branches of our service will vote. I have no right to inquire how they will vote. To me it has made no difference how they vote. If every one of them from my State, given the opportunity to exercise the right to vote, should announce in advance that he would vote against me if I should be a candidate again, I would nevertheless feel it my duty to give each one an opportunity to do that very thing. If all the soldiers and sailors and all the combined armed forces of the United States Army and Navy and all the other United States forces scattered all over the world should at this hour announce that they would vote against the party now in power, if the opportunity to vote were given to them, I would nevertheless feel it my duty to vote to give them that opportunity. I am sorry I cannot now vote for a bill which does that. I do not think I can in this report. I do not think that opportunity is before us. Therefore, I have been constrained, with much regret, to come to the conclusion that insofar as I am concerned, in the discharge of my individual responsibility here, I should vote against this conference report.

Mr. President, I am not going into any legalistic argument about it. I am not going into any constitutional argument about it. Able lawyers and legislators honestly differ about the power of the Congress to enact legislation in war or at any other time in regard to the regulation of elections. I am one of those who believe that, under the Constitution, Congress does have some power in regard to the regulation of elections for Federal officers, namely, President, Vice President, and the Members of Congress. I do not know that that power is any greater in war than it is in peace; but certainly the need and the occasion for it are greater in time of war than in time of peace, because by our own act and by the strong arm of our own Government we have taken these eligible voters away from their homes and away from the opportunity which is theirs to cast their vote not only in Federal elections but in State and local elections. Having done that, I have thought from the beginning and I so expressed myself at the very outset, that Congress not only had the power to deal with it, but it owed a duty to the country, as well as to those involved in the suffrage, to make it as easy as possible, within the law and within its constitutional power, for these voters to exercise that right, instead of making it as hard as possible. Those who have opposed any legislation at all along such lines have sought to make it as hard as possible. I do not criticize that effort on their part. They are no doubt as sincere as I am. But I think it is unfortunate for our country, for those of us who are left at home, and for those who now are doing the fighting and who must continue to do it until this war is over. It is unfortunate because of the reaction and the effect which the refusal of Congress to make it easy for the members of the armed services to vote may have upon their own true understanding of what they are fighting for and what we have sent them around the world to fight for.

I do not oppose the conference report merely because under it the soldiers and sailors and others from my State who are in the armed services will not be permitted to vote. If I felt that the bill granted any substantial increase in opportunity for all the armed services to vote, I might be inclined to vote for it, although not a soldier or sailor from my own State might be able to vote, because I have not looked upon the matter purely as a local one. I do not now look upon it as a local matter. But believing, as I do, that the conference report does not enlarge to any substantial degree the opportunity for voting, beyond the opportunity afforded by the present law, the fact that under the present law soldiers from Kentucky did vote in 1942 and, in my judgment, can vote in 1944, and as long as the present war shall last, constitutes at least an additional reason why I am unable to support the report of the conference committee.

There has been brought into the discussion the question whether the present law is repealed, either by specific reference to its sections or by implication, by the conference report. This bill is a substitute for all the present law with the exception of sections 1 and 2. If it becomes enacted, it nullifies all the rest of Public Law 712. It does not directly repeal sections 1 and 2, which relate only to registration and the payment of the poll tax; but, because of the restrictions placed in the conference report and in the House bill upon the right of exercising the suffrage by the members of our armed services, I think by implication and by necessary interpretation and effect the present conference report repeals sections 1 and 2 of the present law, which waived or sought to waive registration in States where it was required insofar as Federal elections are concerned, and sought to waive the payment of the poll tax.

So, Mr. President, if it be true that by its very terms sections 3 to 15, inclusive, are repealed by this bill, and sections 1 and 2 are repealed by necessary interpretation and implication, then it follows, of course, that no serviceman or servicewoman anywhere will be allowed to vote by reason of any waiver of the payment of the poll tax or registration; and in my judgment under this proposed statute, if it is enacted as the conference report contains it, no one will be allowed to vote, no one will have his or her vote counted, unless he or she is registered according to the laws of the State in which he or she is a legal voter, and unless he or she has paid the poll tax, in the case of States in which payment of the poll tax is a prerequisite to voting.

Mr. President, for the moment let us lay those considerations aside. I wish very briefly to discuss the provisions of paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 302 which, it seems to me, are so utterly contradictory and so utterly at cross purposes that, as was suggested earlier in the day, it will be impossible for the high-ranking Army and Navy officers to explain to the millions of men and women in the armed services down the line what these provisions mean. It will be even more difficult for the privates in the ranks to understand them; and finally, in disgust because of their inability to find out what Congress meant, what Congress was willing for them to do, probably they will give up any effort to vote at all.

While it is true that under the present law in 1942 only approximately 28,000 votes were cast by members of the armed services, I think that many more than that number would be cast under the present law in the coming election.

In the first place, that was what we call a byelection. It is always true that more people vote in Presidential elections than in congressional or State races. By the law of averages, we may expect many more men and women in uniform to vote in 1944 than voted in 1942.

In addition, there has been much agitation on the subject. The right of the soldier to vote has been brought particularly to his attention. It has been emphasized and debated. It has been written about not only in newspapers in the United States but in service newspapers all over the world. Members of the armed forces are more interested in the exercise of the right of suffrage; and I dare say that many a soldier or sailor who under ordinary circumstances might not be willing to take the trouble required in order to vote, now that he finds that someone is trying to deny him the right to vote, will make a more determined effort than ever to vote, and will be greatly disappointed if his willingness, desire, or opportunity to vote is thwarted.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator will excuse me. I do not wish to consume any more time than is absolutely necessary. One question leads to another. I am merely stating my reasons for voting against the conference report.

As I was saying, aside from all other considerations, I believe that under the present law, without amendment or further enactment, probably hundreds of thousands more members of the armed forces would vote in 1944 than voted in 1942. I do not know what the fate of the measure now before us will be. At the outset I stated that I assumed that the conference report would be adopted in the Senate. It will probably be adopted in the House. What will happen to it after that, I have no way of predicting. I have no information on the subject, and I make no prediction as to whether the President will sign it, veto

it, or allow it to become a law without his signature. I do not know what his views are, and I do not know whether he knows, until the bill is sent to him for his examination. According to a standard which I understand he set a few days ago at a press conference, namely, that his attitude might be determined on the basis of whether the pending bill would allow greater or lesser opportunity to vote than does the present law, I am unable to predict what his verdict will be.

Yesterday, in a question or two directed to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], I briefly discussed section 302, under title III. The heading under title III is "Use of Supplementary Federal Ballots." Section 301, under the heading "United States War Ballot Commission," establishes the United States War Ballot Commission, and prescribes its duties. Section 302, subsection (a) provides as follows:

SEC. 302. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b), the provisions of this title shall apply with respect to the following:

(1) Members of the armed forces and the merchant marine of the United States, outside the United States.

(2) Persons serving with the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, and the United Service Organizations, outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States.

While it does not say so, it means outside the United States.

(3) Members of the armed forces inside the United States.

In subsection (b), to which subsection (a) is subject, because it says "subject to the provisions of subsection (b)," we have this provision:

(b) The provisions of this title shall apply to, and the ballot provided for by this title may be used by—

"The ballot provided for by this title" is the ballot printed on the following page—page 7 of the conference report. That is the ballot meticulously set out in terms by this title. That is the ballot to which reference is made in section 302, subsections (a) and (b).

(b) The provisions of this title shall apply to, and the ballot provided for by this title may be used by—

(1) an individual referred to in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a), if he is a citizen of a State whose Governor has certified, prior to July 15 of the year in which the election is to be held (A) that such State has made no provision for procedure which will enable the citizens thereof to whom subsection (a) applies to vote by State absentee ballot, and (b) that the use of ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of such State; or.

I challenge anyone to find an ordinary man who is not steeped in the intricacies of the law who can understand, after reading that, whether he will be entitled to vote or even to receive a ballot. But that is not the main objection to this particular section.

We now come to subparagraph (2) of subsection (b) of section 302:

(2) an individual referred to in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a), if he is a citizen of a State whose Governor has certified, prior to July 15 of the year in which the election is to be held, that the use of ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of such State, even though the Governor thereof does not make the certification referred to in clause (A) of paragraph (1), but only if such individual states in his oath that, prior to September 1, he made application for a State absentee ballot but, as of October 1, has not received it.

I think it is presumptuous to assume, as a matter of law and constitutional power, that any State legislature can meet in session, validate the terms set out in a subsequent congressional action, and approve the ballot set out in the law. If that be true, even though a State legislature may have passed what it regards as an adequate local absentee ballot law under the State law, the legislature of that very State will have to be called back into extraordinary session in order to pass a resolution, even as simple as that submitted the other day by the Senator from Vermont, saying that the soldier or sailor who is eligible to vote under the laws of that State may likewise use the particular ballot set out in this law in casting a vote upon a Federal ballot.

This language does not say that the Governor must certify that some legislation has been enacted by the legislature. It does not say that the legislature has adequately taken care of its own absentee ballot voting situation. This particular paragraph says that the Governor must certify that the use of ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of the State.

The ballot is set forth on the following page. That means, in my judgment, that the legislature must convene and say, by resolution, or by an enactment of some kind, that this particular ballot, which is spread over page 7 of the conference report, is a legal ballot under the laws of the State. In my judgment that means that the State legislatures will all have to be called into extraordinary session in order to validate this ballot. I know that many of them will not do so. Already the Governors of some States have publicly announced that they will not call their legislatures into extraordinary session for the purpose of enacting any soldier ballot legislation. I would not venture a prediction as to how many of them will do so. I feel that many of them will not.

For that reason the Governor of the State will be unable to certify that this particular ballot has been approved by the legislature of the State, not by a blanket approval, but after having it before the legislature to vote upon in the terms in which Congress has enacted it.

If that be true, my theory is that in most of the States no kind of Federal ballot will ever reach the soldiers or sailors, or any others in the armed services. If it should reach them and be executed and returned, if the Governor had not been able to make the certification set out in the bill, it would be left to some local precinct officer in the community where the votes are cast to decide whether such action on the part of the Governor, if attempted, was legal, or whether the Governor had taken any action at all. In my judgment, such confusion would result as to make it possible for fewer men and women in the armed services to vote under the proposed statute than under the law as it now exists.

I regret this, Mr. President, because I think the Congress would do well, and would have done well from the beginning, if, instead of attempting to make it more difficult day by day for the members of our armed services to vote, it had been liberal in its interpretation of its power and made it easier for them to exercise the right for which they are fighting, and for which, perhaps, hundreds of thousands of them will give up their lives. They are fighting that we here at home may not only vote but may hold office by the election and choice of the people in whose behalf the men and women to whom I have referred are fighting and sacrificing.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat that I believe that the conferees on the part of the Senate did the best they could do. I realize the stone wall they were up against in meeting the conferees from the other House. As we all know, on several occasions the conferees on the part of the Senate practically gave up any hope of being able to arrive at a conference report at all by any agreement which might be brought back. Notwithstanding the sincerity of the Senate conferees, and notwithstanding their effort to go further than they were finally able to go, I feel that, as a whole, the bill falls far short of what should have been done, and that it falls far short of giving to the American soldiers, sailors, marines, and all the other members of our armed services the kind of electoral recognition to which they are entitled, and for that reason I am unable to support the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Gerry	Pepper
Andrews	Gillette	Radcliffe
Austin	Green	Revercomb
Bailey	Guffey	Reynolds
Bankhead	Gurney	Robertson
Barkley	Hatch	Russell
Bilbo	Hawkes	Shipstead
Bone	Hayden	Stewart
Brewster	Hill	Taft
Bridges	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Jackson	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Kilgore	Truman
Bushfield	La Follette	Tunnell
Byrd	Langer	Tydings
Capper	Lucas	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	McFarland	Walsh, N. J.
Cordon	McKellar	Weeks
Danaher	Maloney	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	Wherry
Downey	Moore	White
Eastland	Murray	Willis
Ellender	Nye	Wilson
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	
George	Overton	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

The question is on the adoption of the conference report. On that question the yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. TOBEY's name was called). I am asked to announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is unavoidably absent and that if present and voting he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WAGNER (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The senior Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] is absent on official business. I am authorized to announce that, if present, she would vote "yea."

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I do not know how he would vote, but I transfer my pair with him to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who would vote "yea" if permitted to vote, and I allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is absent on official business. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] would vote yea.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]; the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]; and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from California, the Senator from Minnesota, and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and that the Senator from Virginia, the Senator from New York, and the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business. He is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. If present the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. If present the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is necessarily absent. He is paired on this question with the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]. If present the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is necessarily absent. If present he would vote "yea." He has been paired by transfer.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on public business.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—47

Andrews	Danaher	Revercomb
Austin	Davis	Reynolds
Bailey	Eastland	Robertson
Bankhead	Ellender	Shipstead
Bilbo	George	Taft
Brewster	Gerry	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Gillette	Thomas, Okla.
Brooks	Gurney	Tydings
Buck	Hawkes	Walsh, Mass.
Burton	Hill	Weeks
Bushfield	Holman	Wheeler
Byrd	McCarran	Wherry
Capper	McClellan	White
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Willis
Connally	Overton	Wilson
Cordon	Radcliffe	

NAYS—31

Barkley	Kilgore	Russell
Bone	La Follette	Stewart
Clark, Mo.	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Downey	Lucas	Truman
Ferguson	McFarland	Tunnell
Green	Maloney	Vandenberg
Guffey	Millikin	Wagner
Hatch	Moore	Walsh, N. J.
Hayden	Murray	
Jackson	Nye	
Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney	
	Pepper	

NOT VOTING—18

Aiken	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham
Ball	Maybank	Smith
Butler	Mead	Tobey
Caraway	Murdock	Wallgren
Chandler	O'Daniel	Wiley
Chavez	Reed	
Glass		

So the conference report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4070, a bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the adoption of the motion of the Senator from Tennesese, but after consulting with him and with the distinguished minority leader, it is understood that the bill is not to be taken up this afternoon, but will go over until Thursday. With that understanding, I have no objection to it being made the unfinished business.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the bill should be taken up as soon as possible, but I have no objection to the suggestion made, as the two leaders think that course should be pursued.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that consideration of the bill be postponed, at the request of the two leaders, until next Thursday, at the time the Senate convenes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 700.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

FIRST CALL ON FARM MACHINERY

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, before we proceed with the call of the calendar, I should like to have an opportunity of inserting some articles in the RECORD, and making brief observations relative thereto.

I have before me an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune, the issue of March 6, 1944, entitled "First Call on Farm Machinery." The editorial has relation to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, upon which the Senate voted several days ago.

Mr. President, I opposed the joint resolution relating to the U. N. R. R. A. because I do not believe that we are in a position to vote $1,350,000,000 of the taxpayers' money for the relief and rehabilitation of European countries, at a time when our national debt is soaring.

I opposed the joint resolution for the further reason that I feel that the farmers of this country should have first call on farm machinery. I respectfully invite the attention of the Members of this body to this very able editorial, which I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point.

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

FIRST CALL ON FARM MACHINERY

Representative CALVIN JOHNSON of Illinois has performed a useful service in calling attention to proposals for giving away large

quantities of farm machinery to European farmers when the war ends. He believes that the export of 30,000 tractors, 80,000 plows, 50,000 mowers, etc., from this country was suggested by British advisers to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and that some of the estimates were actually increased by the New Dealers.

Mr. JOHNSON remembers that American farmers have had the greatest difficulty in replacing worn out machinery for several years and he is rightly concerned that our own needs be kept in mind. Even those new dealers who are more interested in European welfare than in the well-being of their own country can hardly fail to recognize that American implements are likely to be more productive in the hands of men accustomed to their use than if turned over to peasants who don't know how to run them. Mr. JOHNSON is puzzled, also, by the allocation of implements to the Baltic countries and to Poland, in view of the Russian claims to these areas. Are our contributions to relief and rehabilitation to be used to coerce the little nations, against their wills, into accepting Soviet domination?

Americans, recognizing that there are millions in Europe who have been living on short rations, are willing this time, as so often in the past, to extend relief. The new dealers, dominated as they are by British thinking, have thus far prevented relief organizations from sending protective foods and medicines to the children in occupied countries, a fact which justifies some skepticism about the charitable origin of their present plans. At any rate, it is noteworthy that the principal deficiencies in Europe's wartime diet are in fats, oils, dairy products, and animal proteins. The export of farm machinery is not likely to contribute greatly or promptly to the relief of these shortages.

European soil and climate, for the most part, are not well suited for the production of vegetable oils. Moreover, it is the destruction of herds rather than the lack of machinery which is limiting the output of dairy goods and meat. So far as cereals, potatoes, and such field crops are concerned, European production is believed not to be much below normal. Where the populations lack bread and potatoes, the fault can generally be attributed to lack of transport or to confiscation for military or political purposes.

Nevertheless, Europe will need some farm machinery and should have it, subject to the prior claims of our own farmers. How much should be exported will depend in considerable measure on the season at which the war ends. If the fighting stops in the summer or early fall, a pretty good start can be made in European factories on the production of farm machinery for use in the following crop year. At any rate, until it is known how speedily Europe can convert its factories from swords to plowshares, there can be no reliable estimate of the quantities of farm machinery which, in charity, we should send abroad.

ADJUSTED COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS OF WORLD WAR NO. 2

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, a few days ago the able and distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] introduced in the Senate a bill pertaining to adjusted compensation for veterans of World War No. 2. I estimated that the bill, when every feature of it shall have been finally liquidated, will cost the taxpayers of this country some twenty-five or thirty billion dollars.

Mr. President, I am cosponsor of the bill with the distinguished Senator from Colorado, because I believe that of all the people of our country we should first take care of those American citizens, men and women, boys and girls, who are now in uniform.

I have before me an editorial from a recent issue of the Washington Times-Herald, entitled "The Bonus Bill," in which the editor disagrees with the distinguished Senator from Colorado and myself about the proposal. He is in opposition to it. I clipped this editorial because of its last sentence, which is as follows:

> We believe Congress can serve them best—
>
> Speaking of the soldiers and sailors—
>
> at this time, by concentrating on measures to have productive jobs ready for them in abundance when they come home.

Mr. President, I clipped another editorial from the same issue of the Washington Times-Herald. It is headed "And taxes after the war."

I read one sentence from that editorial:

> Whether millions of our fighting men return to jobs and opportunities—or to unemployment—will depend upon how wisely and speedily a peacetime tax program is put into effect.

That relates to unemployment after the war.

In connection with the two editorials from which I have just read, I bring to the attention of Members of the Senate a news item appearing in the columns of the Washington Times-Herald of several days ago under the headline "Twenty-five million idle seen at postwar peak."

The article is as follows:

> America's post-war unemployment peak will find 25,000,000 out of work, Ewan Clague, Director of the Bureau of Employment, Social Security Board, told officials representing Government, industry, and labor last night at a meeting of the International Association of Public Employment Services in the Interior Department Auditorium. Millard Rice, national service director of the Disabled American Veterans organization, warned that the Veterans' Administration will have all it can do to handle disabled servicemen and proposed that able-bodied servicemen be cared for through other agencies.

Mr. President, with reference to the matter of unemployment mentioned in the article, I desire to say that if we are really and genuinely serious in our desire to provide jobs for our uniformed men and women after the war, we must guard well against the usurpation of those jobs by hundreds of thousands of aliens who are now being permitted to come into this country at a time when we are at war.

I call attention to the fact that when we became engaged in the present war there were approximately 6,000,000 aliens in this country. Since our involvement in the war I imagine that at least several hundred thousand of those aliens, many of whom had been here for years, have become American citizens, and have taken the oath of allegiance to this country. Nevertheless, regardless of that number, I dare say there are nigh unto four or five million aliens in the country at the present time.

Mr. President, what I desire particularly to bring to the attention of the Members of the Senate is that actually since the present World War began on September 3, 1939, more than 600,000 aliens have entered this country. Many of them are very rich. They left their native lands and came here to bask in the sunshine and safety and prosperity and pleasure afforded by America, instead of staying in their homes and fighting for the countries of their birth. On the contrary, our boys and our girls have left this country and gone to the countries of these aliens to fight for them. I protest again against the admission into the United States of any alien from any country in the world while the war is in progress. I protest for the reason that I think that every single American job should be held for the benefit of American men and American women who are wearing the uniform and are now on foreign shores fighting for the "four freedoms" all over the world.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I am rather curious about one aspect of the problem which the Senator has mentioned many times. I understand that the aliens he refers to came in on visitors' visas.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is correct.

Mr. BONE. What is going to happen to them when the war ends and the emergency conditions no longer exist in Europe? How will this country handle that particular problem? Will the people involved be sent out of the country, or what will happen to them?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will say in answer to the Senator that in my humble opinion, based on past experiences with respect to hundreds of thousands who are here now, they will never leave, and we will never force them to leave. I recall vividly, and I am sure the Senator from Washington recalls likewise, that for a number of years we had before us the question of expelling criminal aliens. At the time a bill carrying that provision was before the Senate I went to the Immigration Division, which is now in the Department of Justice, and collected the names and the nationalities of more than 2,300 alien criminals who had committed murder, rape, forgery, and almost everything else in the category of crime, and for 2 years I endeavored to get the Secretary of Labor, Madam Perkins, to expel those 2,300 alien criminals; but we were never able to have any of them expelled because they were placed in the category of what it was pleased to term "hardship" cases.

I take the responsibility personally of saying on the Senate floor that very few of the 600,000 refugees and aliens from all parts of the world who have come to this country during the time when we have been at war, fighting for their liberties, fighting for their countries, will ever return to devastated Europe. They will want to remain here where the money is, where the opportunities are, where we enjoy the "four freedoms." That is why I protest again and again against permitting these people to come into the United States on temporary visas, or student visas, or permanent passes, or anything else. If we are to keep America American I believe we must

deport several hundred thousand individuals who have tried to indoctrinate our country with un-American ideas and to instill them into our people. I say that it is our duty as Members of this body to save America for Americans, and by that I mean save American jobs for American heroes, for American women and American men who are in uniform.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. BONE. What does the Senator from North Carolina think would happen in this country if we had 25,000,000 unemployed, as was suggested in an article he read earlier?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That would be more unemployed than we had between 1930 and 1934. At the peak of unemployment during that period approximately 18,000,000 persons were out of work. Many more millions were employed only part-time.

CIVILIANS ENGAGED IN CONSTRUCTION OF PANAMA CANAL

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to give notice on behalf of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and myself that at the conclusion of the call of the calendar we shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 337, Senate bill 683, to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal.

COMPENSATION FOR TAKING OF PRIVATE FISHERY RIGHTS IN PEARL HARBOR, T. H.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to have the call of the calendar commenced, pursuant to the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to call the measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 700, in accordance with the previous order.

The bill (S. 1682) to provide for the payment of compensation to certain claimants for the taking by the United States of private fishery rights in Pearl Harbor, island of Oahu, T. H., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any funds not otherwise appropriated, to the following-named claimants the sums respectively indicated herein as full and complete compensation for their respective rights in the fisheries of Pearl Harbor, island of Oahu, T. H.: Trustees under the will and of the estate of James Campbell, deceased, and Oahu Railway & Land Co., $62,375.20; the Dowsett Co. (Ltd.), $1; H. N. Kaikainahaole, $1; Adelaide K. Akina, $1; trustees of the Bernice P. Bishop estate, $6,952.80; executor of the estate of Lincoln Lloyd McCandless, $2,827.22: *Provided*, That payment shall not be made to any of said claimants until such claimant has consented to the dismissal with prejudice of all pending litigation wherein right to compensation for the taking of such fishery rights and of any interest therein or part thereof has been or is claimed or asserted against the United States, in a manner satisfactory to the Attorney General, has conveyed to the United States any and all right, title, or interest in said fisheries, and has released all claims to damages or compensation against the United States with respect to alleged rights in said fisheries; and has consented to the entry of a final order or judgment of condemnation in the condemnation proceedings instituted by the United States and pending in the United States District Court for Hawaii for the condemnation of claimants' rights in said fisheries.

CHARLIE HOLCOMB

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1588) for the relief of Charlie Holcomb, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the word "to," to strike out "Charlie Holcomb, of Voth, Tex., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for (1) compensation for personal injuries sustained by his minor son, Eugene Holcomb, as the result of an accident which occurred when he was struck by an Army vehicle in Voth, Tex., on July 28, 1942, and (2) reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred by him as a result of such injuries," and insert "the legal guardian of Eugene Holcomb, of Voth, Tex., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by Eugene Holcomb, a minor, as the result of an accident which occurred when he was struck by an Army vehicle in Voth, Tex., on July 28, 1942, and for all medical, hospital, and incidental expenses heretofore and hereafter incurred as a result of such injury," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Eugene Holcomb, of Voth, Tex., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by Eugene Holcomb, a minor, as the result of an accident which occurred when he was struck by an Army vehicle in Voth, Tex., on July 28, 1942, and for all medical, hospital, and incidental expenses heretofore and hereafter incurred as a result of such injuries: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Eugene Holcomb, a minor."

DEPENDENTS OF DR. ARTHUR B. WYSE, AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 3371) for the relief of the dependents of Dr. Arthur B. Wyse, and others, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOUIS COURCIL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 248) for the relief of Louis Courcil, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

H. G. TOOLEY

The bill (H. R. 2880) for the relief of H. G. Tooley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT C. HARRIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1355) for the relief of Robert C. Harris, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$12,653.25" and insert "$4,435"; in line 9, after the word "of", to insert "loss of wages, medical, and hospital expenses, and"; and on page 2, line 3, after the word "truck", to change the period to a colon and insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert C. Harris, Fort Hancock, N. J., the sum of $4,435. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert C. Harris against the United States on account of loss of wages, medical and hospital expenses, and personal injuries sustained by him on March 17, 1943, when the automobile which he was driving on Rumson Road in Monmouth County, N. J., was struck by a United States Army truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MATHILDE B. MEISTER

The bill (H. R. 2183) for the relief of Mathilde B. Meister was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IRVING L. JONES

The bill (H. R. 929) for the relief of Irving L. Jones was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NADINE GORMAN

The bill (H. R. 2385) for the relief of Nadine Gorman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF JOHN H. CATHCART

The bill (H. R. 1062) for the relief of the estate of John H. Cathcart was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DELORES LEWIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1313) for the relief of Delores Lewis, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$369."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

HEIRS OF SIMON M. MYHRE

The bill (H. R. 1273) for the relief of the heirs of Simon M. Myhre was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADELARD DEMERS

The bill (H. R. 2875) for the relief of Adelard Demers was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLARD KERR, JR.

The bill (H. R. 3195) for the relief of Willard Kerr, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF LORRAINE NOVAK, A MINOR

The bill (H. R. 3173) for the relief of the legal guardian of Lorraine Novak, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDWIN FOLEY

The bill (H. R. 2772) for the relief of Edwin Foley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REV. C. M. McKAY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 544) for the relief of Rev. C. M. McKay, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$581.10."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FROM LIABILITY FOR OVERPAYMENTS

The bill (S. 1665) 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, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the employees responsible for the excess or erroneous payments represented by the sums herein stated be, and they are hereby, relieved of financial liability therefor and the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to allow credit in the settlement of the accounts of Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, in such amounts not exceeding the sums stated herein, which have been or hereafter may be disallowed, as may be necessary to relieve such disbursing officer of financial liability therefor: *Provided*, That this act shall not be construed to bar recovery of the amounts herein specified from the persons to whom and through whom such amounts have been paid:

First. A. J. Dalton, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Baltimore (now Fort Howard), Md., in the sum of $4.50, which amount was expended March 31, 1941, under symbol 11559.

Second. D. D. Campbell, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Perry Point, Md., in the sum of $7, which amount was expended in February 1941, under symbol 11559.

Third. C. F. Sargent, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Batavia, N. Y., in the sum of $420, which amount was expended from December 1, 1938, through February 28, 1939, under symbol 11564.

Fourth. John A. Hadley, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Bath, N. Y., in the sum of $12.66, which amount was expended from August 1 through September 26, 1939, under symbol 11564.

Fifth. Malcolm L. Stoddard, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Togus, Maine, in the sum of $467.50, which amount was expended from January 1 through June 30, 1939, under symbol 11565.

Sixth. D. F. Ivory, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Togus, Maine, in the sum of $42.50, which amount was expended June 30, 1939, under symbol 11565.

Seventh. F. X. McFadden, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration office, Philadelphia, Pa., in the sum of $4.20, which amount was expended July 31, 1941, under symbol 11566.

Eighth. H. H. Higginbotham, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Pittsburgh, Pa., in the sum of $5.26, which amount was expended in May 1941, under symbol 11568.

Ninth. Guy F. Palmer, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Dearborn, Mich., in the sum of $4, which amount was expended in July 1941, under symbol 11571.

Tenth. I. G. Sims, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Knoxville, Iowa, in the sum of $60, which amount was expended July 23, 1941, under symbol 11571.

Eleventh. A. B. Conley, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Wichita, Kans., in the sum of $125, which amount was expended in May 1940, under symbol 11573.

Twelfth. S. E. Malmsten, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., in the sum of $18.55, which amount was expended July 12, 1938, under symbol 11647.

Thirteenth. A. P. Carson, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., in the sum of $83.03, which amount was expended June 15, 1936, under symbol 99280.

Fourteenth. J. C. Dale, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., in the sum of $182.25, which amount was expended June 30, 1936, under symbol 99280.

Fifteenth. M. Carey, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, New York (Bronx), N. Y., in the sum of $100, which amount was expended June 15, 1936, under symbol 99282.

Sixteenth. A. Rosentahl, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Cleveland (now Brecksville), Ohio, in the sum of $4.71, which amount was expended July 10, 1936, under symbol 99284.

Seventeenth: C. A. Blackburn, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Little Rock, Ark., in the sum of $43, which amount was expended on June 15, 1936, under symbol 99288.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE AT BRAINERD, MINN.

The bill (S. 1660) 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., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Minnesota Department of Highways and the county of Crow Wing in Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Mill Street in the city of Brainerd, Minn., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

CONDEMNATION OF MATERIALS UNFIT FOR USE IN BUTTER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1006) 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, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments of the committee will be stated.

The first amendment of the committee was, on page 2, line 4, after the word "butter" and the period, to strike out:

Such ingredients shall be marked "inspected and passed" if found to be clean, wholesome, healthful, and otherwise fit for use in the manufacture of process or renovated butter. All ingredients found to be unclean, unwholesome, unhealthful, or otherwise unfit for use in the manufacture of process or renovated butter shall be marked "inspected and condemned" and shall be destroyed or denatured for food purposes in the presence of an inspector.

And insert:

All ingredients which are found to be putrid or decomposed or which contain organic or inorganic substances which are foreign to such ingredients when properly made, manufactured, produced, collected, stored, transported, or handled, and which organic or inorganic substances cannot be removed by processing, shall be deemed unfit for use in the manufacture of process or renovated butter, shall be marked "U. S. inspected and condemned," and shall be denatured or destroyed under the supervision of the inspector. All other ingredients shall be marked "U. S. inspected and passed," and shall be deemed fit for use in the manufacture of process or renovated butter.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 3, line 5, after the words "shall be", to strike out "destroyed or denatured for food purposes in the presence of an" and insert "denatured or destroyed under the supervision of the."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 24, after the word "regulations" and the period, to insert: "The Secretary of Agriculture may, from time to time, by regulations define the foreign substances and the extent thereof that render the ingredients unfit for use in manufacturing process or renovated butter."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 19, after the words " 'process butter' " to strike out "or 'renovated butter.' "

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 6, to insert:

(k) The administration and enforcement of the provisions of this act, other than its provisions relating to revenue, but including the seizure and denaturing or destruction of ingredients intended to be used in the manufacture of process or renovated butter and the denaturing or destruction of process or renovated butter, are committed exclusively to the Secretary of Agriculture: *Provided*, That any powers and duties of the Food and Drug Administration of the Federal Security Agency under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 301, and the following), as regards such ingredients before they come into the possession of the manufacturers of process or renovated butter, or as regards such powers and duties in connection with process or renovated butter after it leaves such manufacturers and comes into the hands of wholesale or retail dealers, or others, shall not be affected by this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 9, to insert:

SEC. 4. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2325 of the Internal Revenue Code, approved February 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 254), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2325. Inspection of process or renovated butter: For the purpose of protecting interstate and foreign commerce from process or renovated butter which is unclean, unwholesome, unhealthful, or otherwise unfit for human food:

"(a) The Secretary of Agriculture shall, through inspectors appointed by him, cause inspections to be made of all milk, butter, butter oil, and other ingredients intended for use in the manufacture of process or renovated butter. All ingredients which are found to be putrid or decomposed or which contain organic or inorganic substances which are foreign to such ingredients when properly made, manufactured, produced, collected, stored, transported, or handled, and which organic or inorganic substances cannot be removed by processing, shall be deemed unfit for use in the manufacture of process or renovated butter, shall be marked 'U. S. inspected and condemned,' and shall be denatured or destroyed under the supervision of the inspector. All other ingredients shall be marked 'U. S. Inspected and Passed,' and shall be deemed fit for use in the manufacture of process or renovated butter.

"(b) The Secretary of Agriculture shall cause inspections to be made of all process or renovated butter. If such butter is found to be clean, wholesome, healthful, and otherwise fit for human food, it shall be marked 'U. S. inspected and passed.' Process or renovated butter that is found to be unclean, unwholesome, unhealthful, or otherwise unfit for human food shall be denatured or destroyed under the supervision of the inspector.

"(c) The Secretary of Agriculture shall cause inspections to be made of all factories wherein process or renovated butter is manufactured to determine the sanitary conditions thereof, and if it is found that the conditions existing at any such factory do not meet the standards prescribed by the Secretary in his regulations, he shall cause inspection to be withdrawn therefrom.

"(d) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to withdraw inspection from any factory wherein process or renovated butter is made, if the manufacturer shall fail to comply with any of the provisions of this section or with any of the rules and regulations prescribed hereunder.

"(e) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he deems necessary for the efficient administration of the provisions of this section, and all inspections hereunder shall be made in such manner as may be prescribed in such regulations. The Secretary of Agriculture may, from time to time, by regulations define the foreign substances and the extent thereof that render the ingredients unfit for use in manufacturing process or renovated butter.

"(f) The Secretary of Agriculture shall cause to be ascertained, and he shall report, from time to time, the quantity and quality of all process or renovated butter manufactured and the character and condition of the materials from which it is made.

"(g) No person, firm, or corporation shall forge, counterfeit, simulate, falsely represent, detach, or knowingly alter, deface, or destroy, or use without proper authority, any of the marks, stamps, labels, or tabs provided for in this section or in any regulations prescribed hereunder by the Secretary of Agriculture for use on process or renovated butter or on wrappers, packages, containers, or cases in which the product is contained, or any certificate in relation thereto.

"(h) All process or renovated butter and the packages or containers thereof shall be marked with the words 'Process Butter' and by such other marks, labels, or brands, and in such manner, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(i) No statement that is false or misleading in any particular shall be placed on or affixed to any wrapper, label, carton, or container of process or renovated butter.

"(j) No person, firm, or corporation shall transport, or offer for transportation, or sell or offer for sale, in interstate or foreign commerce, or in commerce affecting commerce among the States, any process or renovated butter that has not been inspected and passed and marked, labeled, and branded in accordance with this section and the regulations issued hereunder.

"(k) The administration and enforcement of the provisions of this act, other than its provisions relating to revenue, but including the seizure and denaturing or destruction of ingredients intended to be used in the manufacture of process or renovated butter and the denaturing or destruction of process or renovated butter, are committed exclusively to the Secretary of Agriculture: *Provided*, That any powers and duties of the Food and Drug Administration of the Federal Security Agency under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 301, and the following), as regards such ingredients before they come into the possession of the manufacturers of process or renovated butter, or as regards such powers and duties in connection with process or renovated butter after it leaves such manufacturers and comes into the hands of wholesale or retail dealers, or others, shall not be affected by this act."

SEC. 2. Subsection (c) of section 2326 of the Internal Revenue Code (53 Stat. 255) is amended by striking out "shall be punished by a fine of not less than $50 nor more than $500 or by imprisonment for not less than 1 month nor more than 6 months, or by both said punishments," and by inserting in lieu thereof the following, "Shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for a period of not more than 6 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

SEC. 3. Section 2327 of the Internal Revenue Code (53 Stat. 255) is amended by striking out subsections (b) and (c) of said section.

SEC. 4. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR OIL PIPE LINE OVER OGDEN ORDNANCE DEPOT MILITARY RESERVATION

The bill (H. R. 1488) to provide a right-of-way for an oil pipe line over the Ogden Ordnance Depot Military Reservation was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CARL F. R. WILSON

The bill (H. R. 3547) for the relief of Carl F. R. Wilson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT BECKWITH, JULIUS BUETTNER, AND EMMA M. BUETTNER

The bill (H. R. 1469) for the relief of Robert Beckwith, Julius Buettner, and Emma M. Buettner was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEO GULLO

The bill (H. R. 2999) for the relief of Leo Gullo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF RICHARD ZIELINSKI, A MINOR

The bill (H. R. 1847) for the relief of the legal guardian of Richard Zielinski, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KENNETH E. SHEPARD

The bill (H. R. 2189) for the relief of Kenneth E. Shepard was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. BESSIE PIKE AND MRS. ESTELLE ROSENFELD

The bill (H. R. 1518) for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Pike and Mrs. Estelle Rosenfeld was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MILDRED B. HAMPTON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1412) for the relief of Mildred B. Hampton, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an

amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$487.50."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. GLADYS M. GREENLEAF AND THE ESTATE OF RALPH ALTON GREENLEAF, DECEASED

The bill (H. R. 2091) for the relief of Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf and the estate of Ralph Alton Greenleaf, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROTECTION OF WATER SUPPLY OF SITKA, ALASKA

The bill (H. R. 2956) for the protection of the water supply of the city of Sitka, Alaska, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

APPROPRIATION OF RECEIPTS FROM NATIONAL FORESTS FOR PURCHASE OF FOREST LANDS

The bill (S. 1618) to amend the acts of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866), May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), June 15, 1938 (52 Stat. 699), and June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1205), which authorizes the appropriation of receipts from certain national forests for the purchase of lands within the boundaries of such forests, to provide that any such receipts not appropriated or appropriated but not expended or obligated shall be disposed of in the same manner as other national-forest receipts, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866), which authorizes the appropriation of receipts from the Uinta and Wasatch National Forests for the purchase of lands in the State of Utah within the boundaries of said national forests, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of Agriculture, with the approval of the National Forest Reservation Commission established by section 4 of the act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 513), is hereby authorized to acquire by purchase any lands within the boundaries of the Uinta and Wasatch National Forests in the State of Utah, which, in his judgment, should become the property of the United States in order that they may be so managed with other lands of the United States as to minimize soil erosion and flood damage, and to pay for said lands from the receipts derived from the sale of natural resources, other than mineral, and the occupancy of publicly owned lands within said national forests, which receipts are hereby authorized to be appropriated for that purpose until said lands have been acquired; all lands so acquired thereafter to be subject to and administered under the laws applicable to lands acquired under the provisions of said act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 519, 520, 521), as amended: *Provided*, That the provisions of sections 500 and 501 of title 16 of the United States Code shall not be applicable to receipts so appropriated and expended. Nothing contained in this act, however, shall diminish payments to or expenditures within the State of Wyoming under the provisions of said sections; and any appropriated amounts which are, or which heretofore have been, unexpended and unobligated at the close of the fiscal year for which appropriated shall be transferred to the national-forest receipts of that fiscal year, and amounts so transferred and such portions of the receipts of any fiscal year as are not, or heretofore have not been, appropriated for the ensuing fiscal year shall be disposed of in the same manner as other national-forest receipts."

SEC. 2. The act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), which authorizes the appropriation of receipts from the Cache National Forest for the purchase of lands in the State of Utah within the boundaries of said national forest, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of Agriculture, with the approval of the National Forest Reservation Commission established by section 4 of the act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 513), is hereby authorized to acquire by purchase any lands within the boundaries of the Cache National Forest in the State of Utah which, in his judgment, should become the property of the United States in order that they may be so managed with other lands of the United States to minimize soil erosion and flood damage; and to pay for said lands from that proportion of the receipts derived from the sale of natural resources, other than mineral, and the occupancy of publicly owned lands within said national forest which is equal to that proportion of the gross area of said national forest situated in the State of Utah which receipts are hereby authorized to be appropriated for expenditure for that purpose until said lands have been acquired; all lands so acquired thereafter to be subject to and administered under the laws applicable to lands acquired under the provisions of said act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C., 519, 520, 521), as amended: *Provided*, That the provisions of sections 500 and 501 of title 16 of the United States Code shall not be applicable to receipts so appropriated and expended. Nothing contained in this act, however, shall diminish payments to or expenditures within the State of Idaho under the provisions of said sections; and any appropriated amounts which are, or which heretofore have been, unexpended and unobligated at the close of the fiscal year for which appropriated shall be transferred to the national-forest receipts of that fiscal year, and amounts so transferred and such portions of the receipts of any fiscal year as are not, or heretofore have not been, appropriated for the ensuing fiscal year shall be disposed of in the same manner as other national-forest receipts."

SEC. 3. The act of June 15, 1938 (52 Stat. 699), which authorizes the appropriation of receipts from the San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests for the purchase of lands in the county of Riverside, State of California, within the boundaries of said national forests, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of Agriculture, with the approval of the National Forest Reservation Commission established by section 4 of the act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 513), is hereby authorized to acquire by purchase any lands within the boundaries of the San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests, in the county of Riverside, State of California, which, in his judgment, should become the property of the United States in order that they may be so managed with other lands of the United States as to minimize soil erosion and flood damage, and to pay for said lands from those proportions of the receipts derived from the sale of nautral resources, other than mineral, and the occupancy of publicly owned lands within said national forests which are equal to the proportions of the net areas of said national forests situated in the county of Riverside, State of California, which receipts are hereby authorized to be appropriated for expenditure for that purpose until said lands have been acquired; all lands so acquired thereafter to be subject to and administered under the laws applicable to lands acquired under the provisions of said act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 519, 520, 521), as amended: *Provided*, That the provisions of sections 500 and 501 of title 16 of the United States Code shall not be applicable to receipts so appropriated and expended, but any appropriated amounts which are, or which heretofore have been, unexpended and unobligated at the close of the fiscal year for which appropriated shall be transferred to the national-forest receipts of that fiscal year, and amounts so transferred and such portions of the receipts of any fiscal year as are not, or heretofore have not been, appropriated, for the ensuing fiscal year shall be disposed of in the same manner as other national-forest receipts: *Provided further*, That the amounts to which the county of Riverside would otherwise be entitled under section 500 of title 16 of the United States Code shall be reduced by the amounts by which payments to the State for distribution to counties under that section are reduced pursuant to the above proviso."

SEC. 4. The act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1205), which authorizes the appropriation of receipts from the Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests for the purchase of lands in the State of Nevada within the boundaries of said national forests, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to acquire by purchase any lands within the boundaries of the Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests in the State of Nevada which, in his judgment, should become the property of the United States in order that they may be so managed with other lands of the United States as to minimize soil erosion and flood damage or promote efficiency and economy of administration, and to pay for said lands from the receipts derived from the sale of natural resources, other than mineral, and the occupancy of publicly owned lands within said national forests, which receipts are hereby authorized to be appropriated for that purpose to the extent of amounts not exceeding $10,000 per annum until said lands have been acquired; all lands so acquired thereafter to be subject to and administered under the laws applicable to lands acquired under the provisions of said act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 519, 520, 521), as amended: *Provided*, That the provisions of sections 500 and 501 of title 16 of the United States Code shall not be applicable to receipts so appropriated and expended. Any appropriated amounts which are, or which heretofore have been, unexpended and unobligated at the close of the fiscal year for which appropriated shall be transferred to the national-forest receipts of that fiscal year, and amounts so transferred and such portions of the receipts of any fiscal year as are not, or heretofore have not been, appropriated for the ensuing fiscal year shall be disposed of in the same manner as other national-forest receipts."

SALE AND CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND BY WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATOR

The bill (H. R. 3618) to authorize the War Food Administrator to sell and convey to Mrs. Andrew J. Frey, and her heirs, a certain tract of land, situated in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 454) dividing the State of Florida into two judicial districts, defining the territory embraced in each, and fixing the time of holding term of court therein, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ANDREWS. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

MANAGEMENT AND OPERATION OF NAVAL PLANTATIONS OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1634) to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with an amendment; on page 2, at the end of line 2, to change the period to a colon, and to insert *"Provided further,* That except for the plantation at the Naval Operating Base, Trinidad, British West Indies, no plantation or farming operations shall be undertaken by the Secretary of the Navy without the prior approval of the Naval Affairs Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and thereafter similar approval for the continuance of any plantation and farming operation, including the operation of the plantation at Trinidad, shall be obtained annually on or before June 30 of each year: *Provided further,* That statements relating to each operation showing the receipt and expenditure of money, data on production, and recommendations for the continuance or abandonment of each project, shall be made by the Secretary of the Navy as of December 31 of each year: *And provided further,* That notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, commanding officers, pursuant to the authority contained in this act, may undertake local gardening projects for the purpose of furnishing fresh vegetables to messes, whenever the production of vegetables is considered practicable and fresh vegetables are not otherwise available and funds are administratively allocated to the costs of a garden project", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to manage, operate, maintain, and improve plantations and farms outside the continental limits of the United States, directly by the United States or under such lease, contract, or other arrangement as he may find suitable and in the interest of the United States, for the purpose of furnishing food and food products to the armed forces of the United States and the personnel thereof, and to civilians serving with the armed forces: *Provided,* That no land shall be acquired for the purpose: *Provided further,* That except for the plantation at the Naval Operating Base, Trinidad, British West Indies, no plantation or farming operations shall be undertaken by the Secretary of the Navy without the prior approval of the Naval Affairs Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and thereafter similar approval for the continuance of any plantation and farming operation, including the operation of the plantation at Trinidad, shall be obtained annually on or before June 30 of each year: *Provided further,* That statements relating to each operation showing the receipt and expenditure of money, data on production, and recommendations for the continuance or abandonment of each project, shall be made by the Secretary of the Navy as of December 31 of each year: *And provided further,* That notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, commanding officers, pursuant to the authority contained in this act, may undertake local gardening projects for the purpose of furnishing fresh vegetables to messes, whenever the production of vegetables is considered practicable and fresh vegetables are not otherwise available and funds are administratively allocated to the costs of a garden project.

SEC. 2. Appropriations for the subsistence of naval personnel shall be available for any and all expenditures necessary in the management, operation, maintenance, and improvement of any such plantation or farm: *Provided,* That equipment, material, and supplies required therein may be purchased without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and other laws applicable to purchases by governmental agencies.

SEC. 3. Food and food products and other property incidental to the operation of any plantation or farm may be sold under such regulations as may be issued by the Secretary of the Navy without regard to the provisions of other law relating to the sale of Government property, and all funds and moneys received or accruing from such sales shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts: *Provided,* That surplus production over the amount furnished or sold to the armed forces of the United States and the personnel thereof, and to civilians serving with the armed forces, may only be sold outside the continental limits of the United States.

SEC. 4. All persons employed directly by the United States, and their heirs, shall be governed as to compensation for disability or death from personal injury sustained while in the performance of duty, by the act approved September 7, 1916 (39 Stat. 742, 5 U. S. C. 751 ff.), as amended: *Provided,* That only American citizens, employees of the United States, shall be entitled to benefits under the civil-service laws and other laws of the United States relating to the employment, work, compensation, rights, benefits, or obligations of civilian employees of the United States.

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I would appreciate it if the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs would indicate to me just what are these naval plantations.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I shall be very happy to inform the Senator. The naval base at Trinidad consists of approximately 10,696 acres. At this base there were large acreages devoted to the cultivation of citrus fruits, namely, grapefruit, oranges, lemons, limes, and other citrus fruits. The Navy was in the position of continuing the cultivation or of abandoning it and letting the fruits be wasted. The Navy has continued to cultivate the fruit trees and to keep them in condition to produce citrus fruits, and has supplied the entire naval unit there, as well as the Army units located at Trinidad and the vessels which come in and out of Trinidad, with citrus fruits. Our committee went into the matter very thoroughly, because we realized that this was somewhat of a departure from the usual naval activities. The committee decided that it would be a very great waste not to take advantage of the very successful, productive citrus fruit area which was already there.

Another question arose in connection with this matter, namely, that in the southern Pacific on certain islands the naval personnel is unable to obtain any fresh vegetables.

The officers and men themselves undertook, at their own expense, to plant vegetables so that they would have fresh vegetables at their tables. The Navy Department has asked for legislation to sanction the continued cultivation of citrus fruits in Trinidad, and also to permit the planting of fresh vegetables and the hiring of native labor, which is a very cheap operation, so that in those sections where it is impossible for the men otherwise to obtain them they may have fresh vegetables. Several letters were presented to us complaining about the inability of the men to obtain fresh vegetables. We felt that this was a departure which ought to be very carefully safeguarded. The amendment which has been read requires the Navy Department every year to obtain the consent of the House Naval Affairs Committee and the Senate Naval Affairs Committee to continue these operations. The amendment restricts and limits the possibility of extension and expansion in this field of operations. We did not want the Navy to go into the farming business, but we felt that with this restriction and limitation it would not be a dangerous precedent.

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

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Who owns the land in Trinidad?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. We have a lease for 99 years.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What will be the cost annually?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The original plantation at Trinidad, which was acquired under the lease-base agreement and extension thereof, has been cut up in the course of the development of the naval base at Trinidad so that at present, among other installations situated on the original plantation site, are the hospital, the radio station, rifle range, ammunition storage, and so forth. The remaining parts of the plantation under cultivation have not been appraised in value. However, it is estimated that the remainder of the plantation being operated as such represents an estimated land value of $100,000 and an estimated value of trees and planting of $150,000. The value of the crops, on the basis of present operations, is estimated at a yearly gross of $50,000.

The islands in the southern Pacific, of course, we have taken through occupation. The gardens in this area are only a temporary arrangement to raise vegetables from season to season.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is merely a year-to-year garden?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It is a vegetable garden which the men themselves have undertaken to operate for their own benefit.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Has any estimate been made of the cost of maintaining the citrus fruit groves in Trinidad?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It is comparatively small. I have not the figures before me, but in any event the expenditure would be less than it would cost the Navy to buy the fruits and vegetables in the open market.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee report be printed in the RECORD at this point, so as to make clear what the limitations are.

There being no objection, the report (No. 723) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1634) to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment, and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The bill was introduced at the request of the Navy Department. As introduced, it authorized the Secretary of the Navy to manage, operate, maintain, and improve plantations and farms outside the continental limits of the United States, for the purpose of furnishing food to the armed forces.

It provided that no land shall be acquired for the purpose.

The committee amended the bill by providing that, except for the plantation at the naval operating base, Trinidad, British West Indies, no plantation or farming operations should be undertaken by the Secretary of the Navy without the prior approval of the Naval Affairs Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and that approval for the continuance of any plantation and farming operation, including the operation of the plantation at Trinidad, shall be obtained annually on or before June 30 of each year. The committee provided also that commanding officers may undertake local gardening projects for the purpose of furnishing fresh vegetables to messes, whenever the production of vegetables is considered practicable and fresh vegetables are not otherwise available.

The bill, as amended by the committee, authorizes the Secretary of the Navy, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to manage, operate, maintain, and improve the plantation at the naval operating base at Trinidad, British West Indies. This operating base includes a substantial plantation, from which large supplies of tropical fruits and other products have been furnished to the armed forces in Trinidad and to civilians serving with them and to vessels of the Army, Navy, and Coast Guard, calling at Trinidad.

The naval operating base at Trinidad consists of about 10,696 acres, of which 7,196 acres were originally leased for 99 years under the London Agreement of March 27, 1941, or April 22, 1941, and approximately 3,500 acres have since been leased under said agreement on December 24, 1942, for the remaining period of the basic 99-year lease.

About 2,900 acres of this area was a producing plantation and farm at the time the United States acquired it. This operation has since been continued on a salvage basis under the general construction contract for the construction of military and naval facilities at the base. This method does not contemplate replanting or necessary cultivation to keep the trees healthy and bearing. It subjects the plantation to the hazard of becoming run-down and unproductive within 2 to 5 years.

The plantation contains an extensive acreage of citrus fruit. Its products include grapefruit, oranges, and limes in considerable quantities. The plantation also produces tonka beans, coffee, coconuts, nutmegs, mangoes, and other products. Other crops, such as fresh vegetables, could be grown. Livestock for local use and food supply could be raised.

In order to preserve the plantation and to assure the continuance of production, the plantation must be operated and cared for with that object in view, and provision for adequate maintenance and improvement must be made. For this purpose legislation is required.

The sale of surplus products to others is authorized by the bill, provided that such products may only be sold outside the continental United States. Such sales would be made only with the approval of the authorities governing the island of Trinidad, in conformity to the basic London Agreement pursuant to which the base was acquired.

In view of the location of this plantation beyond the continental United States, the bill provides that all persons employed directly by the United States, and their heirs, shall be governed as to compensation for disability or death from personal injury sustained while in the performance of duty by the act approved September 7, 1916 (39 Stat. 742, 5. U. S. C. 751ff), as amended, provided that only American citizens, employees of the United States, shall be entitled to benefits under the civil-service laws and other laws of the United States relating to the employment, work, compensation, rights, and benefits of civilian employees of the United States.

In order to facilitate and simplify the operation of this plantation, it is provided that equipment, material, and supplies may be purchased without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and other laws relating to purchases by governmental agencies, and that sales of produce may be made without regard to the provisions of other law relating to the sale of Government property. Appropriations for the subsistence of naval personnel are made available for expenditures in managing, operating, maintaining, and improving this plantation. The proceeds of all sales are directed to be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

From the experience gained in the operation of the plantation on the naval operating base at Trinidad, it appears that the plantation is self-supporting financially, when the value of all its produce is taken into account. The Navy Department informed the committee that no cost to the Government would, therefore, be involved in the enactment of the bill.

The bill has been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget.

SURVEY OF FISHERY RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 112) authorizing and directing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to conduct a survey of the marine and fresh-water fishery resources of the United States, its Territories, and possessions was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is there any member of the Committee on Commerce present who can give us information concerning this joint resolution? All I wish to find out is whether the joint resolution does anything more than authorize a study or survey. Would it in any respect change the existing law?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator who reported the joint resolution [Mr. BILBO] is not present.

Mr. WHITE. I ask that the joint resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

Mr. BILBO subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar 736, Senate Joint Resolution 112. At the time when the joint resolution was called, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] objected to its consideration. However, with the assurances I have given him, he has no further objection to it, and I should like to have it passed. The proposed survey by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior is very important.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I asked that the joint resolution go over because I did not know at the time, and no one was present to advise me, whether the joint resolution affected the legislative status at all, or whether it was merely to authorize a study and a survey to be made. I understand the latter to be the fact, and under those circumstances I have no objection.

Mr. BILBO. I can assure the Senator that the joint resolution pertains merely to a survey of the marine and fresh-water fishery resources of the United States, in order that they may be protected and developed for the use of the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 112) authorizing and directing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to conduct a survey of the marine and fresh-water fishery resources of the United States, its Territories, and possessions.

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

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to conduct a survey of the character, extent, and condition of all of the marine and fresh-water fishery resources and other aquatic resources of the United States, its Territories and possessions, including high-seas resources in which the United States may have interests or rights; and the economic organization and status of the industry based thereon; such survey is to include but is not to be limited to the following:

(a) The current methods, practices, facilities, and equipment used in producing commercial fishery products.

(b) The methods, practices, facilities, and equipment used in processing, distributing, transporting, marketing, and storing fishery products, including an assessment of measures required for the protection of these perishable commodities.

(c) The methods, practices, facilities, and equipment which may be practicable for expanding the utilization of the existing or potential marine and fresh-water fishery resources, inclusive of recreational fishing.

(d) The laws and regulations that govern the commercial and recreational fisheries.

SEC. 2. The Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior is directed to submit a report to the Congress as soon as practicable, but not later than January 1, 1945, concerning the results of the survey mentioned in the preceding section, and also shall submit recommendations with respect to the following:

(a) New or revised regulations or precautionary measures deemed to be necessary or advisable for the protection, conservation, and management on a sustained-yield basis of the fishery and other renewable marine and fresh-water resources.

(b) New or revised regulations or precautionary measures deemed to be necessary or desirable to insure adequate protection of the fishery and other biological resources from contamination by pollution or other hazards, and to prevent spoilage or deterioration of fishery products; such recommendations to apply to catching, landing, processing, transporting, marketing, or storing fishery products or commodities derived from the fisheries.

(c) The opportunities for, and the advisability of further arrangements for, coordinating fishery administration and management through State fishery compacts with the consent of the Congress (as authorized by article I, section 10, of the Constitution of the United States of America), and opportunities for, and the advisability of additional coordinated management and administration of, international fisheries.

(d) The means of effecting the maximum utilization, consistent with their continued preservaton at an optimum level of productivity, of the marine and fresh-water fishery resources utilized or potentially capable of utilization for commercial and recreational fishing, giving special consideraton to methods of managing and increasing the fishery production of interior waters, including artificial impoundments and farm ponds.

(e) New and improved methods of capturing, landing, processing, storing, distributing, and marketing fishery products or commodities, including increasing consumption as food and the industrial utilization of fishery products through public education, or other activities; such recommendations to contemplate the full and cooperative use of the personnel and facilities of appropriate State, Territorial, county, local, or other organizations, as well as those of private and industrial or other organizations and enterprises.

(f) A program of economic stabilization of the fisheries and of Federal, State, or other assistance needed during the post-war period and thereafter to effect orderly development and expansion of the commercial fisheries and allied enterprises, and to secure and provide for the fisheries benefits comparable to those afforded the food-production activities and industries dependent upon the lands.

(g) A comprehensive statistical and market-reporting system to provide complete, accurate, and current data on production and fishing intensity in the commercial and recreational fisheries, to facilitate the most efficient utilization of the aquatic resources and the greatest possible benefits and returns therefrom, as well as for the purpose of providing fundamental information on rates of withdrawal in order that the effects of utilization upon the basic resources may always be known.

(h) Special and regular appropriations necessary to establish a national policy and to carry out a program for the optimum utilization of the marine and fresh-water commercial and recreational fishery resources such as may be necessary to accomplish the specific purposes and objectives hereinbefore mentioned, including funds for the publication and dissemination of technical and practical information.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such funds as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, but not to exceed $20,000.

The preamble was agreed to.

MRS. PRISCILLA B. McCARTHY

The bill (H. R. 2440) for the relief of Mrs. Priscilla B. McCarthy was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1711) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize Army officers designated by the Secretary of War to take final action on reports of survey and vouchers pertaining to the loss, damage, spoilage of Government property," was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILSON. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

IVER M. GESTELAND

The bill (S. 754) for the relief of Iver M. Gesteland was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Iver M. Gesteland, of Sawyer, Wis., a member of the crew of the steamer *W. D. Calverly, Jr.*, the sum of $617.70 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred by him as the result of illness contracted in March 1942, the serious nature of such illness having prevented his removal to a United States marine hospital where he would have been entitled, as a seaman, to medical treatment and hospitalization without cost to him: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

MAVIS NORRINE COTHRON AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3390) for the relief of Mavis Norrine Cothron and the legal guardian of Norma Lee Cothron, Florence Janet Cothron, and Nina Faye Cothron, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$1,500" and insert "$2,000"; and in line 7, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$6,000" and insert "$3,000."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ANNE REBECCA LEWIS AND MARY LEWIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1305) for the relief of Anne Rebecca Lewis and Mary Lewis, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$11,065.24" and insert "$2,857.50"; and on page 2, line 7, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$10,410.37" and insert "$806.50," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to Anne Rebecca Lewis, of Baltimore, Md., the sum of $2,857.50, in full satisfaction of her claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and property damage sustained by her, and for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by her, as the result of an accident which occurred when her privately owned automobile which she was driving collided with a Navy patrol car at the intersection of Southwest First Street and Eighth Avenue, in Miami, Fla., on March 11, 1943; and (2) to Mary Lewis, of Baltimore, Md., who was riding as a passenger in such privately owned automobile at the time of such accident, the sum of $806.50, in full satisfaction of her claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her, and for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by her as a result of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

J. M. MILLER AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1553) for the relief of J. M. Miller, James W. Williams, and Gilbert Theriot which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$500"; and on page 2, line 13, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$500" and insert "$250", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to J. M. Miller, of Kenner, La., the sum of $500, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and property damage sustained by him, and for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by him, as the result of an accident which occurred when his privately owned automobile which he was driving collided with a Navy jeep (No. 227873) at the naval air station, Houma, La., on July 30, 1943; (2) to James W. Williams, of Houma, La., who was riding as a passenger in such privately owned automobile at the time of such accident, the sum of $4,000, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him, and for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by him as a result of such accident; and (3) to Gilbert Theriot, of Houma, La., who was also a passenger in such privately owned automobile at the time of such accident, the sum of $250, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him, and for reimbursement of medical and other expenses incurred by him as a result of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered

to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REBECCA A. KNIGHT AND MARTHA A. CHRISTIAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1281) for the relief of Rebecca A. Knight and Martha A. Christian, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$75,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rebecca A. Knight and Martha A. Christian, both of Durham County, N. C., the sum of $7,500, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for the deaths of their mother and stepfather, Lena U. Hare and William E. Hare, who died from injuries sustained by them when they were struck by a United States Marine Corps truck at a point on the Goldsboro Highway near Kinston, N. C., on July 19, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENRY GROSSI

The bill (H. R. 3139) for the relief of Henry Grossi, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDDIE T. STEWART

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1411), for the relief of Eddie T. Stewart, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$3,000" and insert "$1,292.50."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JOHN W. BOOTH III

The bill (H. R. 2993) for the relief of John W. Booth III, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARIE GEILER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2743) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Geiler, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,577.75" and insert "$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF CARL OPLINGER AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 2459) for the relief of the legal guardian of Carl Oplinger, City Hospital of Akron, Ohio, and to Dr. Walter A. Hoyt, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN FORMER POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The bill (H. R. 3763) to relieve former postal employees who performed postal duties after induction into the military service was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, does the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] or any other Senator who is familiar with postal matters, know whether or not House bill 3763 is general legislation, or whether it is designed merely to take care of the accounts referred to in the letter of the Postmaster General dated November 25, 1943, and found in the committee report?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let the bill be passed over for the present, until I can examine it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over temporarily.

Mr. McKELLAR subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 751, House bill 3763, about which the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] questioned me. I think I can explain it to him in a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? Without objection, the clerk will state the bill by its title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. An act (H. R. 3763) to relieve former postal employees who performed postal duties after induction into military service.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I find from a report of Postmaster General Walker that this bill applies to only eight employees. I will read a portion of his letter in regard to them.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., November 25, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. RAYBURN: In the administration of the Postal Service a situation has arisen due to the induction of postal employees into the military service, which I wish to bring to the attention of Congress with a recommendation for remedial legislation.

Some eight postal employees, upon varying dates, were inducted into the military service and immediately furloughed, whereupon they were inadvertently permitted to continue their duties as postal employees, although such course was in contravention of the dual compensation laws inasmuch as such inductees were receiving compensation as personnel of the armed forces. A typical case is that of William F. Quirk, who was a regular carrier at Ware, Mass., regarding whom the postmaster addressed this Department under date of September 8, 1942, a copy of the postmaster's letter being hereto attached. It will be seen that Mr. Quirk was inducted into the military service on April 15, 1942, but was sent home with the information that he might be called for service in 30 days. The postmaster was not aware that Mr. Quirk was to receive any remuneration until he was actually called for service. As a result Mr. Quirk received not only his military pay but $141 for service as a letter carrier from April 16, 1942, to May 15, 1942. In a ruling to the Secretary of Agriculture under date of June 5, 1941 (20 Comp. Gen. 860), it was held to be unlawful for an individual to receive both military pay and civilian pay while in an active military service status.

In those cases where the individuals involved have received their compensation as postal employees, the respective postmaster's accounts have been charged with the amounts and in cases in which the compensation has not been paid, it has been necessary for the postmasters to withhold payment because of the ruling of the Comptroller General.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee stop the reading at that point?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. That is what led to my inquiry. Insofar as this bill purports to deal with clearing the accounts of postmasters who have been charged with compensation hitherto paid to postal clerks through error, there can be no question, and the bill ought to be passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think so.

Mr. DANAHER. If, on the other hand, the bill is to be taken as a precedent for permitting postmasters in the future to continue to make payments to men who are furloughed pending actual induction into service, obviously a very different situation would arise. Does not the Senator agree with me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree entirely.

Mr. DANAHER. This bill does not deal with any such future permission so to make payments, does it?

Mr. McKELLAR. My interpretation of it is that it does not. I wish to say that this bill has not come from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, but for some reason has come from the Civil Service Committee. I do not know how it got to that committee, but it did. It is a fair and proper bill for these eight men, because evidently a mistake had been made for which they were not responsible, and they were able to perform the work while on furlough. I take it there is no objection to the arrangement of the accounts so as to relieve them; but surely if any others come forward with a similar claim they will be turned down.

Mr. DANAHER. I think the bill provides for a fair adjustment and should be passed. I thank the Senator for his explanation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the entire letter from Postmaster General Walker, which I read in part.

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

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., November 25, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. RAYBURN: In the administration of the Postal Service a situation has

arisen due to the induction of postal employees into the military service, which I wish to bring to the attention of Congress with a recommendation for remedial legislation.

Some eight postal employees, upon varying dates, were inducted into the military service and immediately furloughed, whereupon they were inadvertently permitted to continue their duties as postal employees, although such course was in contravention of the dual compensation laws inasmuch as such inductees were receiving compensation as personnel of the armed forces. A typical case is that of William F. Quirk, who was a regular carrier at Ware, Mass., regarding whom the postmaster addressed this Department under date of September 8, 1942, a copy of the postmaster's letter being hereto attached. It will be seen that Mr. Quirk was inducted into the military service on April 15, 1942, but was sent home with the information that he might be called for service in 30 days. The postmaster was not aware that Mr. Quirk was to receive any remuneration until he was actually called for service. As a result Mr. Quirk received not only his military pay but $141 for service as a letter carrier from April 16, 1942, to May 15, 1942. In a ruling to the Secretary of Agriculture under date of June 5, 1941 (20 Comp. Gen. 860), it was held to be unlawful for an individual to receive both military pay and civilian pay while in an active military service status.

In those cases where the individuals involved have received their compensation as postal employees, the respective postmaster's accounts have been charged with the amounts and in cases in which the compensation has not been paid, it has been necessary for the postmasters to withhold payment because of the ruling of the Comptroller General.

There is enclosed herewith a list of employees together with the respective amounts involved, the aggregate of which is $2,613.38.

In view of the fact that the postal employees in question actually performed service for the amounts of salary involved and that the compensation accruing to them as members of the armed forces were comparatively small, it is believed that the legal barrier to the payment of the employees of the compensation to them should be removed. Accordingly there is submitted herewith, with the recommendation that legislation of this character be enacted, a tentative draft of measure which it is believed would accomplish the desired purpose.

Very truly yours,

FRANK C. WALKER,
Postmaster General.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3763) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LT. COL. JASON McVAY AUSTIN

The bill (H. R. 3387) for the relief of Lt. Col. Jason McVay Austin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLINTON A. CLAUSON

The bill (H. R. 3701) for the relief of Clinton A. Clauson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDWARD E. HELD AND MARY JANE HELD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2625) for the relief of Edward E. Held and Mary Jane Held, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CLARENCE WAVERLY MORGAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2212) for the relief of Clarence Waverly Morgan, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CHARLES J. GOFF

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2925) for the relief of Charles J. Goff, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the name "Idaho", to insert "as administrator of the estate of Judson E. Goff, deceased."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Charles J. Goff, as administrator of the estate of Judson E. Goff, deceased."

CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION OF ALASKAN FISHERIES

The bill (S. 930) to assure conservation of and to permit the fullest utilization of the fisheries of Alaska and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Let the bill go over.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the bill is approximately 30 pages in length. I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has already been made. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. BILBO subsequently said: Mr. President, with reference to Calendar No. 757, Senate bill 930, am I to understand that objection was made to consideration and passage of the bill? It is known as the Wallgren bill, and has to do with the conservation and utilization of the fisheries in Alaskan waters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection was earlier made to consideration of the bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, the bill consists of some 28 or 30 pages. It deals exhaustively with the subject of the fisheries of Alaska. I think it is somewhat too important to be taken up at this time on the call of the calendar. I wish to have an opportunity to examine the bill, because its subject matter happens to be one in which I have been much interested in years past. I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I appreciate the observation of the Senator from Maine. The Commerce Committee spent considerable time in working out the details of the bill. It is a very important piece of legislation, and I sincerely trust that it will be acted upon at the earliest possible moment.

PROSECUTIONS AFTER LAPSE OF A TEMPORARY STATUTE

The bill (H. R. 1201) to permit prosecutions after the lapse of a temporary statute for offenses committed prior to its expiration, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REQUISITION OF PROPERTY

The bill (S. 1748) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, as amended, to continue it in effect, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of the first section of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941 (55 Stat. 742), as amended by the acts of March 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 176, title VI, Public Law 507, 77th Cong.), and June 30, 1943 (Public Law 104, 78th Cong.), is hereby amended by striking out the date "June 30, 1944" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1945."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Act of October 16, 1941 (55 Stat. 742), as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the date "December 31, 1944" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1945."

AUTHORIZATION FOR REQUISITION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES AND MATERIALS

The bill (S. 1749) to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940, as amended, to continue it in effect, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), as amended by the act of July 2, 1942 (Public Law 643, 77th Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The authority granted in this act shall remain in force until June 30, 1945, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate."

CHANGE OF NAME "LABORER" IN THE POSTAL SERVICE TO THAT OF "MAIL HANDLER"

The bill (H. R. 2419) to change the name of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of "mail handler," was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

POSTHUMOUS COMMISSION TO THE LATE COL. WILLIAM MITCHELL

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 10) authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Col. William Mitchell a commission as a major general, United States Army, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President is authorized to issue posthumously to the late William Mitchell, late a colonel, United States Army, a commission as a major general, United States Army, as of the date of his death in 1936.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War is authorized and requested to amend the records of the War Department so as to carry the said William Mitchell as a major general, United States Army, at the time of his death in 1936.

RELIEF OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

The bill (S. 1590) for the relief of the State of Tennessee was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, does the Senator from Tennessee desire that I explain the bill, which is No. 764 on the calendar?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, this bill is for the purpose of giving the State of Tennessee a credit of $2,920.18 for supplying the Army with certain articles, such as shirts and other clothing, which the National Guard of Tennessee required when it was mustered into service and took part in the maneuvers in August 1940. I say it is a credit because the State of Tennessee owes the War Department approximately $6,700 for lost, destroyed, and damaged goods; so it is merely a bookkeeping credit. However, the goods were turned over to the United States Army, and were used by it. The War Department has examined into the matter. The Judge Advocate General has stated that this is the proper way in which to handle the account. Everything is in proper order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

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

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1590) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized to give to the account of the National Guard of the State of Tennessee credit in the amount of $2,920.18 for the money value of property listed on approved reports of survey for which the State of Tennessee has been held pecuniarily responsible, said credits to be given in full satisfaction of any and all claims of the State of Tennessee against the United States on account of clothing purchased by the State and issued to the National Guard of Tennessee to meet a shortage existing prior to the Army maneuvers of August 1940. This credit shall be established by the submission of evidence acceptable to the War Department of the purchase, issue, and transfer of title to the United States of the clothing.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 252) to inquire into the legal authority for the issuance of Executive orders of the President and of departmental regulations was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let the resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The call of the calendar is completed.

PROTECTION OF THE COINAGE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BARKLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. On the last call of the calendar, Mr. President, Calendar No. 639, House bill 3408 was objected to. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who is in charge of the bill, discussed the matter with me on the floor at that time. It seemed, Mr. President, that an amendment was indicated in order that, in our effort to protect against the manufacture of tokens, slugs, discs, and other devices which might be used for counterfeiting purposes, we should also take steps to protect the ration tokens, which are put out by the Office of Price Administration in the administration of the rationing program. The matter was brought back before the Committee on the Judiciary, and it was voted that I submit on the next call of the calendar as a committee amendment the amendment which was then and there considered.

With that explanation, Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Kentucky to yield further in order that I may ask unanimous consent that the Senate recur to Calendar 639, House bill 3408.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield for that purpose?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut for that purpose.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3408) to amend chapter 7 of the Criminal Code.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I now send to the desk an amendment, which will appear on page 1, line 11, after the words "United States", to insert "or any token, disk, or other device issued or authorized in connection with rationing by any agency of the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 11, after the words "United States", it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "or any token, disk, or other device issued or authorized in connection with rationing by any agency of the United States."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments reported by the committee.

The amendments reported by the committee were, on page 1, line 7, after the word "sale", to insert "or expose or keep with intent to furnish or sell"; in line 8, after the word "manufactured", to insert "furnished" and a comma; and on page 2, line 15, after the word "him", to insert "exposed or kept with intent to furnish or sell", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 7 of the Criminal Code (35 Stat. 1115; U. S. C., title 18, ch. 7) is hereby amended by inserting after section 168 the following new section:

"SEC. 168A. (a) Whoever shall manufacture, sell, offer, or advertise for sale, or expose or keep with intent to furnish or sell, or shall cause or procure to be manufactured, furnished, sold, offered, or advertised for sale, any token, slug, disk, or other device similar in size and shape to any of the lawful coins of the United States, or any token, disk, or other device issued or authorized in connection with rationing by any agency of the United States, with knowledge or reason to believe that such tokens, slugs, disks, or other devices may be used unlawfully or fraudulently to procure anything of value, or use or enjoyment of any property or service from any automatic merchandise vending machine, postage-stamp machine, turnstile, fare box, coin-box telephone, parking meter, or other receptacle, depository, or contrivance, designed to receive or to be operated by lawful coins of the United States, shall be fined not more than $3,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"(b) 'Knowledge or reason to believe,' within the meaning of paragraph (a) of this section, may be shown by proof that any law-enforcement officer has, prior to the commission of the offense with which the defendant is charged, informed the defendant that tokens, slugs, disks, or other devices of the kind manufactured, sold, offered, or advertised for sale by him or exposed or kept with intent to furnish or sell, are being used unlawfully or fraudulently to operate certain specified automatic merchandise vending machines, postage-stamp machines, turnstiles, fare boxes, coin-box telephones, parking meters, or other receptacles, depositories, or contrivances, designed to receive or to be operated by lawful coins of the United States."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

INVESTIGATION OF SURPLUS WAR MATERIALS

Mr. MURRAY and Mr. BUSHFIELD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. I have a very brief matter to present.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand the Senator from South Dakota desires to deliver an address. Therefore, I shall yield first to the Senator from Montana, not that I attach more impcrtance to what he may have to present, but probably it will not last quite so long.

Mr. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent to recur to Calendar No. 550, Senate Resolution 195.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would granting the request interfere in any way with the unfinished business, which is the appropriation bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is for unanimous consent and it would not interfere with the unfinished business.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. Reserving the right to object, may I ask what the resolution proposes?

Mr. MURRAY. The resolution was reported to the Senate from the Military Affairs Committee on November 26. The purpose of the resolution is to have the President direct the various Government agencies to make a study of the amounts and types of surplus war materials on hand now or likely to be on hand after the war. By the end of the war we will have on hand an estimated $75,000,000,000 worth of materials, machinery, factories, and other property that have been bought for war purposes. There is legislation now pending in the Congress with reference to the disposition of these surplus properties and materials, and it is most essential that there should be an inventory made of them in order to aid in the program for their disposition.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize the importance of that objective ultimately, but I am wondering whether at this stage of the war the Government agencies or departments can with any degree of accuracy report on the amount of surplus property they have or will have at the end of the war. For some of it which may now appear to be surplus they may find use between now and the end of the war.

Mr. MURRAY. That is true; but the resolution contemplates that adequate current records and inventory controls will be developed, so that when the time does come for the disposition of the property the information will be readily available. Surplus property is being disposed of today. A short time ago there was disposed of in Michigan a large amount of surplus material, valued at over $1,700,000, for $31,000, and it was disposed of by the agencies that had control.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the resolution contemplate that the reports under the resolution shall be made from time to time, or when one report has been made does that end it?

Mr. MURRAY. No; it contemplates a study and investigation of—

(2) The adequacy of current records and inventory controls to keep the Congress and the Executive informed as to the foregoing particulars with respect to such materials and property; and (3) those modifications in the method of keeping such records and maintaining such controls which may be necessary to make the above information readily available to the appropriate Government authorities.

It is absolutely necessary.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not disposed to object to the consideration of the resolution, but I will say frankly that I do not see how the War Department or the Navy Department or the Maritime Commission or any other agency can at this stage of the war determine what property is going to be surplus.

Mr. MURRAY. They can determine in many instances what is going to be surplus. At the present time, of course, they cannot determine the entire amount of surplus that will be on hand at the end of the war. They can, however, make broad general estimates.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the resolution would necessarily make it obligatory upon the Government agencies to be cautious in reporting as surplus what might actually be surplus when the time comes, because if they reported a surplus once they could not recall their report.

Mr. MURRAY. The resolution does not require them to report property as surplus. It merely requires them to report to Congress on the results of their study and investigation, together with recommendations on improved inventory controls.

Mr. BARKLEY. If it is not needed it is surplus.

Mr. MURRAY. By the resolution the President is requested "to direct the appropriate executive agency or agencies to make a study and investigation with respect to (1) the types, quantities, cost, location, and custody of those war materials and other tangible property, real and personal, owned or controlled or hereafter acquired or controlled by or in behalf of the Government of the United States, which are or shall become no longer needed for war purposes."

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall not object, but I think the Senator's resolution sets a rather difficult task for the Government agencies to perform.

Mr. MURRAY. I have been in contact with the various agencies of the Government involved in this problem, and, as chairman of the War Contracts Subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee, I have been carrying on investigations, and I can say that it is most important that the resolution be adopted in order that preparations may be made for the disposal at the proper time of surplus property.

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

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 195) was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the President is hereby requested to direct the appropriate executive agency or agencies to make a study and investigation with respect to (1) the types, quantities, cost, location, and custody of those war materials and other tangible property, real and personal, owned or controlled or hereafter acquired or controlled by or in behalf of the Government of the United States, which are or shall become no longer needed for war purposes; (2) the adequacy of current records and inventory controls to keep the Congress and the Executive informed as to the foregoing particulars with respect to such materials and property; and (3) those modifications in the methods of keeping such records and maintaining such controls which may be necessary to make the above information readily available to the appropriate Government authorities. The President is requested to report to the Senate within 3 months after adoption of this resolution and at intervals of not more than 3 months thereafter until such study is completed, concerning the results thereof together with his recommendations.

PRESERVATION OF THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT—THE FOOD CONFERENCE

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, in the spring of 1934 Dr. William A. Wirt, superintendent of Gary, Ind., city schools, startled the country with a statement that the Roosevelt administration was planning to destroy our Government and to substitute in its place a Fascist state, with complete power over the lives and activities and property of the American people.

A special committee to investigate this charge was selected by the House of Representatives and Professor Wirt was summoned to appear and tell his story. It was at a time when the New Deal was riding high, wide, and handsome. They were in complete possession of the Government. Nothing could be denied them. They occupied all the offices, their doings filled the newspapers from coast to coast. Their demands and Washington-prepared legislation dominated the State capitals of the country. The power of the new President was almost unlimited.

As always, in the exercise of power, the top-heavy New Deal majority was careless of the rights of individuals and of minorities.

The Indiana school teacher, when called as a witness before the committee, was denied the right of counsel. He appeared alone with his wife to tell his story, but was not even allowed to tell it without interruption, ridicule, and abuse.

He testified that he had heard the scheme for remaking our Government discussed at a dinner party given for New Deal officials by one of them. He had been a guest at the dinner, but his testimony of the conversation that had been had at this dinner party was denied by each one of the guests attending, as well as by the hostess.

Mr. Wirt was made to appear ridiculous and unworthy of belief, and before they were through he was completely discredited. The impression was created, by those desiring it, that he was not a very clever liar, and that he had imagined the whole story. But the story was not a figment of his imagination. It was not a dream. If we may judge by what has happened since, there is little doubt that Dr. Wirt told exactly what he had heard, and that the parlor economists who flocked to Washington with the New Deal planned to remake this country just as he said they did. Fortunately, the Supreme Court, before it was revolutionized by new appointments, threw out as unconstitutional many of the plans of this group.

Today, after 11 years, the President says that the New Deal is dead; that he wants it respectfully buried with flowers, but that he does not want it mentioned again. His new slogan is "Win the War."

Most Americans have had the impression that this was not a New Deal war, but was an American war, fought by all of us, for the survival of the American way of life. The New Deal does not have any patent right upon this war. Your son and my son are in this conflict, not

because they are Republicans, or Democrats, or New Dealers, but because they are Americans, and they hope to come back to the America they knew when they left home.

There are those within the President's own group who do not agree with him that the New Deal is dead. The Vice President is one of those, and I am inclined to agree with the Vice President, because the New Deal has followed a certain pattern from the very beginning. In spite of the President's wishes, in spite of the very evident fact that the New Deal is sick and will be buried next November, those of the inner circle of this unique organization of parlor economists are still at work charting and planning our future for us.

The people are tired of and disgusted with the kind of government we have been getting during the last 10 years. Totalitarianism—for that is what it is—represents a philosophy of government as alien to our shores as that administered by the Japanese Emperor. Our constitutional form of government is a government of the people, by the people, and responsible to the people.

A totalitarian government is the complete opposite. It assures the people that what it is doing is for their good, that the regulations and restrictions are imposed for the welfare of all the people. But the regulations are never relaxed when once imposed. From the cradle to the grave the people are under its paternalistic care. The individual as such disappears. He becomes dependent upon government. His initiative is gone. His will to work, to progress, to acquire, his purpose in life, disappear. He drifts along with the tide, rudderless and helpless, waiting for orders. Such is the course of every totalitarian state in history. Such is the pattern of government through which we are now traveling.

For proof turn to the record of the last 10 years, showing the demand for and assumption of emergency power year after year. None of those powers has ever been surrendered, and every attempt on the part of Congress to repeal them is fought bitterly.

I have a letter from a soldier in which he discusses the new pattern for America. In this letter he says:

> What do they mean fussing around about what kind of an America we servicemen want when we get home? Do they value America as something that can be changed with the seasons, the same as women's hats and clothes?
>
> We can't escape the notion here that some people back home are trying to fashion new patterns for America—running around with tape measures, shears, chalk, and things, and quarreling among themselves as to what style of a tailor-made country will please us after the war.
>
> You tell these self-appointed designers to let Uncle Sam alone. When we get back, we want to see his swallowtail coat still there and his boot straps, tall hat, and everything else that's familiar. His way of dressing has been all right for a long time. It's what we're fighting to keep all right for a long time to come. Leave him be. Just have him there to say "Hello" when we return—dressed the way we know him.
>
> When that period is over all that we want is to be free to work at what we can do best. Doesn't it make sense?

Mr. President, maybe it is just as well if we do not undertake to revolutionize this country while 11,000,000 soldiers are tied up in a war. Maybe it is just as well if the planners let nature take its course until the boys come home. I, for one, believe so. I see no necessity for rushing into plans for the future before the future has disclosed itself and before the boys most concerned can take part in the planning. We have another job today far more important than planning what we will do next year or next decade, and that job is to defeat the enemy, for all the plans of the star gazers will be useless if we fail.

Last April the President called a food conference. It was secret, behind closed doors. It was held in Hot Springs, Va., because there it was easier to guard the members of the conference from contact with the public. Why it was necessary to hold a secret conference with armed guards surrounding the hotel in which the conferees lived has never been explained to the American people, but such was the case. The representatives of 44 nations were gathered at that conference. There was plenty of liquor, but little news. The newspapers were refused admission. Prepared statements were handed out each day by those in charge. That was our only news report. For the first time in our history newspapermen were denied admission to a conference upon public business. Members of Congress were neither wanted nor invited to attend.

Some 15 Members of the United States Senate met to consider the situation. A representative of the State Department met with us. Our case was stated. He said he favored an open conference, but his superiors did not. The request that the Senate be represented was ignored.

Now, almost a year after that conference, comes the first official statement indicating what was done there and what is intended to be done in the future. I have the statement before me. It is by the Department of Agriculture, and describes the plans adopted for your welfare and mine for all future time. This statement, entitled "The Farmer and the War," starts out with this declaration:

> This conference, meeting in the midst of the greatest war ever waged, and in full confidence of victory, has considered the world problems of food and agriculture and declares its belief that the goal of freedom from want of food, suitable and adequate for the health and strength of all peoples, can be achieved.

The objectives of the conference are then set forth:

> First, that the governments represented declare to their own people and to one another their intention to obtain more and better food for all who need it.
>
> Second, that these governments recognize that a great increase will be needed in the total production if this goal is to be attained.
>
> Third, that the governments recognize that it is useless to produce food unless men and nations have the means to acquire it for consumption.

Thereupon the conference proceeded to appoint an Interim Commission to prepare the way for a permanent organization. No doubt, Mr. President, the thought has occurred to you, as it did to me when I first read these statements, that the objectives were worthy ones, to which all men could subscribe, but when we begin to delve into the underlying reasons, purposes, and objectives of this plan, we see the proverbial nigger-in-the-woodpile, and in this particular case the American people are to be placed under complete Government control. It is a continuation of the planned economy about which the President declared, "We have planned it this way and do not let anyone tell you differently."

The conference declared:

> Those in need must have the required purchasing power to buy, otherwise they can be provided only at public expense.

Public expense means the American taxpayer, through the channel of the Federal Treasury.

> For the first year or two—

Declared the conference—

> after the fighting stops, we shall probably have to continue to maintain our farm production and our diets on the wartime basis of producing and consuming these products that enable us to get the largest total amount of the most needed food nutrients per unit of resources used.
>
> Such changes will enable us to meet relief requirements and at the same time fill most of the requirements for good nutrition here at home, though not exactly the products which consumers would like to buy.
>
> In the years immediately following the war this disparity between demand and supply is likely to be even greater than it is now, for a larger part of our supply will be needed for relief and rehabilitation in liberated countries.
>
> During that period, farmers in the United States will face even larger export demands than during the war, and both farmers and consumers will find it urgent to make our foods go as far as possible.

Then comes the inevitable suggestion that America do the providing. The conference report says:

> For these reasons the Food Conference recommended that the countries not occupied by the enemy make every effort to supply the devastated areas with the needed food and means of producing food—machinery, fertilizers, seeds, and other production supplies—even though it may mean that such nations may have to postpone the achievement within their own borders of adequate nutrition for all their people.

Inasmuch as we are the only uninvaded country in the world, it means that we are to supply the needs of the world.

> It was also agreed—

Stated the report of the conference—

> that the proposed international agricultural organization should devote a large part of its efforts to increasing agricultural production and efficiency in each country by helping each country get started on crop-improvement work, livestock breeding and feeding, soil and water conservation, land development and reclamation, and all the other things that can be done to increase farm output. Each country will also be helped to develop an agricultural extension service to aid its farmers in using the new and improved methods.

All of which is building competition for our own markets.

> In effect, this proposes a joint cooperative effort on a world-wide scale.

And then it goes on to say:

> This long-time program of the world-wide scientific research, development, and educa-

tion in modern agriculture will not, of course, solve the immediate problem of enough food as soon as the fighting stops. The first supplies of food for emergency relief feeding will have to come from the United States and from the other nations that have been fortunate enough not to have their own fields and farmsteads and cities overrun by invaders or bombed out from the air.

The conference informs us that the after-the-war period will require 40,000,000 more acres of crop land to be financed by our Government.

Except for the normal increase of population, we will have no more people to feed than we have today. There has been no deficiency in the food supply of the American people during the past several years. There is no deficiency now. One cannot help but wonder why the planners insist that 40,000,000 acres more of crop be planted following the war than we have today at a time when we are at our highest peak of farm production. Does it indicate a hidden purpose to burden the United States with the care of the entire world? That this is so is more than suggested by the language used. Here are the words contained in the report upon this very point:

We submit first, in the most general terms, that the over-all objective of government should be adequate food and fiber for all at prices fair to both consumers and producers. But so stated this is one of those general objectives or purposes that can usually be expressed in such broad terms as to arouse no disagreement and be meaningless. Hence, in proposing such sweeping objectives we must indicate, as necessary, the general means by which they may be accomplished. In doing so we are acutely conscious that as we go thus further we run the risk of reducing the number of those who will agree with us.

This statement means that the conference purposely concealed in general terms the objectives which they are seeking. Who are to be deceived? Surely not the people of Russia. They do as Joe Stalin tells them to do. Not the people of conquered Germany. They will do as the Allied Nations tell them to do. Not the people of Great Britain, because Winston Churchill has stated many times that he proposed to protect the British Empire from encroachments upon any side. Then, who are the people the conferees wish to deceive? Obviously, it is we, the American people. The members of the conference apparently understood that if the truth were told and publicized their proposals would not be approved by us.

The report of the conference proceeds as follows:

We subscribe to the Atlantic Charter. Under this charter, it is our responsibility, through both private and public processing and distributive channels, to help provide the means for securing freedom from want for all men. To attain freedom from want is a task that has both world-wide and national aspects. Difficulties of finance, culture, and tradition raise their heads on both the international and the home fronts.

We believe that as a Nation we should embark upon a program of producing the kinds and quantities of food consistent with an expanding international trade, should provide a nutritionally adequate diet for our own people, and should do as much as possible toward helping all the people of the world reach a similar goal.

These goals, to have specific meaning, must be interpreted in terms of quantities; a pattern of production must be decided upon and concrete measures must be devised that will enable the great masses of the population to obtain and use the food produced.

That means governmental control. We are to be directed when, how, and where to plant, how much to eat, and the kind of food to consume. Liberty is soon at an end.

The conference statement continues:

For some time after the close of the war, we shall probably send abroad, for relief and rehabilitation work even more than we are now sending.

If, at the end of the war, our own people were allowed to buy all the food they will want, at present food prices and under conditions of a high level of employment, they would take all we shall then be producing. Nothing will be left with which to play our assumed role in the world rehabilitation or to meet the nutritional needs of our own low-income groups. We believe, then, that the keystone of our own policy for some time after the war should be the selective expansion of food production.

Further along in the report this statement is made:

Our rural school systems are notoriously inferior to those of our cities. Millions of our farmers are still unable to enjoy the modern benefits of electricity. Too many are still isolated by mud every time it rains. In many rural areas hospitalization and medical services are either nonexistent or of very inferior quality. Recreational facilities furnished at public expense in urban centers are conspicuously absent in rural areas.

Now is it not a sad state of affairs, that every farmhouse does not have a bathtub and inside plumbing? I shudder when I contemplate the degradation of it. Even the Government-sponsored Chic Sale projects must now be discarded.

The rural schools are not so large and expensive as the massive stone structures of our cities. Of course not. No one expects them to be. But the planners demand that we in the farming districts of the country start a spending spree that will equal that of our city brothers.

The report also says:

Millions of our farmers are still unable to enjoy the modern benefits of electricity.

Mr. President, was the United States of America settled with electricity? Did your father and mine pioneer into the West carrying an electric iron with which to press their pants? Did your mother or mine grieve because no electric washing machine was there for her?

And what a sad state of affairs it is that many farm homes are isolated by mud every time it rains. I wonder if the planners know that the men and women who live upon farms in this country welcome the rain?

The report also says:

And in many rural areas proper hospitalization and medical services are not provided.

How unfortunate it is that every township throughout this broad and great land of ours is not provided with a modern hospital and a staff of doctors and nurses.

Who is going to pay for these things, and how? Are we to be told by some bureau in Washington when to build a hospital, hire doctors and nurses, when to build schools, roads, and install electric lines and inside plumbing; or are we going to stick to the pattern we have always followed, and buy them when and if we are able to pay for them?

The statement goes on to say:

Farmers have a real stake in a high level of consumption, which should be achieved through full employment if possible and with governmental aid if necessary. If consumers are to be able to absorb the larger quantities of foods and other farm products called for under the policies here proposed, commodities must be available to them at a reasonable cost.

In other words, farm production is to be financed out of the Federal Treasury, and the consumption of food is to be financed from the same empty barrel. The Government pays both coming and going.

The report further states:

Measures should be adopted to establish fair-wage payments and other conditions of employment, including such means as efficient routing and placement of farm workers.

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

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. That is the administration's way of "holding the line." [Laughter.]

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

I read further from the statement:

The Social Security Act should be amended to give all agricultural people, including the self-employed, the benefits of old-age and survivors insurance and all other social-security benefits.

Mr. President, here is a significant statement from the report:

We believe that private property is a public trust and wherever public and private interests in land use conflict the public interest should prevail.

Mr. President, I will repeat that quotation from the report, so that all Members of the Senate will recall the statement by this food conference of the President's:

We believe that private property is a public trust and wherever public and private interests in land use conflict the public interest should prevail.

If that is not socialism, pure and unadulterated, I do not understand the meaning of the word.

I read further from the report:

If all the goals already suggested could be achieved, tenure conditions would undoubtedly improve, but we should see to it that where indirect methods fail, direct methods are used.

Again we see the gloved fist, namely, the statement by those in authority, "If you do not like the food we prepare for you, we are going to force it down you, in spite of your objection."

Here is another gem in the statement which may interest the Senate:

The price of farm land should be kept in line with the capacity of given tracts to yield the product for a decent level of living.

Farm tenancy should be improved through better leasing agreements—

In other words, Mr. President, take it out of the hands of the landlords and

owners, and let the Government make the leases—

to make the rules of the game more equitable.

Experience has demonstrated that for some land, private ownership serves no public purpose—

Think of that, Mr. President—

these lands should be returned to public ownership.

Mr. President, Russia has collective farming. The Government owns the land. The serfs are told how, when, and where to plant, and what they may consume. Have the American people arrived at a stage of development in our new totalitarian existence where we will accept such folderol as is outlined in this report from the Department of Agriculture—a department, by the way, which has 76,000 people on its pay roll. I wonder if this would not be an opportune time to relieve the Department of a few thousand of the employees used to get out such reports as this.

Then comes the climax of all this balderdash. The statement says:

Anyone who wants a "substandard" material level of living, and who does not want to work, should be permitted to live the life of his choice, but no such person should be allowed to force children into this type of existence.

Not content to regulate the lives of those in being, the planners do not even intend to let the poor of this country have children in their own way and in their own time.

In closing, the Department puts forth this gem of wisdom:

We believe that with due consideration for military necessities, we should evolve programs that will tend to reduce domestic production of agricultural commodities that cannot meet world competition and yield an American level of living to producers without tariffs or other forms of Federal subsidy.

It is now suggested through press releases that this new plan, this scheme of world organization, of international farming, can be started for a billion dollars a year, and that we in America are expected to furnish the billion.

These secret deals which dare not be shown the light of day, which dare not be explained to the American people, are not, as yet, in effect, thank goodness; but the legislation necessary to implement them is being prepared to be presented to Congress within a few weeks.

Are we going to turn American farming over to any such starry-eyed scheme as outlined here? It is but a continuation of the planning that has been going on in this administration for 11 years. The plans may be changed from time to time, but the objectives never are. The control of the American people is the objective, and that objective has remained steadfast throughout the entire life of the New Deal. We are even informed by the press that Congress favors this scheme, even though Congress has never seen it and many Members of Congress never have heard of it.

That, Mr. President, is what the President's food conference proposes to do to America. Is it not time that we, ourselves, began to do some remaking for our own protection?

The boys of 1917 and 1918 went to war to make the world safe for democracy. They came home, and all they got was a League of Nations that did not work. The boys of 1943 went to war to save our way of life. If this scheme goes through, all they will get when they return home will be a glorified W. P. A.

As Thomas Jefferson said, "Were we directed from Washington when to sow, and when to reap, we should soon want bread."

SESSION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF DELAWARE TO ACT ON SOLDIER VOTE LEGISLATION

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, it is with considerable pride that I point to the proclamation issued last Friday by Hon. Walter W. Bacon, Governor of the State of Delaware, calling for the convening of the general assembly in special session on Friday, March 24, at 11 a. m.

The purpose of the call is to provide for voting by members of the armed forces, regardless of where they may be stationed, and to exempt them from payment of State income taxes up to the first $3,000 received from services rendered in the armed forces of our country. In addition, the proclamation calls for the enactment of legislation accepting the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act amendments of 1943 and for confirmation of officers appointed by the Governor since the last session of the State senate.

While we in Washington have watched weeks, yes, months, fly by without enactment of soldier-vote legislation, the State of Delaware has decided to go ahead on its own initiative to see that its sons and daughters will have a voice in the elections next November, whether they are at home, at camp, out on the high seas, or on foreign soil.

Governor Bacon indicated last December that he was awaiting congressional action on the soldier-vote legislation before taking any steps. He indicated further, however, that he would do everything within his power to protect the ballot rights of those in the armed forces. He waited patiently for almost 3 months, and at last decided to go ahead and call the legislature into session, before it would be too late.

In a statement last December, the Governor declared that—

Those who are engaged today in the battle for the survival of our Republic should not be deprived of the right guaranteed them under our Constitution to have a voice in the selection of their elective officers.

We owe it to those men and women who are sacrificing their all, that we may continue to have the right to vote—to guarantee their right to vote while they are engaged in this great conflict.

I, for one, am not interested in the possible political consequences of a "soldier vote." I am interested in the guarantee of their constitutional rights for a free election of Government officials by majority rule. It is necessary under our form of government for all citizens to vote, regardless of whether they are civilians or in the military service.

Delaware's present Governor has always indicated a great interest in veterans' welfare. He was responsible for the creation of a Delaware Veterans' Commission and it has brought about the setting up of a central clearinghouse to ease the returning servicemen into civilian life. Only recently he said—

The welfare and happiness of our returning veterans are of paramount importance to all of us, and any contribution that we can make toward achieving these objectives will be worth all the time and effort we can spend. Nothing can repay the veterans for the sacrifices they have made, but we can at least have foresight enough to assist them get readjusted into civilian life.

The veterans' clearinghouse is now located at Eighth and Shipley Streets in Wilmington, and is known as the Delaware Red Cross Veterans' Clearing Bureau.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the proclamation issued by Governor Bacon calling the general assembly into special session on Friday, March 24.

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

Whereas the provisions of section 16 of article III of the Constitution of the State of Delaware authorize and empower the Governor of the State to convene the general assembly on extraordinary occasions by proclamation.

Now, therefore, I, Walter W. Bacon, Governor of the State of Delaware, by virtue of the power and authority vested in me as aforesaid, do hereby proclaim the following:

That the One Hundredth and Ninth General Assembly of the State of Delaware shall convene at Dover, the capital of the State, on Friday, the 24th day of March A. D. 1944, at 11 a. m., eastern wartime, to consider and act upon certain matters hereinafter set forth which are of great concern to the people of our State.

(1) The enactment of necessary amendments to the election, registration, and absentee ballot laws to provide reasonable opportunity for voting by all qualified absentee voters of our State, and particularly those serving in the armed forces of our country, the merchant marine, the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, and the United Service Organizations outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States.

(2) The passage of such amendments to the income tax and war emergency gross-income tax laws as will exempt from taxation up to the first $3,000 of moneys, including mustering-out pay, received for services rendered in the armed forces of our country, the merchant marine, the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, and the United Service Organizations, and those who are attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States and to be retroactively effective beginning with the calendar year 1942 and to continue in force and effect for the duration of the war.

(3) The enactment of legislation accepting the provisions of the "Vocational Rehabilitation Act amendments of 1943" so that benefits being derived therefrom will not be discontinued.

(4) The confirmation of officers appointed by the Governor since the adjournment of the last session of the Senate.

In testimony whereof, I, Walter W. Bacon, Governor of the State of Delaware, have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of said State to be hereunto affixed, at Dover,

this 10th day of March A. D. 1944, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and sixty-eighth.

WALTER W. BACON.

By the Governor:

WILLIAM J. STOREY,
Secretary of State.

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 MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law:

Maj. Gen James Harold Doolittle (major, Air Reserve), Army of the United States, to be lieutenant general; and

Brig. Gen. Hoyt Sanford Vandenberg (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, to be major general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John B. Tansil to be United States attorney for the district of Montana.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Theron Lamar Caudle to be United States attorney for the western district of North Carolina.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Timothy T. Cronin to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul B. Messick to be United States marshal for the district of Delaware.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles H. Cox to be United States marshal for the northern district of Georgia.

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

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James P. Finnegan to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lipe Henslee to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Tennessee.

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

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the Army nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the Navy nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the Marine Corps nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

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

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, March 16, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 14 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

THE JUDICIARY

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF PUERTO RICO

Enrique Campos del Toro, of Puerto Rico, to be Attorney General of Puerto Rico, vice George A. Malcolm.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Harry H. Holt, Jr., of Virginia, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Virginia, vice Hon. Sterling Hutcheson.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Raymond E. Thomason, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Alabama. (Mr. Thomason is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 2, 1944.)

Roulhac Gewin, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Alabama. (Mr. Gewin is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires March 29, 1944.)

Edwin D. Bolger, of Michigan to be United States marshal for the western district of Michigan. (Mr. Bolger is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 9, 1944.)

Robert W. Rabb, of Pennsylvania, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Pennsylvania. (Mr. Rabb is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 25, 1943.)

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Leroy P. Raynor to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the 1st day of February 1944.

John H. Brittain to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the 1st day of February 1944.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 14 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

John B. Tansil to be United States attorney for the district of Montana.

Theron Lamar Caudle to be United States attorney for the western district of North Carolina.

Timothy T. Cronin to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Paul B. Messick to be United States marshal for the district of Delaware.

Charles H. Cox to be United States marshal for the northern district of Georgia.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

James P. Finnegan to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Missouri.

Lipe Henslee to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Tennessee.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Lt. Col. Philip Doddridge

TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Second Lt. John Edward Fritz

TO INFANTRY

First Lt. Frederick Grinnell White

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be rear admirals

Louis E. Denfeld
Forrest B. Royal

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be lieutenant general

Holland M. Smith

To be brigadier general

Walter G. Farrell

REGULAR SERVICE

To be second lieutenants

Frank C. Caldwell
John T. McFadden, Jr.
William C. Hawkins
Ralph M. Sudnick
John C. Landrum
John L. Bricker
Billy E. Horner
David W. Ketler
Charles Toma, Jr.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Paulina-Mae Pittori, Betteravia.
Don M. Benedict, Tarzana.

COLORADO

V. Lester Finch, Springfield.

GEORGIA

Fred S. White, Hartwell.

ILLINOIS

Joseph B. Lager, Albers.
Esther Cherry, Arrowsmith.
Mildred E. Harder, Atwood.
Louis P. Baron, Beaverville.
Seth D. Abbott, Big Rock.
Oscar C. Stehr, Bonfield.
Florence I. Reising, Cabery.
Minnie A. Ralston, Caledonia.
Edmond Lovel, Cambria.
Naomi C. Reiter, Cherry.
Verda Malone, Chesterfield.
Victor L. Strawn, Dana.
Saidee A. Bowling, Dowell.
Anna Holshouser, Frankfort Heights.
Jessie M. Hickman, Good Hope.
Ella M. Watson, Harvel.
Anna Kirk, Ina.
George L. Campbell, Kingston.
Walter C. Howe, Latham.
Mary G. Lawless, Loraine.
John E. Cornelius, Lyndon.
Jeanette O. Perry, Martinton.
E. Floyd Crockett, Neoga.
Joseph Leonardo, Palos Heights.
Eloise N. Morgan, Payson.
Mary C. Guest, Reddick.
Katherine Hake, Tovey.
J. Amelia Crichton, Towanda.
Ambrosia E. Walker, Vergennes.
Francis H. Greene, Wapella.
Lea J. Orr, Wilmette.

INDIANA

Harry M. Collins, Dugger.
Robert E. Wilhelm, Hammond.

LOUISIANA

Ethel Barry, Grand Coteau.
Charles Williams, Many.
Frank C. Bertrand, Paradis.
Lillian Boyett, Serepta.
Mary Irma Jenkins, Tickfaw.

MONTANA

Ruth E. Hewett, Flaxville.
Keith G. Carpenter, Sidney.

NEBRASKA

Luise A. Zaiser, Avoca.
Charles E. Furman, Danbury.
John P. Moran, David City.
Walter Nowka, Glenvil.
Eva L. Denney, Lyman.

NORTH DAKOTA

Bernice K. Gustafson, Alexander.
Ralph S. McConn, Fairmount.

OKLAHOMA

Daniel H. Blair, Clayton.
Otto L. Badgley, Keyes.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Rosa R. Rountree, Buffalo.
John E. James, Summerton.

TENNESSEE

Minnie M. Dyer, Byington.

VERMONT

Wright E. Rives, Barton.
Catherine G. Hoag, Grand Isle.
Edgar J. Chapman, North Springfield.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who dwellest far beyond the light of suns and yet art forever with us, keep in our thought that all we do in soul and body, our God standeth by as witness. We pray that ours may be the memory of a useful life, eloquent in truth and in wisdom. Help us to understand that all that lives is in conflict and that there is no living virtue nor glory except in overcoming. In every situation we pray that the spirit may be stronger and more courageous than the flesh.

Heavenly Father, should we pause here? Art Thou not the God of those children beyond the flood? Hast Thou not said: "I will go with thee all the way"? We most earnestly pray that war, with its most inhuman cruelties, may cease and the wine press no longer be trodden with heavy and bleeding feet. May that day soon dawn in which the groans which have filled the earth with a vast moving requiem, shall come to an end and the joyful trumpet tidings shall resound throughout the world, and the prophecies of our blessed Lord shall be fulfilled. Then will begin the ministrations of humanity with its blanched face, and tragic memories shall be dissolved into an alluring hope that shall never die. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. 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 agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2836) entitled "An act to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Navy.
2. Post Office Department.
3. Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
4. Tennessee Valley Authority.
5. War Production Board.

AWARD OF DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL IN THE NAME OF CONGRESS TO ADMIRAL CHESTER W. NIMITZ

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 4377, authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Georgia please explain the bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under the law a Distinguished Service Medal may be awarded by the President to any person, who, while serving in any capacity with the Navy of the United States, since April 6, 1917, has distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious service to the Government in a duty of great responsibility. It may be awarded for combat or noncombat action.

The Committee on Naval Affairs felt that in view of the fact that Admiral Nimitz has rendered such outstanding service, it is fitting and proper that the Distinguished Service Medal be awarded to him in the name of Congress. Therefore, we unanimously reported this bill to the House.

As the House and the country know, Admiral Nimitz is the Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet. He is one of the most outstanding officers in the armed forces of the United States.

While it is appreciated that the President is empowered, without further action by Congress, to present a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Nimitz, the enactment of the bill would announce the special approval of the Congress of his services and it is therefore deemed appropriate.

His ability, judgment, and masterful conduct of naval warfare in the Pacific have placed the naval forces of the United States in that area in a position of dominance and have forced the Japanese back from vital sectors of its defense ring.

Admiral Nimitz's designation as Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet on December 17, 1941, was a fitting climax to a naval career which has been one of distinction ever since he was appointed a naval cadet in 1901. Admiral Nimitz, in the 40 years between the date of his appointment as a cadet and his designation as Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet, served on battleships, cruisers, and for a considerable period served aboard submarines and in command of submarine units. He served 3 years as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Navigation—now the Bureau of Naval Personnel—and on April 28, 1939, he was appointed Chief of that Bureau and was serving as such when he was called to take command of the Pacific Fleet.

Upon assuming command of the Pacific Fleet, Admiral Nimitz, exercising sound judgment and bringing to bear his great naval skill as a strategist, directed the units of the Pacific Fleet with the result that successful actions were fought against the enemy in the Coral Sea in May 1942, off Midway Island in June 1942, in the vicinity of the Solomon Islands in the summer and fall of 1942, and, as the losses of ships and materials sustained at Pearl Harbor were made good and more ships were placed at his disposal, he assumed the offensive and conducted the brilliant operations of the past few months which have resulted in the taking and occupation of the Gilbert Islands and the Marshall Islands and attacks on the perimeter of the inner defense circle.

Admiral Nimitz now holds a Distinguished Service Medal, awarded to him in 1942; the American Defense Service

Medal; Fleet Clasp; the Victory Medal; Submarine Clasp; a Silver Lifesaving Medal, awarded to him on March 20, 1912, for rescuing a man from drowning; and he was given a special letter of commendation by the Navy Department for the performance of his duties as chief of staff to the commander, United States Atlantic submarine fleet in World War No. 1.

Under the successful direction and leadership of Admiral Nimitz, the American Navy has come a long way since Pearl Harbor, and under his continued leadership we can look forward to still more glorious victories and the ultimate annihilation of the Japanese Navy.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I am not disposed in any way to object to the request of the gentleman from Georgia, but I was wondering whether you are not establishing a precedent that you now have to give the same medal to a number of generals in the Army?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to establish the precedent. The President has the authority, under the law, to give the Distinguished Service Medal to anyone he desires. But with these naval officers who have earned this honor, I think it means so much more when it is given in the name of the Congress. Therefore, I am not worried about the precedent that may be established.

Mr. FISH. I am not worried about the precedent at all either. I am glad the Congress does act sometimes on these things. But I was wondering whether it was not true, if we give this to Admiral Nimitz, if we should not likewise give it to General Eisenhower and General MacArthur.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. If I were a member of the Committee on Military Affairs I would have a similar bill here. But that is a matter entirely within the discretion of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman from Georgia would not object if I were to introduce a bill for General MacArthur in the same way?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not at all. If there is any distinguished officer who, the gentleman feels, has earned the Distinguished Service Medal, and if Congress thinks so, the medal should be given to him in the name of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy, for exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service to the Government in a duty of great responsibility as Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet from December 31, 1941, to the present time.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE MISSOURI RIVER IMPROVEMENT—FORT PECK DOING ITS PART TO WIN THE WAR—"CHAIN OF ROCKS" DANGER ZONE FOR NAVAL TOWS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. 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. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, some time after the end of World War No. 1, I had the privilege of attending a hearing before a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission concerning certain barges that had been built for use on the Missouri River but which had been diverted to other service during the war. Senator Reed of Missouri was demanding the return of the barges to the Missouri, and made one of the most interesting and informative speeches it was ever my pleasure to have heard. He was criticizing the dilatory course that prevailed, and said that his patience had been worn threadbare, notwithstanding he had a reputation for patience that was Nation-wide.

Senator Reed also discussed the silt situation, and called attention to the fact that engineering estimates had shown that the Missouri was discharging into the Mississippi a cubic mile of silt and sand every year, and that every possible effort should be put forth to relieve the situation without further delay. Speaker Champ Clark was also present at this hearing.

Since World War No. 1 systematic methods have been applied for the improvement of the Missouri. A 6-foot navigation project from the mouth to Sioux City, a distance of about 800 miles, is being successfully carried out. Bank revetments and dikes to stabilize the channel have relieved the silt situation to a large extent, and the confined flow of water has kept the main navigation channel scoured out to the extent that required depths are being attained and maintenance costs materially reduced. The engineers report that on at least four-fifths of the stretch from Sioux City to the mouth the channel now has a depth of 9 feet, though the project depth is only 6 feet.

The pending river and harbor bill has provision for increasing the project depth from 6 to 9 feet to be uniform with the major river channels with which the Missouri connects. This plan does not call for any additional water from the Missouri Basin, but will be carried out as stated by General Robins, as follows:

House Document 214, Seventy-sixth Congress, outlines the proposed work in detail. It states specifically that the 9-foot channel is now available for at least four-fifths of the mileage and that the improvement of the obstructive stretches will be by means of minor extensions of existing contraction systems, by bank revetment, cut-offs, closing of channels, removing of snags, and dredging.

The proposed 9-foot channel will be obtained in a manner similar to that used for the Mississippi River. The contraction works serving generally to confine the wide shallow portions of the river to narrow and deeper sections. It will not be attained by any additional demand upon the water resources of the Missouri River Basin over that presently authorized.

In this connection I will call attention to the fact that more water is now being released from the Fort Peck Reservoir than is necessary for the present 6-foot channel on the Missouri. It is for another purpose entirely and as a war measure. A few miles below the mouth of the Missouri is an extremely dangerous condition on the Mississippi known as the Chain of Rocks. All shipping passing this point must use great care and caution.

Approximately 1,000 ships and boats of various types for the Navy use have been towed down through this dangerous stretch of the river since our participation in the war. The normal flow of the river was inadequate to meet this situation at the Chain of Rocks and it was relieved by the release of additional waters from the Fort Peck Reservoir. In the month of January ice conditions interfered for a short time with the release of water at Fort Peck, and at the request of the Navy, the War Department obtained the release temporarily of additional water through the Sanitary District of Chicago.

Hon. Chester Thompson, in charge of the Federal Barge Line operations, informed me a few weeks ago that he is now carrying out a contract of towing 360 naval vessels from Lake Michigan to the Gulf. These boats, he said, consist of submarines, destroyer escorts, frigates, PC patrol cruisers, SC mine sweepers, and YW Navy water tenders. Some of these ships are over 300 feet in length, and have a draft of 17 feet. In order to tow them down on a 9-foot channel to New Orleans, it is necessary to lash them to steel pontons to give them greater buoyancy, raising them to a draft of about 6 or 7 feet. It would then be hazardous for such tows to pass the Chain of Rocks without this additional water from Fort Peck.

The Navy takes the further precaution of having the tows of the main naval vessels convoyed by the Coast Guard. Owing to limited equipment available only three tows of these ships are now sent down each week from Chicago. The Navy is in urgent need of them, and some are taken down in sections before completion.

The construction of the Fort Peck Dam was commenced under the National Recovery Act by the P. W. A., in 1934, when an allotment of $25,000,000 was made for the commencement of the work. The project was then embraced as a Senate amendment in the river and harbor bill of 1935, and completed as a navigation project under the Army engineers. The total cost was $118,443,000, of which $5,411,000 was for the installation of the power plant.

The project as originally adopted by the P. W. A., and as embraced in the act of Congress in 1935, was upon the recommendation of Gen. Lytle Brown, then Chief of Engineers, which was in part as follows:

I further recommend that the project for navigation on the main stem as heretofore authorized, namely from the mouth to Sioux

City, Iowa, be vigorously pressed to completion, and that, in addition, the reservoir at the site of Fort Peck be built to the maximum practicable capacity; and be operated primarily for navigation, with such arrangement for future installation of power as will permit the maximum production of hydroelectric power consistent with the primary demands of navigation; and for these purposes an authorized expenditure of $145,000,000 be authorized, together with the maintenance that may be found necessary.

In 1938 a river and harbor measure was passed providing for the installation of power facilities at Fort Peck. This was a Senate bill which created a Government bureau at considerable cost, for the transmission and sale of the electric energy. Under the direction of the Rivers and Harbors Committee I reported the bill in the House which was Report No. 1504 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, third session. This report struck out all the Senate bill after the enacting clause and substituted a new bill, which is now the law.

This new bill from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors had the recommendation of Hon. John Page, then Commissioner of Reclamation, who said that the limited amount of power to be produced at Fort Peck would not justify an expensive set-up as proposed in the Senate bill, and as provided in a similar law for disposition of the power at Bonneville. We therefore decided to place the matter in the hands of the Reclamation Bureau, which would involve but little, if any, additional expense and avoid the establishment of an additional Government bureau. Section 1 of the act, among other things, contains the following provision:

The Secretary of War shall provide, construct, operate, maintain, and improve at Fort Peck project such machinery, equipment, and facilities for the generation of electric energy as the Bureau may deem necessary to develop such electric energy as rapidly as markets may be found therefor.

Under this provision of the act of 1938 one power unit only has been installed by the Secretary of War, and no request has been made by the Bureau of Reclamation for additional units. The Fort Peck Reservoir is 189 miles long, with storage capacity of 19,412,000 acre-feet of water, and is said to be three-fourths full at the present time. The testimony before the committee when this measure was under consideration in 1938 showed that about 200,000 acres of land could be made accessible for irrigation from the Fort Peck project.

The interests of navigation and reclamation are mutual. The water that turns the turbines will flow down the stream. The greater the number of turbines in operation the greater will be the flow for navigation.

The pending river and harbor bill has provision for elimination of the dangers at the Chain of Rocks by cutting a canal around it on the Illinois side and installation of locks. After enactment, completion of the work would probably require several years. The war will not wait for this to be done.

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors has not been derelict in its efforts to eliminate the danger at the Chain of Rocks. After authorizing the survey and receiving the favorable report of the Chief of Engineers, the project has been embraced in every river and harbor bill presented to Congress since that time. It was in the bill that fell under the veto ax in 1940. It was in the bill which was not permitted to come to a vote in the last Congress. It is in the pending bill which is expected to come before the House next Monday. We hope for its enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in this connection and to include therein a few brief extracts from existing law and Government reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADMIRAL NIMITZ

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs has just introduced and the House has just passed a bill to award the Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Nimitz. As a Member of this body I would feel somewhat derelict today if I did not also mention a few things about the man with whom and under whom I had the privilege of serving in this war.

I am glad the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] brought up the question of whether or not we were establishing a precedent. In the military services as the gentleman knows, it is somewhat difficult sometimes to give a medal of high merit to a commanding officer. The people sometimes feel they are slighting those in minor positions.

Admiral Nimitz has almost been one of us in Congress, since he served for so many years in the Bureau of Navigation. We on the Committee on Naval Affairs almost claim him as our own. For once, we want the Congress to speak out and say, "Here is a leader who should be rewarded. He served long and tirelessly for many years." I think when history is written he will be shown to be one of the greatest naval strategists of all times. We do well to pay him this honor here today in the name of Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address I delivered some time ago before the Social Security Board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FROM THE WILL OF SAM HOUSTON

Mr. DIES. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to read a very appropriate and timely bequest from the will of Sam Houston, the hero of Texas, dated April 2, 1863:

To my eldest son Sam Houston, Jr., I bequeath my sword, won in the battle of San Jacinto, never to be drawn only in defense of the Constitution, the laws and liberties of his country. If any attempt should be made to assail one of these, I wish it used in its vindication.

ADMIRAL NIMITZ

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I, too, would like to express great approval of the fact that the Congress is giving this Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Nimitz.

I happened to see him just before he left for the South Pacific. I saw his grim determination to be successful in winning the war. Most of us have an idea, although we have not been there, of what he has had to do in that extremely difficult area. It is a very fine thing, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has pointed out, that the Congress should give this medal—that it does not come by favor from any particular group in the Navy Department, but comes with the approval of the Members, representing the people all over the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. 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. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two on the question of awards of medals by the Congress to generals and admirals in the military services. I think General Eisenhower already has the Distinguished Service Medal. As far as I can see, the question of to whom medals are to be awarded should rest with the military and not with the Congress. I have the highest regard, as has everyone, for Admiral Nimitz, but if we start in the medal business here with one man it will never stop, and it might well be left entirely to the military, to the Army and the Navy, as to whom these decorations are to be awarded.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a list of the dairy feed payments made to the farmers of the 10 counties of the Third District of Wisconsin, and also a summary of the oil meal distribution in the Third District of Wisconsin, through the A. A. A.; also a letter from the chairman of the Wisconsin Agricultural Conservation Committee.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SIMPLIFICATION OF FEDERAL TAX STRUCTURE

Mr. CLASON. 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. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House of Representatives have every reason to be proud of the splendid work which has been accomplished by the great Ways and Means Committee during 1944. It has devoted many weeks to the difficult task of preparing a new revenue law at a time when the American people are already paying into public treasuries more than 40 cents out of every dollar of their incomes. Some of these payments are made in the form of direct taxes. A large part of our tax burden is paid through a system of indirect taxes. Both have helped to create a very complicated tax structure, particularly with reference to the United States Government. The need for simplification of the Federal tax structure, and thereby of the Federal income-tax returns filed by corporations and individuals, has become progressively greater year by year under the Roosevelt administration.

Members of the Ways and Means Committee have pointed out that the Treasury Department should have developed a program for simplification of our tax laws and tax returns long ago. Since the administration leaders failed to take an active concern in this serious situation, the members of the House Committee on Ways and Means have taken it upon themselves to initiate corrective legislation. They have not relied solely upon their own personal knowledge of the tax subject, of which they have a wide and sound knowledge, but they have called in the Treasury experts as well as the experts employed by the committee. The members of the committee raised this issue early in January at the start of this session. On January 25, 1944, I spoke on this subject here in the House, urging that full support be given to the gentleman from Kansas, Congressman FRANK CARLSON, who had offered a program for simplification of taxes and returns at that time. Other members of the committee have since offered other suggestions and programs.

It is gratifying to note that after the passage of the revenue bill over the President's veto on February 25 of this year, the Committee on Ways and Means immediately took up the difficult problem of simplification of our Federal tax structure. They have held hearings, they have worked assiduously; they have secured results. We are delighted to know that before the month of April has passed bills will be introduced in the Senate and House which will provide for the simplification of our Federal-tax laws. The simplification of the tax laws will result in the simplification of the tax returns. This activity on the part of the Ways and Means Committee will bring untold relief to many thousands of American citizens. In accomplishing this much-needed tax reform, the credit will belong solely to Congress and largely to the members of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Thirty million Americans who now file returns will be relieved altogether of filing returns. We are told that normal taxes, surtaxes, and Victory taxes will be combined into one tax. Relief from guesswork about one's income for months ahead will be given in large measure.

Every American is vitally interested in this legislation. I hope that the committee bill will be given immediate consideration by the House as soon as it is reported.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Cincinnati Inquirer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INDIANAPOLIS POWER & LIGHT CO.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include in the text of my remarks the text of a citation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LUDLOW addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last, I obtained unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article entitled "Representation for Smaller Business." I have been informed by the Government Printing Office that the insertion of this article will cost about $120. Notwithstanding that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding and without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. If there is general debate that may be done, but if a bill is being read for amendment, the policy is not to permit it.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the request until tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein an editorial in regard to public schools.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial appearing in the Indianapolis Star recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short editorial from the Chicago Times and one from the Watertown Daily Times, and a telegram, all on the soldiers' vote bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article appearing in the Chicago Times of yesterday on why it is absolutely necessary to reelect President Roosevelt in the interest of the country and the world.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ROOSEVELT BUTTONS SENT TO SOLDIERS

Mr. McWILLIAMS. 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. McWILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote an extract from a soldier's letter sent from the north African theater of war:

> We are being flooded with Roosevelt pin-on buttons. We are invited to take them by the handfuls. This leads to some queer uses for the buttons. Arab babies usually don't wear them, but French babies do, and French mothers find it useful, in a general scarcity of safety pins, to employ the F. D. R. buttons to pin diapers. Some of the men go down to the water front and have fun, for, with practice, the buttons make admirable skimmers.
>
> We also are using them as chips in games of chance. Some Arabs find them valuable to pin together what sketchy undergarments they wear.
>
> Seriously, the men I have talked to resent this kind of politicking, and we'd all be obliged if you could tell us who is to blame. When I come home I'll bring you a handful.
>
> That's what we call teamwork—600,000 diapers from lend-lease and Roosevelt campaign buttons from O. W. I. to hold 'em up.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Mr. William Borthwick, tax commissioner, Territory of Hawaii,

and a letter from one of my constituents, Mr. John C. Cuneo, of Modesto, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 8, the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior made a very important announcement concerning the fine progress they were making with the Columbia Basin project in the State of Washington. I ask unanimous consent to insert that press release in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had for Thursday of this week may be transferred to Wednesday, March 22.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the American Federation of Labor Federationist entitled "Still Lots of Truman Reports."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein an editorial appearing in the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News entitled "Unity at Washington."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today at the conclusion of the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SMEARING OUR HEROES IN TIME OF WAR

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SMEAR ATTACKS ON GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

Mr. FISH. 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. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the wolf pack of communistic smearers and radical New Deal and fellow traveler stooges are out gunning for Gen. Douglas MacArthur, our greatest fighting general, who with little to fight with wins victory after victory over the Japs while our invasion troops have been bogged down in Italy for 6 months.

Why the calculated and deliberate assaults by the smear artists of the War Department Library Service and the PM newspaper, or the uptown edition of the Daily Worker, except that both the New Deal hatchet men and the Communist fellow travelers are afraid that he will be drafted by the Republican National Convention in June to lead the fight against the Great White Father? Are the New Dealers afraid that General MacArthur will steal the war ball from the Commander in Chief?

What is wrong with Gen. Robert Wood, with a fine record in World War No. 1 and former head of the America First Committee, visiting Australia on official business, having a conference with General MacArthur? Evidently the PM forgot that Brig. Gen. Hanford MacNider, a gallant soldier wounded in the last war and in this, is serving directly under General MacArthur and that General MacNider is a Past National Commander of the American Legion and was a member of the National Executive Committee of the America First Committee, as was Mrs. Nicholas Longworth, sister of another brave officer, Brig. Gen. Theodore Roosevelt.

General MacArthur is the best-known and the best-loved officer in our armed forces, and if these unfair smear attacks continue they will insure his nomination and election as the next President of the United States. These false smear attacks can only undermine the morale of our armed forces, and cause dissension and disunity and come dangerously near the border line of sedition and treason against the United States.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from New York is recognized for 30 minutes.

JEWISH HOMELAND IN PALESTINE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include therein certain excerpts and a bill now pending before the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I intend today to discuss the important problems raised by the British white paper on Palestine and the resolutions introduced in the House and the Senate calling for the abrogation of this White Paper.

It seems that the powers that be have set down their foot on the attempt made by Congress to pass a resolution urging the British Government to annul its so-called white paper, which bars Palestine to all future Jewish immigration.

Through the actions of elements evidently hostile to the Jewish people, it has been decided that Palestine should be the one country in the world to which Jews should not be allowed to go. What a strange travesty on justice.

Twenty-five years ago the British Government solemnly proclaimed Palestine as the national Jewish homeland. At that time Palestine belonged to Turkey, so Britain was very generous in deciding to make Palestine the Jewish homeland.

Now, 25 years later, when Britain obtained a mandate from the League of Nations to administer Palestine, Britain sees fit to pervert this mandate into full control, to such an extent that by its own unilateral action Britain tries to prevent Jews from entering their own homeland forever.

Such is the story of 25 years, during which the Jews poured their blood and treasure into the building of their own homeland. Deserts have been converted into blooming agricultural areas and industries were started where none ever thought industries could arise. For 25 years Jews were coming into Palestine from many countries and a population of some half a million found their homes there.

When Hitler began his campaign for extermination of the Jews of Europe, many were able to escape by going into Palestine, and Palestine still remains for many the one oasis of hope and settlement.

But the fact that the powers that be have closed the gates of Palestine should not make us close our eyes to the very need of the Jews of the world, particularly all those in the Hitler-occupied areas of Europe, to find some place to which they might go in this emergency. And so I introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives on September 14, 1943, which stated the following things:

House Joint Resolution 154

Joint resolution to provide for the temporary admission into the United States of political or religious refugees from the Axis Nations

Whereas it is common knowledge that countless thousands of innocent persons, of all racial and religious denominations, in many of the countries of continental Europe have been murdered or otherwise ruthlessly persecuted by the Axis Nations; and

Whereas it is accepted by well-informed people that unless something is done within the next few months, which months will embrace winter, countless more thousands will be murdered or otherwise ruthlessly persecuted; and

Whereas under the present existing immigration laws, unlike the limitation on the number of persons who may come to the United States permanently as immigrants, there is no such limitation on the number of those who may come temporarily; and

Whereas under present practices of administrative officials but very few persons are permitted to come to the United States temporarily or otherwise; and

Whereas ocean transportation of persons coming to the United States can be made available on returning transports: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that immediate temporary relief should be granted to those unfortunate people and it is therefore urged that an administrative policy be

adopted to admit to the United States for a period not exceeding 6 months after hostilities have ceased between the Allied and Axis Nations such persons now residing in continental Europe who desire to come to the United States and who can establish to the satisfaction of any American consul before whom they may appear that they are bona fide political or religious refugees: *Provided, however*, That it is further the sense of the Congress that no persons should be admitted, in accordance with the spirit of this joint resolution, if they are afflicted with any loathsome, dangerous, or contagious diseases, have criminal records of crimes involving moral turpitude, or whose presence in the United States would endanger the public safety of the United States or otherwise be inimical to the best interests of the United States. It is is further urged as being within the spirit of this joint resolution that as time is strictly of the essence in the success of the purpose of the joint resolution, the Secretary of State and the Attorney General are urged to issue their joint regulations to carry into effect the purpose of this joint resolution just as soon as it is possible following the passage of the joint resolution.

What I propose to do under this resolution is to save as many human lives as can be saved within the framework of our immigration laws.

While much can be said concerning our future immigration policy, there is no question that restrictions of immigration and limitations of immigration have been clearly written into our legislation and there is no question but that our future immigration policy will continue to be based on selective immigration.

It is therefore impossible to do anything by way of increasing the number of permanent immigrants who might be admitted from Europe from the Hitler ridden countries. I still hope that Palestine will not be closed as a haven for Jews persecuted all over the world. But apparently something must be done without any further delay to keep the doors of Palestine open, since the arbitrary policy of Great Britain has already cost millions of human lives.

In his progress through Europe, Hitler has already murdered and enslaved masses of people in every country to which his legions have gone. He enslaved the countries of western Europe and whenever his armies are forced to retreat from Russian territory, he slaughters and enslaves thousands along his path.

The only way we can save at least some of his victims is by granting temporary havens of refuge to as many as can find the opportunity to escape, until such time as they shall be able to return to their homelands or until such time as other countries might be found ready to receive them.

The object of my resolution is, therefore, no amendment to our immigration laws and no desire to interfere with a settled policy of our immigration laws, but it is purely a temporary measure and a measure designed to help and to save.

Only a few days ago a Member of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE], suggested that there might be a way of finding a home for the persecuted Jewish people on the Pacific coast in the great Republic of Peru, one of our good neighbors to the south. There might be other places of similar nature and other countries which require cultivation and pioneers, for which many of those who are persecuted today are particularly well fitted. The Commonwealth of Australia, for instance, has repeatedly stated that it would welcome white settlers.

But, the important thing now is not to provide for a future settlement of these people, but to enable them to save their lives until such time as definite plans could be made for their settlement.

Hitler will not wait for us to rescue them from his clutches. He is carrying on his program with ferocious and unrelenting might, and if we do not do something now at once, and in a hurry, there will be nobody to save when the time will come for us to resettle the ravaged countries which Hitler has despoiled.

I am addressing my remarks not only with reference to the people who have borne the brunt of Hitler's extermination policy, but we might say the same thing about the people of other nations who have fallen a prey to Hitler, and even about the people of Italy, who for a while Hitler called his allies.

We know how in the last few weeks resentment in Italy arose to fevered heat and how in the sections of Italy which are under Hitler's control the people revolted and engaged in strikes or sabotage, to prevent Hitler's machine from grinding them to dust. Hitler treats his former friends, if you can call them so, with the same ruthlessness with which he treats his alleged enemies.

When Italy surrendered to the Allies, it gave Hitler the opportunity to seek to enslave every Italian who came within the orbit of his power, and even the people of Germany cannot honestly say that their lot has improved with Hitler, but the common people of Germany are just as much Hitler's slaves as are the people of the European nations whom he had conquered.

But, this is not the time to shed tears over the fate of the German people. After all, "they made their bed and they must lie in it." The German people were warned by every nation in the world as to their fate if they saw fit to elect Hitler as their ruler, and they must suffer for their brutality and ruthlessness when the time comes for retribution.

Our duty as Americans and as Members of Congress is to help those who cannot help themselves and to rescue the victims of brutality wherever they may be found.

The Jewish people have suffered more than any other and while the other peoples enslaved by Hitler will eventually see the dawn of a new day and will sooner or later be relieved of the nightmare of Nazi domination, no such hope can be dangled before the eyes of the Jewish people.

The many Jews in Europe who were uprooted from their homes and whose means of livelihood have been taken away from them cannot expect that with the defeat of Hitler they could calmly go back to their own homes and start life anew.

Even the most progressive European peoples, even the Czechs and the Dutch, who have forever been lovers of liberty and particularly fair in their treatment of the Jews in their respective countries, will be unable to restore their Jews to the position they held before the Hitler invasion.

Hitler has so thoroughly mixed up the affairs of every country in Europe that there is no way by which any person can possibly find his home again in the place where it was before Hitler destroyed it. There will be many thousands who will have to look for homes elsewhere and many thousands will have to find new homes for themselves.

It was therefore my hope that with the aid of our Congress we shall be able to impress upon the British government how we as Americans resent the so-called White Paper of 1939.

A few days ago President Roosevelt specifically stated that the American people never approved or consented to the British white paper of 1939. America must be consulted, under the terms of the Palestine mandate, on every major change of policy which Britain as a mandatory power may wish to adopt with reference to Palestine.

So, if Britain saw fit to establish limitations on Jewish entry into Palestine, she did so without consulting us, and we are not in any way bound by the British White Paper.

It was therefore rather painful to many of us to have listened to testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee given by some members of the War Department suggesting that military expediency would not permit the passage at this time of the resolution designed to call upon Britain to abrogate this so-called White Paper.

I do not believe that it was really the intention of these important public officials to stand in the way of our passage of this resolution. I am positive that the Palestine resolution is closely linked to the question of rescue of the Jewish people. The creation by the President of a War Refugee Board aims at the same object.

We must not forget that the entire problem is only one and can only be treated as one. It will do no good to separate the various activities and lose sight of the principal question, which is the question of rescue of human lives. If we permit the British Government to continue with its White Paper and ban Jewish immigration into Palestine, the entire work of the War Refugee Board will be futile from the start.

How can the War Refugee Board help to rescue anybody if the most obvious place of rescue, Palestine, should be closed to a considerable portion of Hitler's victims?

But, aside from any question of humanitarianism and aside from the fact that America has always prided herself as being the asylum for the oppressed, how can we as their allies possibly forget the great debt of gratitude which Britain owes to the Jews of Palestine for their fine record in the present war.

Pierre van Paassen called the Palestinian Jews the "forgotten ally" and the forgotten ally they really are.

We must not forget the fact that Hitler's armies stood at the entrance of the Suez Canal. It looked as though the British Empire would be doomed to utter extinction and that Hitler's armies and the armies of the Mikado would join hands at the Indian Ocean as soon as the Suez Canal was taken over by the German Army.

The German marshal, Rommel, was already "licking his chops." It seemed a matter of hours that Britain would be doomed and it was this small Jewish population of Palestine which far above its means and far in excess of its physical ability was able to stem the tide of the German advance and win this battle for Great Britain, when otherwise Britain would have undoubtedly perished.

Another important phrase which was coined by Van Paassen was that "this was the best kept secret of the war." The British Government never gave the Jews of Palestine any recognition or credit for their exploits and never wanted to admit that it was the valor of the Palestine Jews which saved the day for the Allies in the Near East.

As against this record we have the record of all the other peoples in and about Palestine, that did absolutely nothing to aid the cause of the United Nations. Neither the Syrian, nor the Egyptian, nor the Iraqis furnished as much as a donkey or a camel to aid the Allies in the war, and strange as it may seem the British Empire is seemingly trying to appease the Syrians, Egyptians, and Iraqians, who did nothing to help the British, but on the other hand is attempting an anti-Jewish policy with reference to Palestine, thus repaying by utter ingratitude the help which they received from the Jews of Palestine.

It seems that to some extent the reluctance of our statesmen to help the cause of Jewish settlement in Palestine is due to the fact that we expect to obtain oil concessions from Egypt, Syria, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia, which countries are seemingly opposed to Jewish immigration because they are afraid that if Jewish immigration continues, Palestine will become in fact, the Jewish homeland and therefore exclusively Jewish.

We can assure Egypt, Syria, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia that any fears they entertain with reference to the Jews' excluding other people from Palestine are absolutely groundless. The Jews do not intend to make Palestine an exclusive Jewish country, but on the contrary they wish to establish in Palestine a democratic commonwealth open to all who wish to make Palestine their home.

As a matter of fact, at this time there are many non-Jewish refugees in Palestine who are full of praise for the treatment they are receiving from the Jews in that country. We have a large contingent of Polish refugees who have established their headquarters in Palestine and who have found the Jews of Palestine very cooperative and very helpful. Even some former Germans, so-called Aryan refugees, who found new hope in Palestine are more than eager to see an increase in Jewish immigration into that country, since they feel that they will not be discriminated against and will be able to live happy lives in Palestine.

If we consider the fact that in the brief space of 25 years Palestine has changed from a desert into a blooming country, we can well see what debt of gratitude is due to the Jews for the work which they have done in Palestine. The Arabs who lived in Palestine before 1917 are more than happy to continue to live in Palestine and they have shown in their demeanor and their generous spirit of friendship for the Jews, how much they appreciate the changes which were made in Palestine in the last 25 years.

I am hesitant to believe the statements which are so common around the Capitol today and which seek to imply that the opposition to the Jewish commonwealth of Palestine is based upon the fact that we expect to obtain oil concessions from the Arab countries and therefore must play with the Arabs against the Jews. I hesitate to believe that any such considerations should have any weight with responsible public opinion in the United States and I feel that any idea of imperialistic oil concessions is clearly out of date at this time.

No, I do not believe that we will be swayed by such improper considerations to base our national policy on such utilitarian foundation. America will not forget that in the 150 years of its national history it has always been an asylum for the oppressed and has always taken the part of the oppressed.

Palestine is not going to prevent a union of all the Arab states if they see fit to form a confederation. If Egypt, Syria, and Iraq should desire to unite, the existence of a Jewish homeland in Palestine will not in any way prevent such a confederation. We have situations in Europe where nations have become confederated even if some adjacent territories were under another flag.

Take for instance, Switzerland, which exists as an independent country, in spite of the fact that these people speak French, German, and Italian, and there is an independent France, Germany, and Italy.

It will not hurt the future Arab Commonwealth to find a little Switzerland in the Near East, just as there is a Switzerland in Europe.

Palestine, by its geographical position and by virtue of its natural resources and the spirit of its inhabitants, is clearly destined to become another Switzerland.

The protests made against the Palestine resolution by Arab states are contrary to good diplomatic procedure and contrary to the normal procedure which prevails in the Congress of the United States.

What nonsense it is to have officers of a foreign government attempting to tell the Members of Congress what to say and what not to say? Since when do we obtain ideas and statements of policy from foreign governments? Under the Constitution of the United States no Member of Congress can be questioned for any statement he makes on the floor of the House by anybody in the United States. Shall we submit to questioning by foreign governments?

I am afraid that while "the voice is the voice of Jacob, the hand is the hand of Esau." I am very suspicious of the source of these utterances and am afraid that behind them is the fine hand of the British Foreign Office. I am afraid that it was the British Foreign Office which prompted our Syrian, Iraqian, and Egyptian friends to express their views in such form as to prevent Congress from doing its duty.

But I am also convinced of the fact that no Member of this House will be influenced by the statements coming from such foreign sources and will do his duty fearlessly and as his own conscience prompts him.

The question before us is much broader than the mere problem of Palestine and even the question of rescue of the Jewish population of Europe. The question before us is shall we bow to the dictation of Egypt, Syria, and Iraq?

We have received numerous appeals from various groups and organizations. Church organizations have called upon Congress to do something to help the Jewish people, pointing out that if we permit the Jews to be annihilated it will encourage the Nazi barbarians to extend their program of brutal murder to others. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that many Christians have been murdered in cold blood by the same Hitler followers. All are clamoring that something be done to help, yet nothing has been accomplished. As far as the persecuted Jews of Europe are concerned, their only avenue of escape at the moment, as well as their last hope, is Palestine. Unfortunately, the Palestine White Paper of the British Government is about to close this last avenue of escape and to shatter this last ray of hope.

As a result of mounting indignation in this country, and as an official protest against the vicious provisions of the White Paper, a resolution was introduced in the House by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. COMPTON], and in the Senate by Senator WAGNER and Senator TAFT, to persuade the British Government to abrogate the White Paper, which would close the doors of Palestine—at the end of this month—to further Jewish immigration. All of the Members of the House were hoping and waiting for an opportunity to support such resolution. But out of a clear sky we hear today around the Capitol and other places that the Wagner and Wright resolution and other similar resolutions have been tabled in the committees. Why? The answer seems to be that some influential people, some politicians in the Arab countries, were able to convince some Americans with influence that the creation of a Jewish homeland would create unrest in the Arab countries.

We hear further, Mr. Speaker, that the War Department has interposed some objections to these resolutions. This latter objection is very amazing to me. I have a high regard for the War Department. If it were really and truly a fact that by tabling the resolution we would help the war effort, I would be for it. If

it were going to help us win the war, in spite of the fact that millions of Jews and others could not be saved from being murdered, I would be willing to heed the War Department's advice. But, Mr. Speaker, from the evidence before us and from the observations of well-qualified people—even within the War Department—who have been in the Near East recently, the Department's objections are based on much less important—that is, important to our country—grounds. It has no more to do with the war than the man in the moon.

Palestine is just a little piece of land when compared with the millions of miles of Arab land. Palestine is just a little spot when compared to the vast area under the control of the Arabs. In all the 25 years the Jews have settled in Palestine they seem to have gotten along very nicely with the Palestinian Arabs, except for a few political, self-appointed leaders of the Arabs who have created a lot of disunity to further their own interests. They have enjoyed the benefits of the Jewish homeland but at the same time they have been spreading insidious propaganda abroad that Jewish immigration to Palestine is detrimental to Arab interests.

I hope and trust that the proper committees—both in the House and the Senate—will look into the matter and expose this insidious propaganda. It is a pretty sad state of affairs when in this whole great world, with lots of space, we cannot find enough room, whether it be in Palestine, the United States, or in any other part of the world—to offer as a place of refuge to the tormented people whom we may be able to snatch from the claws of the Nazi beast.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. In 1939 when the British Government issued its Malcolm MacDonald White Paper to which the gentleman has adverted, we were not at war and despite the fact that 60 United States Senators and a great many Members of this Chamber protested to our own administration that it in turn protest the issuance of this MacDonald white paper, our administration was silent. As I stated, we were not at war at that time. Now, 5 years later, we are at war and the same attitude is assumed toward the British Foreign Office with reference to this White Paper. Was our administration and our State Department correct in 1939 or are they correct now? In other words, were they correct in their attitude when we were not at war or are they correct now when we are at war?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think they have been wrong in both instances. I thank the gentleman for calling that to my attention. Of course, he is correct.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. I would like to get the gentleman's idea and also the idea of the other gentleman from New York on whether they are just going to make speeches here and let it go at that, or whether they are going to strive to get action from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, even if it is necessary to amend the original proposal? I have an idea that if this thing were put in proper form, that is, in a form in which we could come out and repudiate the white paper and hold the Balfour resolution upon which the Congress has voted unanimously, we could get action. What I am interested in, of course, is action to permit these hounded and persecuted Jews to find a haven, a refuge, a homeland in Palestine. I think that raises the real question.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I can assure the gentleman that as far as I am concerned, I do not intend to stop with a speech. I will knock at every door, I will try to reach every home of Americans with decent judgment, Americans who are good people, to get behind this resolution and to do everything in their power to assist us in saving as many human beings as possible.

Mr. FISH. May I say right here and now that I am in favor of the resolution, but I want to get action and I am going to take a resolution in amended form striking out all reference to the establishment of a commonwealth so that we can repudiate the "white paper" in order to demand immigration into Palestine and the right of the Jews to go there, to own property, to live there and bring up their families there?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. I think the gentleman from New York, our distinguished colleague, speaks directly and wisely. If we can get that resolution past the House Foreign Affairs Committee without the use of the word "commonwealth," I certainly would be for that proposal. It is essential to open Palestine to refugees so that the hapless, hopeless, tempest-tossed Jews can find some haven of refuge, be it only temporary. If we can get that resolution through, and thereby needle and spur England into action to withdraw this MacDonald "White Paper" and to allow further Jewish immigration into Palestine, even for temporary purposes, we will have accomplished something. I want to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from New York, first, because he was the author of the original Fish resolution of 1922 and because of his remarks in that regard just presented to us.

Mr. FISH. May I say to the gentleman that I am willing to cooperate in that way with him and the others to amend the resolution and even to write the amendment in order to get action.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY. As the gentleman knows, I am interested in this subject and made a talk in December before the House. I am wondering as a practical situation and from a parliamentary standpoint, whether we could file a petition to discharge the committee?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. In my judgment there can be no objections to the filing of such a discharge petition and I intend to take this action if the Committee on Foreign Affairs does not report the Wright-Compton resolution within the next week.

Mr. KENNEDY. May I say to the gentleman that if a petition is filed I will be delighted to assist the gentleman in bringing it before the House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I thank the gentleman. I have had the same statement made to me by many, many Members of the House and I am sure it is the will of the American people to have us live up to the obligations we took upon ourselves when our Government officially endorsed the Balfour Declaration.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. May I inquire if the gentleman can inform me what the reason is for the proposed modification of the term "commonwealth"?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not know. Someone is raising some technicality, for fear that a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine will arouse objections by some Arab interests.

Mr. ROWE. Why, is what I would like to know.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There is a lot of British and Arab propaganda being carried on to that effect.

Mr. ROWE. Are we not acceding to the same injustices that brought about the White Paper?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There is no question about that. I think we ought to insist upon what we believe is the right thing to do; in other words, when the Balfour Declaration was adopted, the other nations endorsed it. Britain was just given the mandate over Palestine—to administer such mandate subject to approval of the Mandate Commission of the League of Nations and the other powers who endorsed the Balfour Declaration.

Mr. ROWE. I concur in the views of the gentleman. I do not believe it is possible to modify a wrong.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I thank the gentleman for taking that position. That is the position I have taken. I am tired of foreign governments telling us just what to do and how we should do it. I am tired of listening to a lot of irresponsible Arabs, who were nobodies until the settlement of Palestine. When the place was cleansed, progress was made, and money earned by these Arabs, all due to the work and sweat of the Jewish pioneers who battled malaria and trachoma and who turned the desert into gardens and fields. The absentee landowners among the Arabs, afraid that the poor fellahin, the poor exploited, unsettled Arabs, would learn to enjoy these new luxuries and learn too much to remain under the complete domination of these large, absentee landowners, started a campaign against the Jews.

Mr. ROWE. I am informed that the Arabs that were directly connected with the Palestinian group are the best off of all the Arabs, and I am further informed that they themselves are not complaining particularly about this.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROWE. It is the Arabs that are not part of the development in Palestine.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is right.

Mr. ROWE. Inasmuch as it is them, I am not too willing to place the blame upon the Arabs. I am inclined to think it is more attributable to some international politicians, particularly those interested in empire rights.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think the gentleman has something there. I agree with the gentleman that it is not the Arab in the area of Palestine who is complaining, because he is receiving the benefit of the prosperity which has come to Palestine under the new agricultural and industrial development of the country brought about by the Jewish settlers.

It is the Arab who is hundreds and thousands of miles away from Palestine who is seeking to put an obstacle in the way of the destinies of millions of people who have been dreaming of and working hard for the establishment of a homeland—a homeland guaranteed not only by England but by the United States and the other nations of the world.

The big question is whether this Congress shall, in its wisdom, bring out this resolution and discuss it openly. Let us know what is behind the opposition. Let us find out whether it can stand the searching light of public inquiry. Let us find out whether the oil deal with King ibn-Saud is really responsible for our appeasement policy—whether the accusation in an editorial in New York's PM, March 13, 1944, excerpts of which I would like to read to you, is justified:

POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES

And like all forms of economic imperialism, this one has already started a train of political consequences. The Jews in Palestine have proved the first victims. One of ibn-Saud's conditions in granting oil concessions to America may well have been that the American Senate withdraw its projected Wagner resolution about Palestine. And it is not impossible that General Marshall acted on the reasoning that oil is a matter of great military moment, and that its sources for fueling future wars ought not to be endangered by native Arab unrest. At any rate, he appeared before the Senate committee, and the resolution was tabled. Also, somewhere in the Arabian desert, a quantity of rifles and ammunition was handed over by Maj. Ralph Royce to ibn-Saud, as a lend-lease token. Ibn-Saud said he was satisfied by the American response, and I am sure that the British are not grieving.

Thus all goes well for oil imperialism. To be sure, the smell of oil may thus have set back for a decade the great dream that Theodor Herzl had for a Jewish homeland. To be sure, also, it may doom millions of Jewish post-war refugees to continued poverty and persecution in Europe. But in the perspective of the oil imperialism these are trifling matters.

Mr. ROWE. I am inclined to think that the Arab on whom we are placing the blame for starting this uprising is merely a smokescreen, in that the final act so far as the white paper is concerned can be attributed to the English Government and those in the Parliament that want to accede to the politicians to bring about this infiltration of Jewish people.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Exactly. That is what I stated at the beginning of my remarks.

Mr. ROWE. That was done over the remonstrance of the fair-minded people of Great Britain, and we ought to place the blame where it belongs, with the international politician, who has ulterior motives and selfish interests.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Then why should we, the Congress, representing the will of the people, stifle resolutions affecting an official agreement entered into in good faith by our Government?

Mr. ROWE. If the question is directed to me, may I say that I am a new Member of this House and I am anxious to express myself on this matter, but as yet the opportunity has not been afforded me.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am sorry. I hope the gentleman is given such opportunity very soon.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Is it not a fact that the power politics to which the gentleman recently referred will prove the greatest stumbling block to future world peace?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am inclined to agree with my distinguished colleague.

Mr. Speaker, this cannot go on. We would be the laughing stock of the world if we were to accede to threats and intimidations. We are told by some foreign hoodlums that they are objecting to something which is humane and which is right. We have made some official commitments regarding the Jewish homeland in Palestine and we are honor bound to live up to them. In acquiescing in this pact that we made with other nations in 1917 and 1918, we agreed to the very program that is now being violated by Great Britain. I want to mention at this point that the permanent Mandate Commission of the League of Nations refused to ratify the Palestine White Paper when it was submitted to them by Britain. This conclusively proves my point that Great Britain has no authority to enforce it.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I serve notice now that unless the Wright-Compton resolution is reported out I will file a discharge petition. I have every confidence that every Member of this House will do the right thing and give us an opportunity to discuss this question. Then, whether you are for it or against it, we can discuss it in an American way without dictation from foreign sources, foreign governments, or foreign interests. How long will the civilized world permit the hangmen of the Nazis to go on murdering and slaughtering innocent people of all religious faiths? If we have a conscience we must take steps to save as many people as it is humanly possible to save from the gruesome deaths planned for them by the madman of Berchtesgaden.

At first we had the Bermuda Conference. We in Congress believed that the Bermuda Conference would bring about some relief for the persecuted people. Our hopes were in vain. Now, after much discussion in this country and all over the world, the President of the United States has created a War Refugee Board. One of the important tasks of the Board was to assist Jewish refugees escaping from the Lowlands and the Balkans to get to Palestine.

Now comes Great Britain and says, "After the end of this month Jewish immigration into Palestine is forbidden.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What reason did Great Britain give for refusing to let the Jews go to Palestine?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There is no reason under the sun.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What reason did Great Britain assign?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Great Britain—the great imperialistic power—is not used to give reasons for any of her actions. Britain claims she is afraid of Arab trouble. The evidence shows that the role the Arabs have played in this war is so negligible—unless you consider their help to the Axis—that their behavior could not possibly harm us any more than it has already done, no matter what we do or fail to do to appease them.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman will consult the minutes of the Permanent Mandate Commission of the League of Nations, he will find repeatedly expressed there that there has never been any trouble between the Jews and the Arabs in Palestine, except that which was caused by the British Colonial Office. He will find there evidence that Britain does not wish Palestine to be industrialized, because they are afraid that modern industrialization will raise the standard of living of the Arabs. They want to keep the Arab fellahin on a low standard of living. The Jew wishes to industrialize Palestine, but the British do not want that. They have just used their old method of divide and conquer to gain their own ends.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Why does Britain frown on the industrialization of that territory?

Mr. CELLER. For the same reason that she frowns on the industrialization of India. England is not self-sufficient. She has to depend upon her manufactured exports to exist. There are practically only 40,000,000 inhabitants in Great Britain, and, therefore, if Palestine or India or any of the colonies of England become industrialized, there would be a lot of competition for English industrialists and the ruling families of England, who are primarily interested in large industries, do not want competition of that kind.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Then, of course, it resolves itself down to the old British policy of divide and conquer, just as she did in Ireland.

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That may be one of the causes, but there are many others.

It boils down to a political situation of certain groups within the Arab country who are playing ball with some British industrialists.

Mr. CELLER. The economic absorptive capacity would not permit, say, 4,000,000 more Jews to go into Palestine, or even 2,000,000 more, because of its smallness. Palestine is only half the size of the State of Vermont, and contains only about 10,000 square miles, and unless we do industrialize it, you would not give them the economic absorptive capacity to permit the entrance of a large number of Jews.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is true, but that would not come overnight. Walter Clay Lowdermilk, a noted American soil conservationist, at present Assistant Chief of the United States Soil Conservation Service, in his splendid book Palestine, Land of Promise, points out that the unique combination of the natural features and resources of the Jordan Valley makes possible a huge reclamation project, capable of supporting at least 4,000,000 refugees in addition to the 2,000,000 Jews and Arabs already living there. There are more than 500,000 families in Palestine today who ask that they be permitted to take one or two or three refugees, no matter where they come from, to take care of them temporarily, until after the war.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman means 600,000 inhabitants, not families?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Do I understand that the gentleman means that the Jews are not going in there on a competitive basis but that whatever developments there are would be only enough to take care of their own needs?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman inform the House what is the attitude of the President of the United States on this resolution?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not know that I can answer that question. I have no right to say how the President feels on this resolution. The fact remains that the President has created a commission to save the suffering people of Europe, and that he has authorized a statement to the effect that he was happy that the doors of Palestine were open to refugees and that the United States had never given its consent to the Palestine White Paper. The gentleman may draw his own conclusion.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me in order that I may answer the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It is my understanding on the highest authority that only within the last 10 days the President of the United States made a statement that this country had never recognized the so-called white paper.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Which is true.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And that of course would be an indication of his decision with respect to this problem.

Mr. FISH. I think that is important, and I ask the gentleman to yield because I think that is the whole issue. It is the white paper. I believe we ought to have an expression from the Congress against the white paper and that is what I want to see done.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. FISH. And we do not want people from the other departments of the Government coming here and favoring the white paper. What we want is an expression by the Congress against the white paper.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is why I said this resolution ought to be reported from the Foreign Affairs Committee to give us an opportunity to discuss it on this floor.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And I would like to say for the benefit of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] that I favor strongly the reporting out of that resolution, and its passage, and would say that I appeared before the committee on the first day it opened these hearings.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I know that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I argued that the white paper had no standing in international law, and that this country had never approved it in any form.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I agree with the gentleman. I know that is the fact, and what I am trying to point out is that this resolution, call it what you like, ought to be discussed here on this floor and not behind the doors of a committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. As I understand it, the whole point of this thing is the white paper?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Does the gentleman know whether any agencies of the Government sent any individual down to the Foreign Affairs Committee to oppose this resolution?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The Government did not—as far as I know. It has been rumored, however, that somebody in the War Department wrote a letter to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and some Army man—I don't want to discuss the name—appeared before the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs and put it on the war exigency basis.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Was there any opposition from the State Department?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Not that I know of.

Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress, this is not a partisan issue; this is not a political issue. This is an issue which raises the question of our national honor and of our conscience as decent human beings. Are we, as a nation, going to live up to a covenant entered into in good faith; are we, as decent human beings, as Americans, going to live up to the faith and hope put in us by our suffering brethren trapped in the Nazi inferno?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order for today be put over until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, also I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include certain statistics.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] may be excused today on account of illness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore agreed to, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] for 45 minutes.

PROPAGANDA—DISSEMINATION OF POLITICAL INFORMATION TO THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I addressed this body in support of House Resolution 431, which would provide for the appointment of a bipartisan committee of six members, with direction and authority to study and investigate the dissemination of news, motion-picture, and radio broadcast material, pertaining to public officials other than officers of the armed forces, candidates for public office, national legislation, or public issues, to the armed forces of the United States, either at home or abroad, by or through any governmental agency. In support of this resolution I cited instances of unfair and improper handling of news and like material sent overseas. I also gave what I believed to be reasonable and proper arguments in support of favorable action on the resolution.

Last week an administration spokesman made a rather weak, and I believe futile, effort to defend the Office of War

Information and its activities in the dissemination of news and propaganda. I use the word "weak" in this connection because the administration spokesman made many statements that cannot be substantiated by the record. I say futile because I am convinced that there are few, if any, Members of this body who have been misled by the gentleman's effort to clothe this bureaucratic agency of the Government in the white robes of benign righteousness and sanctimonious purity.

In his attempt to defend the Office of War Information the administration apologist quoted Mr. Palmer Hoyt as saying, "O. W. I. is no propaganda agency." Evidently, the gentleman did not know Mr. Palmer Hoyt served only as Chief of the Domestic Branch of the Office of War Information, and had nothing to do with the preparation or dissemination of foreign news and propaganda. Mr. Hoyt, it is true, is a Republican. He was brought into O. W. I. after this Congress had become so disturbed over O. W. I. activities in the domestic field that it refused to appropriate the huge sums requested for the Domestic Branch of that agency, thus forcing its reorganization. Mr. Hoyt was placed in charge of the domestic end of O. W. I. to do a needed job of house cleaning. He did it well; but there is not a newspaperman in America who does not know that when Palmer Hoyt made the statement, "O. W. I. is no propaganda agency," he was discussing only the Domestic Branch of O. W. I., and was in no way referring to its activities in the foreign field. Of course, it is needless to remind you that Palmer Hoyt, a Republican and a splendid public servant, is out of the Office of War Information, and that his place has been filled by a gentleman whose political thinking fits in better with the New Deal pattern. You can judge for yourselves as to whether the coming elections had anything to do with the change that has been made.

The administration spokesman, in attempting to defend the Office of War Information, makes some directly conflicting statements. In one paragraph of his speech he attempted to tell us—and I quote:

> My investigation shows that, in accordance with a standing agreement with the press associations, O. W. I. files full texts of all statements, speeches, or messages of the President when they are available in advance. In keeping with this agreement, the O. W. I. filed the text of the President's message on the soldier-vote bill for all the news services to pick up. The text also was sent to Algiers in accordance with a request from the Psychological Warfare Branch of the Army for all soldier-vote material, but also included in the file was a description of the vote in the House of Representatives, showing that Members had stood up to be counted.

However, in the following paragraphs of his prepared speech the gentleman attempted to deny the very words he had just previously spoken by saying—and I quote him:

> A check of the scripts of the four major short-wave broadcasts in English, French, Italian, and German shows that the Office of War Information did not broadcast anything in regard to the President's soldier-vote message, the roll call, or the statements of Senators GUFFEY and BYRD.

And then he continues by stating—and I quote him:

> In psychological warfare it would be absurd for the O. W. I. to consider that congressional action on the soldier-vote legislation was good propaganda material for transmission abroad.

Now, fit those two statements together if you can.

But let us hurry on: The gentleman, speaking in defense of the Office of War Information, flatly denied that the O. W. I. controls news or entertainment going to the armed forces, and insisted that the information sent out relative to soldier-vote legislation was a fair and unbiased report of what transpired here in this Chamber. I hold in my hand a statement from our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative SCOTT, in which he tells of contacting the Office of War Information on the day the President's message was read to the House; and of being referred by Mr. Barnes, assistant to Mr. Elmer Davis, to the War Department, where inquiry was made of Colonel Munson, the officer in charge of disseminating news by short-wave broadcasts to the armed forces, if the President's message would be covered on the forthcoming broadcast. Upon being informed that relevant excerpts therefrom would be sent overseas the inquiry was made as to whether the action of the minority leader, in asking unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of and vote on the soldiers' vote bill, would be given as a matter of news. Colonel Munson agreed, that in the interest of presenting the news objectively, action of the minority party should also be reported. Assurances were given the gentleman from Pennsylvania that both sides of the story would be told, but I have here a copy of that short-wave broadcast, which, while playing up Mr. Roosevelt's charges of fraud, in no way mentions the minority leader or his reply to the President's message.

Of course, it is entirely possible that later on some of the agencies of the Government disseminating so-called news may have sent overseas some information as to the roll call on the soldiers' vote bill here in the House, but if so it was done only after the poisonous seeds of the President's fraud charges were first well planted. Thus far I have been unable to find any evidence whatsoever that any information was ever given as to the actions or statements of the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], in connection with the soldier-vote legislation.

And before I leave the subject of the publicity given the President's message on the soldiers' vote bill, and the failure of our governmental agencies to properly tell both sides of the story, let me say to you that, in my opinion, this Presidential message was a purely political document prepared and distributed not only for political use on the home front but especially for its political effect on the armed forces.

I do not contend there is anything wrong in any governmental agency furnishing to the armed forces the content of any Presidential message delivered to the Congress—or in giving the content of any other Presidential statements on domestic or political affairs—even though such messages contain affronts to, and cast aspersions upon, the Congress of the United States, as in the case of Mr. Roosevelt's tax-veto message. However, I do contend that it is unfair and un-American, after publishing a Presidential message on a controversial issue, to refuse or fail to give just as full publicity to the statements of those who oppose the President's position—or, in other words, not to give the other side of the story.

Oh, I know one of our colleagues who has spent some time in the Aleutians told us the other day that the only news received there was from the condensed reports of the press associations reprinted and posted as bulletins for the benefit of Navy personnel. I do not question the gentleman spoke the truth; but on last Tuesday another colleague—the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]—quoted from one of these Navy press bulletins, posted out in the far Pacific, giving an excerpt from a press association report of certain statements made by the new chairman of the Democratic National Committee, in which that gentleman spoke at length as to the alleged necessity of reelecting Mr. Roosevelt for a fourth term. Information as to this bit of political propaganda, which was contained in the Navy news release, was furnished to the gentleman from Wisconsin by one of his State's fighting sons who expressed his bitter indignation over the fact that the other side of the story was not given.

This is typical of the very practice I am protesting against—the practice of selecting from the regular press association news services, for dissemination to our troops, those particular statements or news items that are favorable only to one candidate, to one school of thought, or to one side of a public issue. This editing of the news so as to favor one particular viewpoint or person is sometimes called, in newspaper parlance, "putting English on the ball." And then quite often I have noticed the news releases from O. W. I. and other governmental agencies, going overseas to our armed forces, carry what we call in newspaperdom, "reverse English," which means to play up or to so report news as to create a poor impression of the particular candidate, public official, or side of an issue opposed by the publisher. A clever editor can always stay within the confines of the exact truth and still so color the news as to favor one candidate or one point of view. Likewise in the reverse order, he can create in the minds of his readers disrespect or opposition to an individual or to one side of an issue.

For instance, I have read a number of so-called "profiles," or little sketches of various public men, including Members of Congress, which have been prepared and distributed by the Office of War Information during the past year. I am not surprised to find that the most ardent of the administration supporters were pictured as valiant warriors for the right, clothed in the armor of purity and good,

with nothing to be found in any of the sketches of such favored individuals with which anyone could disagree or find fault. However, in the profiles written of those who have opposed the actions and philosophies of the President and his administration, there always appear subtle sentences that are either injurious or at least not helpful to the individual concerned. That, my friends, is what you call smart and clever propaganda.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. In that connection I had a letter a few days ago from a boy in Africa. At the close of his letter the boy said, "If we do get to vote, I do not know how we can get the true picture."

It seems to me that is the important problem here, and it is entirely a nonpartisan matter. It is something that this Congress on both sides of the aisle should be equally interested in. I would like in that connection to point out a comment made by a member of the Senate, Mr. LUCAS, who is certainly not by any stretch of the imagination a Republican, and, as a matter of fact, who would not care much about being associated with the Republican Party. He says:

> I am for a commission or anything that will give the troops honest and fair information about all candidates, regardless of who they are. I do not want anyone to have any advantage.

The proposal being made by the gentleman from Ohio does exactly the same thing that this soldier boy is asking about, and it does exactly the thing that Senator LUCAS is asking about. It seems to me if we are going to do the job right by these boys and give them an opportunity to vote, we should go at least a step further than will be necessary to give them an intelligent vote and have this kind of a commission to see that this kind of a job is done.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska, and I agree fully with his conclusions.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I want to compliment the gentleman for the study he has made of this important topic. He has surely brought to the attention of the House in his speech today and his speech made a short time ago something about which we should know. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he has had an opportunity to go into this proposition: I understand that in practically every department in the Government an investigation is being made in some way by somebody who was once employed in the O. W. I. with the idea in mind that every bit of news that goes out from the various departments of the Government has to be sanctioned by somebody who had his training in O. W. I. I do not know whether it is true or not.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand that O. W. I. does, through the domestic branch, pass on news released from the different governmental agencies, as far as it affects the war effort, at least.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I have been very interested in the distinguished gentleman's statement, because I know he is an experienced newspaperman. I think the gentleman will agree with me that it is very possible for newspaper writers who seek to put "English on the ball," so to speak, and give added color to the description of a simple little event, to do so by the choice of language. For example, a bank is robbed. That is the story. One writer in describing the incidents outside the bank said "that John Jones was walking down the street after the robbery." Another writer said, "John Jones was seen slinking down the street after the robbery"—an entirely different construction placed upon the situation by just the choice of the word "walk" and the word "slink." The type of news releases that might be put out can be colored in describing an absolute fact, on which there should be no difference of opinion, simply by the choice of a word here and there.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think the gentleman has given a very good illustration of the way news items can be twisted and distorted, and I expect to point out some examples a little later.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. In connection with what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] said, a few years ago in my district there appeared an article worded like this: "A certain gentleman running for public office was contacted and asked the question, 'Is it true that you were drunk and discovered in a certain location with another man's wife the other night?' The gentleman said: 'Absolutely not.' So the next day the propaganda comes out, 'Mr. Jones denies that he was drunk and caught with another man's wife.'"

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is another apt illustration and a very clever one.

And, of course, our fighting men have been, and are being, propagandized cleverly and adroitly in other ways. Sometimes it is possible to color and change men's way of thinking by the reading material furnished them; such as by the distribution to the armed forces of 50,000 copies of Louis Adamic's book, The Native's Return, which was called to the attention of the Congress and the public not long ago by our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] in which Adamic urges that America should and must turn to the left. Personally, I agree with the gentleman from Michigan in condemning the distribution of such a book, written by a man of foreign birth whose activities and membership in a number of Communistic front organizations have been made a matter of record by a committee of this House.

I hold in my hand another book that has been distributed widely among the armed forces of our Government at the expense of the American taxpayers. It is purported to be a Pocket History of the United States. It is written by Allen Nevins and Henry Steele Commager. Mr. Nevins, I am informed, is a controlling influence in that well-known liberal publication, the New Republic. This book interprets history from the radical angle. It views the happenings of days gone by through pink, if not red, colored glasses. Under no stress of the imagination can it be considered an impartial and unbiased recording of historical facts. Instead it constantly belittles and decries those individuals and policies with which its authors disagree, and praises and deifies the persons, the actions and the philosophies with which they agree.

Let me read you just a few excerpts of that which these gentlemen have written relative to recent history—history with which many of you are personally well acquainted. I quote from pages 470 and 471:

> A group of Republican Progressives, led by Senators Norris, La Follette, Costigan, and Cutting, had challenged Hoover's policies, but they were not strong enough to wrest control of the party from the "old guard." Of necessity the country looked to the Democrats for salvation. In 1930 the Democrats swept the Congressional elections, and in 1932 they prepared to take over the presidency. The Republican Old Guard, which had learned nothing from the depression, defiantly renominated President Hoover, who appealed once again to "rugged individualism" for a solution to the national crisis. The Democrats presented the brilliant and magnetic Franklin D. Roosevelt, who as governor of the Empire State had revealed himself as a resourceful, courageous, and humane leader, and who promised the Nation a "new deal." In the November elections Roosevelt rode triumphantly into the White House on the crest of a popular majority of 7,000,000 votes.
>
> One of the most heartening things about American democracy is that it has always managed to find great leaders in time of crisis. Sometimes, as in the case of Washington, the choice has been reasoned and deliberate; at other times, as in the cases of Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt and Wilson, it has been largely fortuitous. It cannot be said that Franklin Roosevelt was an unknown quantity when first elected to the Presidency; it can be asserted that few of those who so hopefully voted for him realized that in Roosevelt they had a leader who as spokesman for democracy and nationalism was the peer of Lincoln, as a leader toward a better world order the peer of Wilson.

And again we find on pages 478 and 479:

> Finally, the Roosevelt administration inaugurated important far-reaching reforms in administration. The executive department of the Government, which had grown in a helter-skelter fashion and which was inefficient and extravagant, was reorganized and reformed. * * * And in 1937 the President, deeply concerned by an unprecedented series of Supreme Court decisions nullifying most of the New Deal measures, proposed a plan to reform the Court. The method was to bring about the retirement of aged Justices and infuse new blood into the Court; the purpose to persuade the Court to return to the great tradition of Marshall and Story and Holmes—the tradition that interpreted the Constitution as a flexible instrument of government rather than as a barrier to government. Roosevelt's specific proposal was defeated, but his purpose was achieved. The Court, frightened perhaps by criticism and sobered by a realization of its own inadequacy and incompetence, took a more enlightened view of the legislation enacted by the other equal and independent branches of the Government, and reversed most of its earlier paralyzing decisions. Not the least of Roosevelt's achievements was this of educating the Nation to the real character of the American constitutional system and persuading the Court to accommodate itself to American democracy.

Now that I have read these excerpts from the official Government-approved Pocket History of the United States, perhaps those of you who played some part in the historic events described therein are, for the first time, fully aware of what actually happened. At least you know what our soldiers and sailors are being told happened in those particular instances.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I recall a rather celebrated remark that was made on one occasion:

I care not who fights a nation's war so long as I may write its history.

I would suggest to the gentleman that perhaps some of the people responsible for history should pay a little more attention to fighting and winning the war.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I think we should pay more attention to who writes our news releases, as well as to our histories.

Yet, the gentleman from North Carolina tells us to sleep quietly; no propaganda goes to our men in uniform.

But let us look again as to how some of the news of what happens right here in this body is interpreted and sent overseas by the Office of War Information. Let me quote from the official news release of O. W. I. on February 27, 1944, in which is described the dramatic and historic events connected with the overriding of the President's veto on the recent tax bill. I quote:

And at home, in the midst of war, the American home front has been giving a first-class example of a democracy in action. Congress passed two bills which were sent to the President for his signature. One was a bill stopping Government food subsidies. The other was a new tax bill. President Roosevelt disapproved both—or in American parliamentary language—he vetoed them. Congress upheld the veto on the food-subsidy bill—or, on second thought—it agreed with the President.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I think it is fair to point out that in both Houses of Congress more than a majority still held the same opinion they held before the bill was vetoed.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is true, and I shall later point that out. Again quoting:

But on the tax bill, Congress disagreed. The Presidential veto was overridden by a decisive vote in both Houses. In spite of President Roosevelt's disapproval, the tax bill has become a law.

Now some of you may be rather surprised to learn that this House agreed with the President on food subsidies; but that is certainly the impression that has been given by the O. W. I., even though the truth is that a majority of this House continued to register its opposition to the payment of food subsidies despite the President's veto, by a vote of 226 to 151.

But let me continue by reading the next paragraph, which is as follows, and I quote:

This is democracy in action. Laws are made in the United States by joint action of the Executive—the President—and the legislative—the Congress. But the President and the Congress do not always agree. When they disagree, there is orderly machinery in the American Constitution for setting the disagreement. During the past 10 days, this machinery has worked as it was meant to work.

Now, again, some of you may be surprised to learn from that paragraph of the O. W. I. release that the Chief Executive of the Nation, the President, helps make the laws, and that the Congress does not have original jurisdiction in framing the laws. Perhaps you have noted that according to O. W. I. the Executive seems to be the senior partner in the lawmaking business, inasmuch as he is named first.

And then let me read the balance of the news release, and I quote:

Over the tax bill there was a sharp argument between the President and the majority leader of the Senate, Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky. And this argument was published in the Nation's press. It was not concealed or denied. Every American knew about it. President Roosevelt, in his message vetoing the tax bill, said it was, in his opinion, a bad bill. He gave his reasons, in forceful language. Senator BARKLEY, who is leader of the President's own party in the Senate, thought the language was too forceful. Senator BARKLEY felt that the integrity of Congress had been called in question. He said so, publicly, on the floor of the Senate. His remarks, too, were published in every American paper, on the front page, as President Roosevelt's veto message had been. By an overwhelming vote of both Houses, Congress agreed with Senator BARKLEY.

In some countries, the President, as leader of his party, would have found himself out of office because of lack of party support. In other countries, Senator BARKLEY would have been rebuked or punished for disagreeing with his party leader. In certain countries, the press would not have dared publish the details of the disagreement. But in the United States we don't do things like that. The whole controversy was brought out into the open. And since the people elect their President, and their Congressmen too, the people will decide, at the next election in November which side in the debate they will support.

After this public airing of a difference of opinion, both President Roosevelt and Senator BARKLEY publicly stated that the argument itself had not destroyed the mutual confidence, respect, and affection that each had for the other. President Roosevelt urged the Senator to continue as majority leader. Senator BARKLEY, in a letter to the President, said: "I want you to know that you have my utmost confidence and affection, and the personal and official relations which have been to me a source of infinite pride, I hope may be continued."

There was a disagreement in the American democracy this week. There was an orderly settlement of the disagreement by legislative process. A renewed expression of confidence between the two main persons in the argument resulted. The whole matter was known to every American; it was published in full in the press and discussed fully on the air. And while the discussion went on, the United States continued to bear a major share in the United Nations offensive all around the world.

Now, if that is not pouring oil on the troubled waters and taking care of the President's interests, then I am unable to judge the English language.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. In other words, they reduced the matter between Senator BARKLEY and the President to one of a personal nature.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; and on top of it, of course, in interpreting to the soldiers and sailors, they gave the impression that the President makes the laws, right along with the Congress, which, of course, is not according to the Constitution.

Of course, I am happy that O. W. I. saw fit to point out that in the United States a Member of this Congress can still publicly disagree with the President without being rebuked or punished. I hope that such a situation may continue to exist.

In my original address to the House on this subject I made the statement that O. W. I. not only actually controls the flow of news to our soldiers, but also controls the kind and form of much of their entertainment—and that our armed forces are exposed to the propaganda disseminated to the peoples of foreign lands, and discussed over the radio or published in the press in the lands in which they are located. The spokesman for the administration, in his attempt to answer these charges, denied that O. W. I. furnished much of the news or information and like material to the armed forces overseas, and even seemingly denied that our fighting forces in foreign lands listened to the short-wave radio.

Let us see what the facts are: Mr. Elmer Davis, Chief of the Office of War Information, told the House Appropriations Committee—page 710 of the hearings—that O. W. I. was providing news to 3,000 newspapers in 39 countries, and was furnishing practically all the foreign news reaching north Africa. Mr. Sherwood, in charge of the Foreign Branch of O. W. I., told the Senate Appropriations Committee—page 244:

Wherever the Special Service Division of the United States Army has set up a paper like the Stars and Stripes, or Yank, and wishes to get news service from our outposts, we furnish it.

General McClure, in replying to a query by our late colleague Mr. Ditter as to what our men are reading, replied—page 1259:

They not only read it, but also receive information that comes in from the United States—from any source—information that comes in daily from O. W. I., news bulletins, etc., which are furnished the Stars and Stripes, as well as the foreign press, and they use it.

Mr. Hamblet, an O. W. I. official who had just returned from Sicily, north Africa, and the Middle East, and was presented to the committee by Director Davis, testified—page 1272:

We have the responsibility of providing the Army staffs in the field with all the news that reaches them.

Remember, please, that he was speaking about the O. W. I.

In justifying their Budget request for the Radio Outpost Division the O. W. I.

told the Appropriations Committee—page 770—that 80,000 news releases were broadcast every day by short-wave radio to foreign cities and that they had 3,200 radio programs a week. The O. W. I. official further testified—and I quote:

The Division has these responsibilities for programs to American troops overseas:

1. To produce and broadcast via short-wave from transmitters in this country news programs directed at the armed forces, but which also have tremendous propaganda value to a large "eavesdropping audience."

2. To cooperate with the Special Service Division of the Army by providing broadcasting time on Office of War Information transmitters for network programs and for troop entertainment shows prepared by the Army.

3. To arrange for distribution and broadcasts at the outposts of transcriptions produced by the Army.

O. W. I. officials further testified before the Appropriations Committee—page 773—that all short-wave broadcast facilities in this country are under their control; and that no private concern or commentator can broadcast short-wave at all from this country—page 779.

Representative WIGGLESWORTH—page 780—asked Mr. Sherwood, Assistant Director of the O. W. I., this question:

If a soldier in Africa is to hear short wave, is it O. W. I. and nobody else?

To which Mr. Sherwood replied:

Yes, if it is from the United States.

Mr. Barnes of the O. W. I. testified before the House committee—page 776—that the material being broadcast over short-wave by O. W. I. "runs roughly 70-percent news and 30 percent what we call features." In reply to a query by Mr. TABER as to what a feature was, Mr. Barnes explained:

A radio program comparable to an editorial in a newspaper.

Mr. Lattimore, who is in charge of O. W. I.'s Pacific Bureau, in defending an O. W. I. appropriation, said—page 810:

The amount is largely for programs for rebroadcasts in Australia. One is a program for our largest family—our troops overseas.

Mr. Sherwood again told the Senate committee—page 244:

Our only service that reaches troops is straight, factual news by short-wave radio, which, of course, reaches more than troops abroad.

Then later in October he told the House committee—page 1267:

We are inaugurating a 24-hour-a-day flash news service from New York to Algiers, Tunis, and Naples.

I wonder if the administration's apologist still contends that our troops do not listen to the short-wave radio, or that O. W. I. has nothing to do with furnishing the troops with their radio and news programs. By the very words of the top officials of the Office of War Information, the charges I have made have been proven true. O. W. I. does furnish a great portion of the news, both by short-wave radio and by straight dispatch, that reaches our armed forces. O. W. I. officials admit it. Everyone else seems to know it, except the gentleman who attempted to challenge my original statements.

Furthermore, O. W. I. does control the motion-picture entertainment that reaches our troops overseas; at least, officials of that governmental agency so testified before the Appropriations Committee—page 793—in which they stated:

Hollywood representatives of the Motion Picture Bureau (officials of O. W. I.) view all films designed for export, either in the script form or during production. The purpose is to help the industry produce pictures which will aid the war effort when commercial American films are shown in foreign countries. Not only are inappropriate sections corrected through this cooperative process but it frequently is possible to introduce new and helpful subject matter.

Perhaps this explains the famous propaganda film, Mission to Moscow.

On page 799 Mr. Sherwood testified that O. W. I. also produces pictures of its own and distributes them overseas, stating frankly:

The people who are working on the overseas job think directly and frankly in terms of propaganda. Everything they do is intended to produce a certain state of mind on the part of those who see the motion pictures or hear the radio programs.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. What I am about to say is in the nature of a tribute to the far-sightedness and thoroughness of one of the deceased Members of this House, the Honorable J. William Ditter, of Pennsylvania.

Last year in discussing the Office of War Information, Mr. Ditter urged that there be less propaganda and suggested the elimination of Government magazines, radio programs, and printed material.

We have established media in these fields which the people trust—

Mr. Ditter said.

To create confidence, and to get a better job done, let O. W. I. ask the organized groups—The American Newspaper Publishers Association, representing the daily press; the National Association of Broadcasters, the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors, the National Editorial Association, representing the weekly press, and the National Publishers Association, representing magazines—to draft outstanding committees of top executives to cooperate with Government and direct the information program.

Last week, I read in the press that Mr. George W. Healy, Jr., the present executive of the domestic branch of O. W. I., stated that his organization would ask for decreased funds for future operations, and the newspaper story added:

Mr. Healy explains that his agency can operate far more economically than in the past because it now uses established media—newspapers, radio, magazines, and the motion picture industry—for its campaigns. For example, in the early days, O. W. I. made its own war campaign motion pictures. This function alone cost about $1,750,000 a year. Now, it gets the big studios to do the job free and only $50,000 a year is needed to maintain an industry liaison office.

Thus we have an illustration of an able legislator of vision, pointing the way for both better organization and economy within an administrative agency.

I want to congratulate the gentleman on making such a fine speech, and may I add that I hope some day to have an opportunity to go into this question of the movies a little further, because I think I have some information that may interest the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his tribute to our late lamented colleague, Mr. Ditter, who while with us contributed so much to the welfare of the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In October of 1943 O. W. I. officials told the House Appropriations Committee how they had taken over the movie theater in Palermo, Italy, and showed their own films. Similar action was taken in other occupied areas where unquestionably our troops see such films. O. W. I. books and publications are also placed in libraries in occupied territories, to which unquestionably our troops have access.

So to deny that O. W. I. propaganda has reached our armed forces overseas certainly seems foolish.

In my previous discussion on this subject I made the charge that the O. W. I. was made up of a hodge-podge of ideological hues, and that there are some reds, pinks, and pastels down there. This statement was seemingly challenged by the administration spokesman, who in his attempt to defend the O. W. I. and its staff, contended all employees, including aliens, employed by O. W. I. are, and I quote him, "cleared by the regular Government investigating agencies, including the F. B. I., the Civil Service Commission, and O. W. I.'s Security Board."

For the benefit of the record let me point out that when O. W. I. officials appeared before the Appropriations Committee of this House testimony was given showing 486 aliens, not counting numerous employees in outpost offices, were on O. W. I. rolls. Many of these 486 aliens were undoubtedly included in the 1,720 employees of O. W. I. who had not yet been completely investigated by the Civil Service Commission at the time Mr. Hamblet testified before the House Appropriations Committee late last year on the supplemental national defense appropriation for 1944, page 1349 of the hearings. Nine hundred and twenty-nine employees had received spot checks, but 791 had neither had a spot check nor a complete investigation, according to the admissions made by the official O. W. I. witness.

Let us again look at the record for a moment. Before the Senate committee, Mr. Sherwood, Assistant Chief of

O. W. I., was asked this direct question by Senator NYE:

Against how many persons on your staff has the charge of communistic association or belief been made?

To which Mr. Sherwood answered:

I do not know, Senator, but it seems to me that charges have been made against an enormous percentage.

Later in the same hearing Senator O'MAHONEY made this statement:

It seems to me that the percentage of people of this type—

Meaning communistic or radical—

in your division is pretty high. I cannot see how you get into your job such a high percentage of questionable individuals. I can see that in any organization like yours there will be a reasonably high percentage of them, but I cannot see why you have so many.

I believe that such statements are complete substantiation of the charges I have made on this particular phase of O. W. I. activities.

Another matter I would like to discuss for a moment are some of the instructions sent out by our War Department to guide those who furnish information to our armed forces. David Lawrence in his column calls it an "appeasement guide," which tells the officers how to control or influence the minds of the troops. Stars and Stripes on January 29 carried an editorial telling about the new guide book issued by the War Department for officers and other personnel in charge of information and orientation courses for soldiers, in which it counsels against the undemocratic notion of the Army coming home some day to run the country.

That the soldiers themselves do not like this attempt to control the information they received, and their way of thinking, is attested to by a letter one of my colleagues but recently had called to his attention by the wife of a man serving in the Mediterranean area, in which he wrote under date of February 6 as follows:

The enclosed clipping from the Stars and Stripes dated January 29, 1944, has made everyone boiling mad and if this is the sample of the kind of stuff the administration is handing out to stifle free expression just before election, somebody better look out. It means that certain groups are getting desperate because of their fear of the trend of things. I want you to look this document up and send me this guidebook. This is certainly going too far and I am stating openly that this be given full publicity if it is a matter closed to the American press.

I am sure that no censor—if one reads this—in his right mind will X out a word of what I say. If he does, let me know at once what has been deleted (by sentences, I have a copy) so that we may know whether stifling is starting on this side, by instruction.

The enclosed notice says: "A new War Department Guide Book issued for officers and other personnel in charge of orientation and information courses for soldiers wants the men counseled against the undemocratic notion (! ! !) of the Army coming home some day to run the country. * * *" So what's wrong with that? It's a dirty, skunky trick and I am protesting and defying anyone to tell me that I dare not criticize the perfect job that civilians at home are doing. No, the Army as such will not run the country but we returning soldiers, as citizens, will certainly take a hand, and God help any fool that stands in the way. Write me quick on this matter.

I could read you many other letters that have been received by families and even by Members of Congress, from the men serving overseas, in which they protest the manner in which much of the news sent them is distorted or colored. Those men, who fight under our flag on a half hundred different battle fronts throughout the world, want factual information as to what is going on here at home. They are entitled to it. They do not want to be propagandized. There is no reason why they should be. We are not playing fair with them when we permit such practices to continue.

Undoubtedly the different governmental agencies affected will deny the charges made against them, but the records speak for themselves. These agencies are not unbiased and impartial in their work. They are playing favorites in the dissemination of the news, and this Congress has a duty and a responsibility, both to our fighting forces abroad and to our people at home, to study and investigate the situation.

I want it clearly understood that I in nowise impugn the motives or the professional standards of the regular officers of our Army and Navy when I make the flat charge that fourth term, political and ideological propaganda is being distributed among our troops and sailors at a time when it is impossible for them to get both sides of every controversial question. I am firmly of the opinion that these men of our regular forces, and the overwhelming majority of those who have entered the service since war threatened and became an actuality, wear their uniforms as officers and gentlemen. I make the charge, on the other hand, that our armed forces are having pressures put upon them to disseminate propaganda which I have described. And we all know, gentlemen, of the pressures which are in the hands of this New Deal administration, once it had made up its mind that it would use such pressures, to exercise the arts of propaganda. I would trust the judgment, the discretion and the honor of General Marshall and Admiral King to the ends of the earth in this matter. But, this Congress in turn owes a duty to them to be sure that their operations are not interfered with by some who put politics and economic passions even ahead of a speedy winning of the war.

Truth does not seek the darkness. Truth does not shrink from the light. If these agencies of our Government have nothing to hide, then why should there be any objection to a bipartisan committee from this House being named to study and investigate just how the dissemination of news to our armed forces is being conducted? Why has the chairman of the powerful Rules Committee, of which I, too, am a member, failed and refused to extend to me the usual courtesy of a hearing on Resolution 431? Why has the word seemingly gone out from high sources to kill my resolution and to prevent, at all costs, the investigation I have suggested and requested? If the practices which I condemn, and of which so many fighting men complain in their letters home, have not been followed and do not exist then why should anyone object to an investigation? It seems to me that if these agencies of Government, charged with the responsibility of disseminating news and informational material to our armed forces, have carried on their work well and properly they would want the Congress and the country to know just what they have done; they would welcome a thorough study and investigation by a committee of this House; there would be no need for apologies or explanations to be made in their behalf. But when they take the opposite attitude, and the word goes out to block the naming of an investigating committee at any cost, then the suspicion grows that there must be much to hide.

I believe I have already presented sufficient evidence to establish the need for the passage of House Resolution 431 and for the study and investigation provided thereunder. I hope prompt legislative action on the resolution may ensue.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I appreciate the statesmanlike address just given by the gentleman from Ohio. The gentleman has documented his remarks in such a way that their accuracy cannot be fairly questioned. They are a devastating answer to those who seek to picture as lily white the "red" complexion of the O. W. I.

We all know that the O. W. I. distributes political propaganda, favoring the administration, to the troops. I would go further and point out that even the Army has not always been as careful as it should be in this regard. The gentleman has made reference in passing to the fact that the War Department has published a pamphlet, No. 20–3, entitled "A Guide to the Use of Information Materials." This pamphlet is for use of editors of Army newspapers. It is also a guide for informational officers and those concerned with orientation courses in the Army.

This booklet to which I refer tells the officers how to color the minds of the troops on the very things that will make votes for or against the Roosevelt administration in November of this year. The pamphlet, consisting of 25 pages, is full of subtle suggestions such as the one I read from page 7:

No good purpose is served by plying the soldier with information emphasizing the prevalence of high wages or extraordinary profits or other data tending to show that he is carrying an excessive share of the burden of the war, or that civilian forces on the whole are not cooperating, or that certain economic or social groups are slipping into special favor.

Certainly no good purpose would be served the New Deal administration by such disclosures.

It is also interesting to observe that responsible authorities are permitting Marshall Field, publisher of the Chicago Sun and PM, to send letters which are published in Army newspapers. A

United Press dispatch of March 8, coming from Naples, records that the Fifth Division News, a servicemen's newspaper, published a letter from Field boosting New Deal proposals for public works to employ servicemen after the war.

I have read in the March 9 edition of PM that an Army newspaper in Hawaii has conducted a poll of soldier opinion concerning Westbrook Pegler, foe of labor racketeers. I thought that polls of servicemen had been outlawed by somebody. But, this poll attempts to show that Pegler promotes disunity and by inference, therefore, is disloyal and an obstacle to victory by our forces in the war. It does seem that the Army could concern itself with more important activities and certainly with activities not so subject to suspicion by many citizens. It seems to be the idea of the New Deal that it must spoon-feed the minds of our people. It could be that the Army has, to some extent, unconsciously fallen in with these Pied Pipers who would lead the Nation to ruin because, I am told, O. W. I. furnishes much of the personnel as well as propaganda to the Army for its publication activities.

House Resolution 431, introduced by the able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], should be approved. An investigation needs to be made of this whole question. Certainly if the O. W. I. and other agencies are guilty of no abuse of their responsibilities in this connection they need not fear such investigation. If they have been in error the complete state of facts should be exposed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix an address on Post-War Air Transportation, and include testimony of Admiral Land.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Also, Mr. Speaker, to extend in the RECORD my remarks on the construction of ships of February 1939 to January 31, 1944, and include a letter from Admiral Vickery.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Flathead Monitor, of Kalispell, Mont.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday next, March 21, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes, at the conclusion of the legislative business and any other special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore agreed to, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] for 45 minutes.

INVASION OF WESTERN EUROPE

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, are we Americans, as a nation, losing our instinct for self-preservation?

We have known since the time of the first conscription bill that military decisions were being imposed upon our General Staff from above by officials who are not military experts. We know that after General Marshall stiffened at Quebec, only irate public opinion prevented his being replaced by a general who would be a more complete rubber stamp. We know that while some high Army and Navy officials gave lip service to the decision to finish Hitler before Japan, others managed to let their apprehension become known. We know that against the advice of ranking American military officers who thought it foolish, we went up into Italy because Mr. Churchill wanted it, though Stalin opposed it. We know that the decision to invade western Europe was made because Mr. Stalin demanded it, though Mr. Churchill opposed it. It seems that we follow the leadership of our allies, regardless of what American experts may contend is for the best interest of America. But when our allies differ, we adopt the course which requires America to sacrifice the most.

If we are to invade western Europe, the date of the invasion should be determined not by some gratuitous, anachronistic commitment made in the past, but by our highly trained American military experts. The validity of that determination depends upon correct findings and estimates with respect to numerous abstruse, complicated, highly technical factors. Only a highly skilled military expert is qualified to make these assessments and decisions. They involve such things as tides, weather forecasts, air support, diversion of enemy forces, ability to sustain attack—this last factor being affected by the altered situation in Italy. It is important that Germany shall have been bombed thoroughly, though that is not more important than that the enemy fortifications along the coast which would resist the intended attack shall have been reduced. It seems, nevertheless, that we are to be hurtled pell-mell into an insufficiently prepared invasion according to a schedule made in agreement with Stalin. We act as if going through with this invasion on the date set, pursuant to Stalin's demand, involved no more serious consequences than a shotgun marriage.

Americans are to furnish around 80 percent of the invading force and also replacements. It is admitted that the invasion may cost us a half million men. It might cost a million men or more.

Mr. Churchill opposed this invasion. It is hard to see why it should be important to America to invade Europe if it is not important to Britain. Privately, some of our keenest military experts call the invasion "costly and stupid." It looks as if failure to protest against it is like the unnatural mother. She rides in the car with her husband who is a reckless driver. She watches him heading straight for a collision which may kill her children. She does not cry out because she fears to be called a "backseat" driver.

If the invasion was promised as part of the bargain to revive the senile League of Nations' scheme, it was a poor bargain. It should not have taken much persuasion to induce Britain and Russia to join a reincarnation of the now decomposed League since they are exmembers. A single member of the League—France or England—could have prevented the building up of Hitler. The belief that with America in it so that our partners could more easily tap American resources and manpower, it would insure us against wars in the future, is naive. Look at the way American men and resources are being used by the partnership in Europe now. American aid is being used to buy us trouble now and in the future. It is being used for the purpose of aggression.

Today the British Empire is saved. Russia, or nearly all of it, is saved. But we also saved, it seems, the spots on the leopard. Friend Stalin's gangdoms in various nations which, in a tight moment, he promised to disband, have not really been disbanded. They now work for revolutions harder than ever before in the nations of Europe and also all over Latin America. Oumansky leads the hoodlums in the various South American countries. Here in the United States men who mouth Stalin's party line, work in key positions in strategic Government agencies, including the Office of War Information, the Federal Communications Commission, the Office of Strategic Services, and the armed forces. In the Army they have subtly succeeded in compelling the emasculation of counter-intelligence.

By a fake reorganization of the Russian Government, our irrepressible partner has asserted claim to the Baltic Republics, Polish territory, and Finnish territory. The move to "compensate" Poland by giving her extensive German territory is a move to put German enemy vipers in the vitals of Poland and make her too weak to defend herself. The demands to have Brother Stalin's supporters given important positions in the Governments of Finland, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia are moves to seduce and weaken those nations. Stalin's German committee, which Secretary Hull was assured would be dissolved, has not been dissolved. Headed by the German, General von Seidler, it broadcasts daily to Germany. It offers a peace which will leave the German Army intact, minus Hitler and some prominent Nazis. What would Hitler ever have

amounted to without the German Army? We know that he was a convenient front for the army. We know that if the German Army is left intact Germany has a good chance to rise again. But Stalin's committee implores Germans, when the time comes to overthrow Hitler, to preserve the German Army.

At this peculiar moment in history, when our ally, Stalin, starts finishing the job he helped Hitler start, our Government adopts what it announces is a neutrality policy against such aggressions. This is a sweet time for our Government to turn isolationist! There is no such thing as isolation when you are stretched out in war all over creation. Neutrality, before we became involved in war, was the way to keep out of war, but neutrality when we are in war is a sure way to stay in war.

Neutrality against aggressions now only serves to encourage aggressions because Stalin, if he had not the use and threat of use of American aid, could not make these power and territory grabs. One whose partner uses his resources to commit crimes is also held guilty of those crimes. You cannot wash it off your hands. Europeans, after the last war, called us "Uncle Shylock." This time smaller allies feel we are betraying them. Do you know what they have already started calling us this time? "Pontius Pilate!" Several cocks crew when recently the British Prime Minister, addressing Parliament, disavowed the well-known British treaty obligation to Poland, the British-American agreement with Yugoslavia, and the claim of humanity that the "brave new world" shall not be built upon a foundation of dynamite.

For a thousand years, repeated attempts to enslave the 110,000,000 people in eastern Europe have always caused explosions. Poland, for example, is no small country. A nation of 35,000,000, it is almost as populous as France, which has 40,000,000. Polish history, the past 150 years, lists repeated forced partitions and repeated wars for independence. Brutal treatment by both Hitler and Stalin, begun during the Hitler-Stalin conquest and partition, has made Poles detest both dictators. Poles will never stop fighting until they are free again.

Another explosion sure to come is in Yugoslavia. There are 8,000,000 Serbian men, women, and children in Yugoslavia. Encouraged by our allies, they threw off their pro-Nazi ministry and fought Hitler while Tito, the Earl Browder of Yugoslavia, was still an outlaw trying to cripple their war effort against Hitler because at that time Stalin, his leader, was the partner of Hitler. After Stalin joined the Allies, Tito joined the Yugoslav Army. But, Serbs say, he and his Communists shot so many anti-communistic villagers that the army had to expel him. Now, Serbs complain, the Allies "cooperate" with Stalin to force the Serbs to accept Tito, Stalin's henchman, as their general and ruler. They say that their own General Mihailovich, though refused lend-lease, and having only the equipment he can capture from the Germans, fights with surprising success—a fact carefully concealed from the American public. A recent dispatch received from Mihailovich says that Hitler's planes are flooding Serbs with leaflets containing Churchill's speech regarding Yugoslavia, and saying that his speech is clear proof that the Allies have deserted Mihailovich for Tito. It is clear that these Serbs will never submit peacefully to rule either by Hitler or Stalin.

Another fuse sure to explode in the future is Turkey. Turkey is the iron fence which limits aggression on the Black Sea in the same way that Poland limits aggression on the Baltic. According to the theory used by German militarists, Poland and Turkey are two keys to world domination. At first, the Allies were glad to have Turkey neutral. But Britain, on Stalin's insistence, refused Turkey lend-lease for defense. Then, urged by Stalin, the Allies demanded that Turkey participate in the war—but still without giving Turkey defense equipment. Turks see in this frightening sequence of moves, plus Stalin's demand for a navy, a sinister program to squeeze them out of the Dardanelles and weaken them into submission to Stalin. Turks have never submitted to conquest. Turkey is another potential explosion.

The British have always acted so as to prevent the danger to Britain of letting Europe be dominated by any one power. They know, of course, that the Russian dictator's excuse for seizing power and territory in strategic areas—self-protection—is the same excuse Hitler used for aggressive moves in the same strategic areas. They know that Russia, if Germany were eliminated, would be in no danger from anybody. They know that Stalin could have no need for all the territorial power he is building up, plus the German Army, unless he hopes to conquer more than Europe. The London Times publicly advocates that Germany shall not be dismembered. More significant is the fact that the British make no determined effort to dislodge the German forces from the Aegean and eastern Mediterranean. Why? Obviously, the Germans will block the egress of Russia through the Dardanelles and the Balkans. The Germans, thus, are cheap insurance for the British Empire's life line.

What then will America get out of the coming invasion of western Europe but the corpses of our best young men? The demolishment of Germany? No, because both Britain and Stalin want that Germany shall not be completely demolished and that Germany shall be permitted to retain an army. The liberation of western European nations? Must we repeat all the mistakes in history? Must there be another tragic Children's Crusade? The countries we might liberate in this way would be Luxemburg, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Norway, and France. The terrific bombing of those countries sure to accompany the invasion will leave them a shambles. Their industries, their harbor arrangements, their little model farms, the means by which they live will be destroyed, and, some refugees from those countries say, that is what is wanted. Why else, they say, did Stalin object to the invasion through the "soft underbelly" of Europe, through the Balkans where one could destroy central European war industry and Rumanian oil fields, the source of German power?

Will this invasion help gain for Europe a durable peace? No. We know in advance that the new Europe already taking shape which we have agreed to "cooperate" with our allies in policing, will be anything but peaceful unless Stalin liquidates the brains of Europe. The report that at the Teheran Conference of potentates he revealed that such is his intention is less excruciating than logical.

If we really want to remedy our mistakes and secure a durable settlement of Europe's troubles, the time to get it is now—not later. Later may be too late. Now means before lend-lease stops and before the invasion starts.

It is blithely assumed by mental midgets that when we invade Europe we shall not have to fight the full strength of the German Army because it will still be heavily engaged fighting Stalin. That is a criminally reckless chance to take. Why, when the invasion starts, should not Germany accept the peace being offered by Stalin? Germany would be foolish not to accept it, since it leaves the German Army intact—minus the Nazi prima donnas who have now become a horrific political liability outside of Germany and, perhaps to a larger degree than we realize, also inside Germany. Such a peace, rumor says, has already been arranged. Germany, to be sure, would not relish leaving Stalin free to range through Yugoslavia, the Dardanelles, and elsewhere. But what could be more important to future German aggrandizement than the weakening of the American Army, fighting far from home in western Europe?

America is the force which, Germans think, prevented their winning World War No. 1. America is the force that kept England stubbornly fighting in World War No. 2 long after Germans expected England would be forced to accept negotiated peace. America is the force without whose aid Stalin could not have driven Germany out of Russia. Without American aid Stalin might not long remain the new master of Europe. America, moreover, unless prevented by our allies or Germany, is apt to destroy Germany now.

It is suicidal for America to rush headlong, willy-nilly into this invasion until German coastal defenses are reduced to the extent considered sufficient by American military experts; until American military experts are agreed that we are thoroughly prepared and ready to invade; and until our military experts are sincerely agreed that the invasion is for the best interest of America. Even then, we shall be risking all that we have and all that we hope to have.

Today, Germany sees America poised upon the Channel. Germany cannot be sure how strong we are. The longer we wait, the more thoroughly Germany is bombed, the more punishment she takes. Today we are in a bargaining position. We can do what President Wilson did when he offered the 14 points that brought World War No. 1 to a speedy, successful conclusion.

We know what the terms of a durable peace settlement are. This time it does not require 14 paragraphs to express them. You can express them in a single word—justice. They have already been expressed in this single sentence: "Sovereign rights, territories, and self-government shall be restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

This neat description of what would be a just peace for Europe is lifted from that miracle of manifestoes which rose like the shining sword Excalibur from watery depths—the Atlantic Charter. Nobody has forgotten the Atlantic Charter except the exalted personages who sponsored it. Indeed, the sentence quoted is only half a sentence from the Charter, but disillusioned Europeans would now be delighted to get this solid tidbit from the luscious bounty which has turned out to be a mirage. They will not get that tidbit unless both Hitler and Stalin cough up whatever power and territory they have aggressively usurped since the time these two Macbeths started the war in partnership. But, truly, it looks as if we will never get a durable peace—unless we postpone the invasion long enough to persuade Hitler by bombing, and Stalin by postponement of invasion and diplomacy, including restrictions against aggressive use of lend-lease, to give us that kind of peace. Nobody has the right to refuse to accept this ultimatum. Because every ally has already accepted the Atlantic Charter while the necks were still in danger and before the fists got into the American Treasury.

The invasion of Europe may mean that our war against Japan will go by default. American military experts have always insisted that unless we punish the Japs swiftly and thoroughly, the Japanese ax will hang over the United States for a hundred years. Japs are strengthening themselves in subtle ways. With race propaganda they seek, not without some success, to stir up a billion orientals against us. They had a heyday on the radio propagandizing the Arabs when the House Committee on Foreign Affairs—the State Department having taken a neutral position—held hearings on the Palestine resolution, which is anathema to Arabs. The friendship of Moslems in Africa, who are thus being stirred up, is important if we are to bring home safely the American soldiers now engaged in the Italian campaign. The Japanese, it is reported, are spending money to stir up race agitation in the United States among our colored American citizens.

It is folly to delay crushing the Japs. We have no treaty obliging either Britain or Stalin to give aid in our war against the Japanese. Indeed, Stalin already demands part of our ships which we need and he does not. There are, to be sure, unexploited riches in the Pacific Indies area which our partners might like to acquire. But our military experts say American possession of those areas is vital to the defense of the United States. We have no territorial ambitions but, do not forget, we have already bought and paid for any area of the world vital to the defense of the United States.

The well-advertised Mountbatten campaign has amounted to nothing. American military officials complained softly at the time that it was not intended to be anything but a flashy means of diverting needed officers, men, equipment, and attention from the effort led by General MacArthur. The Burmese campaign is not likely to be important. Burma can easily be picked up at the peace table. To patriotic Americans, Japan is the villainous power that foully plunged America into war, but that is no reason to expect that those who wanted us into the war would especially hate the Japanese.

The leaders of our shamefully neglected forces in the Pacific say they might conquer the Japanese with power already in the Pacific—if it were coordinated under a single unified command. The single command should be headed by General MacArthur because, according to those qualified to make the estimate, he is our ablest American general—perhaps the ablest general in American history. American soldiers out there have fought with superhuman endurance. They deserve the best leadership America can give them.

With a unified command, our forces under General MacArthur may conquer the Japanese within 2 years. Otherwise, it is warned, our war against the Japs may drag on for several years. A single command would be able to lighten the forces in one Pacific area in order to concentrate really effective blows in another. As it is, our Pacific forces are inefficiently divided into four theaters—five counting Lord Mountbatten's—with the overlapping functions and divided authorities typical of Washington civilian agencies. At the moment, General MacArthur sorely needs amphibious equipment. Instead, one hears, he is to be treated to a public smear campaign.

Amphibious equipment is the kind of equipment now being dissipated in the abortive Italian campaign. It is the kind of equipment now being assembled in great quantities in preparation for the western European invasion—for our rendezvous with destruction.

Today, therefore, I introduced two bills. One bill provides for postponement of the invasion until the suggested ultimatum shall be carried out and until our qualified American military experts shall agree that the invasion is for the best interest of the United States.

The other bill directs that the forces now employed in our war against Japan shall be coordinated under a single unified command, of which General MacArthur shall be commander in chief. It provides that no forces now employed against the Japanese shall be withdrawn without his consent and that all forces and equipment requested by him, including amphibious equipment, shall be turned over to him.

All these moves can be made by the Executive without legislation. But probably they will not be made unless the American people vociferously insist. The time has come for patriotic Americans at home to speak up with something of the courage with which American fighters abroad risk their lives.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address I delivered recently in Boston, Mass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. PHILLIPS, for 10 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. KELLEY (at the request of Mr. EBERHARTER), for 5 days, on account of the death of his mother.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 15, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

Hearings will be continued on H. R. 2426 in the Roads Committee room, 1011 New House Office Building, at 10 a. m. Wednesday, March 15, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, March 15, 1944, on H. R. 2522 and H. R. 4350.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the small business subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 2:30 p. m., Wednesday, March 15, 1944.

Business to be considered: Resume hearing on H. R. 2201, a bill providing for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business. Meeting in Accounts Committee room on Ground Floor of House side of Capitol.

There will be a meeting of the land grants subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, March 16, 1944.

Business to be considered: To begin hearings on H. R. 4184 entitled "To amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic."

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold hearings on Thursday, March 16, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on S. 1225, entitled "An act granting a pension to Constance Eager," which was introduced by Senator TYDINGS, and S. 662, entitled "An act to authorize pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children, and for other purposes," which was introduced by Senator BILBO.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads

on Thursday, March 16, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., to consider H. R. 2328 and H. J. Res. 49 (to declare certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings nonmailable). Hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will continue its hearings on H. J. Res. 148, joint resolution to permit the diversion of waters from Lake Michigan to safeguard the public health, on March 22, 1944, at 10:30 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1294. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Administrator, Foreign Economic Administration, transmitting a report on operations under the Lend-Lease Act, from the passage of the act March 11, 1941, to December 31, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 497), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

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. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4381. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 4099. A bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913; with amendment (Rept. No. 1256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KLEBERG:

H. R. 4402. A bill to provide for the control of prices for food commodities during the present war and for 6 months thereafter; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4403. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to defer registrants engaged in commercial fishing operations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 4404. A bill to transfer Government activities in connection with domestic rabbits to the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4405. A bill to amend the act approved March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, 77th Cong.), as amended, so as to more specifically provide for pay, allotments, and administration pertaining to war casualties and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 4406. A bill to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 4407. A bill to provide additional compensation for certain employees of the Government of the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4408. A bill to codify and enact into absolute law title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights"; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 4409. A bill to make retroactive as of June 1942 the increase in the purchase prices paid by the Procurement Divisions of the Treasury Department on and after January 14, 1943, for class A used nonportable typewriters to be used by the armed forces, and to provide for payment of such increase in prices to all persons, firms, and corporations who sold such typewriters to the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department prior to January 14, 1943; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 4410. A bill to extend for an additional 90 days the period which certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed may be imported from foreign countries free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. R. 4411. A bill to exempt from the individual income tax earned income earned in certain taxable years following an individual's discharge from the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. J. Res. 251. A joint resolution authorizing a preliminary examination or survey of Anchorage Harbor, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

My Miss SUMNER of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 252. Joint resolution to postpone the invasion of western Europe and secure a durable settlement of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. J. Res. 253. Joint resolution to provide relief for the American forces now employed in the war against Japan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 469. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4381, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; 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. DIES:

H. R. 4412. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Frank Calhumen et al.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 4413. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Eleanor Peasley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

5247. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of certain citizens of Portland, Oreg., asking for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5248. Also, petition of the Allegheny County Federation of the Blind, asking for the enactment of House bills 2017 and 275, and Senate bills 65 and 910; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5249. By Mr. CASE: Petition sponsored by Charles Agee, of Midland, S. Dak., and signed by 19 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any such bill as the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5250. Also, petition sponsored by Robert Wenger, of Groton, S. Dak., and signed by 19 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any bill such as the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5251. Also, petition sponsored by Dr. L. M. Davis, of Winner, S. Dak., and signed by 40 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any such bill as the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5252. Also, petition sponsored by H. A. Lawien, of Timber Lake, S. Dak., and signed by 15 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any such bill as the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5253. Also, petition sponsored by Lee Elder, of Timber Lake, S. Dak., and signed by 19 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any such bill as the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5254. Also, petition sponsored by Carl L. Fuller, of Isabel, S. Dak., and signed by 41 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any such bill as the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5255. Also, petition sponsored by George Davis, of Dupree, S. Dak., and signed by 42 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any bill such as the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5256. Also, petition sponsored by R. R. Hande, of Webster, S. Dak., and signed by 19 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any bill such as the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5257. Also, petition sponsored by Leonard Likness, of Langford, S. Dak., and signed by 19 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any bill such as the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5258. Also, petition of Post 1273, Veterans of Foreign Wars and Ladies Auxiliary, Rapid City, S. Dak., signed by 45 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any such bill as the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5259. Also, petition sponsored by Esther Cox, of Andover, S. Dak., and signed by 19 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any bill such as the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5260. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of about 350 residents of the Twenty-fourth Congressional District of New York, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5261. By Mr. FENTON: Petition of L. P. Zimmerman and 1,057 citizens of the southern section of Schuylkill County, Pa., protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5262. By Mr. JUDD: Petition submitted by Henry Martin for 21 citizens of Minneapolis, opposing passage of House bill 2082, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5263. By Mr. MYERS: Petition of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5264. By Mr. MUNDT: Petition of John Knutson, of Crocker, and Ingeman Berge, of Wallace, S. Dak., and others, protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5265. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of the Women's Guild of Congregation Emanu-El, San Francisco, urging abrogation of the Chamberlain white paper; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5266. Also, petition of the San Francisco Congress of Industrial Organizations Council, urging that all sessions of Congress be broadcast; to the Committee on Rules.