

its governance, and shall be permitted to adopt reasonable rules and regulations necessary to carry out its functions, but such agreements, bylaws, rules, and regulations shall not be inconsistent with the provisions of this act, and the same and amendments thereto shall be approved by the superintendent before becoming effective. The rating bureau, subject to the approval of the superintendent, shall apportion the expenses of its operation among its members in proportion to the premium income on risks in the District. Each member company of the rating bureau shall have one vote in all matters affecting the operation or affairs of the bureau.

Sec. 5. No company, agent, or broker shall issue or deliver, or offer to issue or deliver, or knowingly permit the issuance or delivery of, any policy of insurance in the District which does not conform to the requirements approved by the superintendent: *Provided, however, That a company may deviate from such requirements if the company has filed with the rating bureau and with the superintendent the deviation to be applied, and provided such deviation is approved by the superintendent. If approved, the deviation shall remain in force for a period of 1 year from the date of approval by the superintendent, unless such approval is withdrawn by the superintendent, for cause after notice to the insurer, or withdrawn by the insurer with the approval of the superintendent.*

It is further provided that a rate in excess of that promulgated by the rating bureau may be charged, provided such higher rate is charged with the knowledge and written consent of the insured and the superintendent.

Sec. 6. The rating bureau shall keep a record of all rates, schedules, and proceedings, and shall file a copy thereof with the superintendent. Every agent shall keep a record of every policy contract issued by or through his agency.

Sec. 7. The superintendent, his deputy, or duly authorized examiner, is authorized and empowered to examine all records of the rating bureau, companies, and agents, and to require every company to furnish promptly accurate written information from such records as will disclose their loss or profit from any class of risk in the district.

Sec. 8. No rate, premium, schedule, rating method, rule, bylaw, agreement, or regulation shall become effective or be charged, applied, or enforced in the district by the rating bureau, or by any company, agent, or broker governed by the provisions of this act, until it shall have been first filed with and approved by the superintendent: *Provided, That a rate or premium used or charged in accordance with a schedule, rating method, or rule previously approved by the superintendent need not be specifically approved by the superintendent. No company, agent, or broker shall issue any form of policy, clause, warranty, rider, or endorsement until such form shall have been filed with and approved by the superintendent.*

Sec. 9. Any company or any agent or broker guilty of violating any of the provisions of this act shall be subject to the provisions of sections 3 and 36, respectively, and as may be amended, of chapter II, Public, No. 824, Seventy-sixth Congress, known as the Fire and Casualty Act, approved October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1066 and 1079; D. C. Code 1940 ed., title 35, secs. 1306 and 1340).

Sec. 10. All laws or parts of laws, insofar as they relate to business affected hereby and in conflict with any of the provisions of this act, are hereby repealed.

Sec. 11. Should any section or provision of this act be decided by the courts to be unconstitutional or invalid, the validity of the act as a whole, or of any part thereof, other

than the part decided to be unconstitutional, shall not be affected.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, after conferring with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. White] I have decided to move a recess until 11 o'clock Friday next. I, therefore, move that the Senate take a recess until Friday at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, March 24, 1944, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATION

An executive nomination received by the Senate March 22 (legislative day of February 7, 1944):

PROMOTION, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, IN THE NAVY

Rear Admiral Robert C. Giffen, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, Caribbean Sea Frontier.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 22 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

GOVERNOR OF ALASKA

Ernest Gruening to be Governor of the Territory of Alaska.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be passed assistant surgeon

Harry F. White, Jr.

To be passed assistant sanitary engineer

John S. Wiley

To be temporary passed assistant surgeons

H. Charles Franklin

Robert S. McClintock

To be temporary senior surgeon

Erwin W. Blatter

To be temporary surgeon

William H. Stimson

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be rear admirals

Thomas L. Sprague

Allan E. Smith

Robert W. Hayler

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR SERVICE

To be lieutenants, to rank from January 14, 1944

Del L. Young

Lee J. Delworth

Jesse L. Holloway

Elof W. Hermanson

Homer K. Davidson

Percy D. Generous

Theodore R. Cooley

Elmo D. Runyan

Clyde B. Lee

David R. Sword

Hubert W. Fisher

James Dyer

Grant E. Horsley

Thomas E. Russell

Richard K. Margetts

Wilfred E. Fleshman

Saleem D. Frey

Walter W. Jones, Jr.

John E. King

Clyde C. Sapp

Elmer L. Prescott

John D. Fuller, Jr.

Westley L. Larson

Marion C. Kelly

William F. Gabberry

Kenneth F. Shiffer

William W. Gribble

Forrest A. Lees

Milford G. Kendall

Orville L. Beck

To be lieutenants (junior grade), to rank from January 14, 1944

John W. Perdue

John H. Newcomb

Bernard M. Kassell

Joseph B. Simpson

Laurence F. Seaman

Joseph C. Lawrence

To be ensigns, to rank from January 14, 1944

Floyd X. Passmore

Raymond E. Dillon

To be passed assistant paymasters with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from January 14, 1944

William C. Humphrey Arthur W. Shawkey

Edgar M. Brown Adam P. Mastio

Goff E. Manuel Creo Baldwin

To be assistant paymasters with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from January 14, 1944

Edward J. Hagen

James E. Corcoran

Francesco M. Barbero

Walter Barsz

Joseph R. Shirley

Frank S. Bird

Henry C. Krueger

Michael J. Knapp

John L. Warden

John A. Keefer

Donald F. Kent

Lester F. Bevil

John T. Barham

To be ensigns, to rank from the date stated opposite their respective names

Harold R. Kellar, Jr., June 3, 1941.

Francis H. McClanan, June 21, 1941.

Forest H. McClanan, June 21, 1941.

Robert J. Beaudine, October 10, 1941.

William B. Troendle, October 16, 1941.

To be assistant surgeon, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from September 8, 1939

Delphos O. Coffman

To be assistant paymasters, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the date stated opposite their respective names

George T. McCoy, Jr., March 17, 1941.

Clark O. Martin, March 19, 1941.

Francis I. Lundquist, June 16, 1941.

Bryant W. Russell, September 24, 1941.

Edgar R. Bryant, September 24, 1941.

Robert O. Dodd, Jr., February 13, 1943.

Calvin A. Vobroucek, March 15, 1944.

POSTMASTERS

MASSACHUSETTS

Joshua T. Wilkinson, Charlton City.

NORTH DAKOTA

Forrest C. Cowles, Ellendale.

WASHINGTON

Edmond Paul Hennessey, Everett.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 22, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Throne of grace and mystery, about which are clouds and darkness, we bring our strivings and yearnings, seeking help and mercy in our need. Touch our immortal souls with seraphic fire and make manifest unto us the innermost depths of the divine. Bring Thy hallowed presence most clearly to our apprehension that we may know that there is in Thy heart a place and a refuge for every human soul in every time of storm.

Our Father, we seek understanding and vision; lead us through these hard days, braving every ignoble act and temper. Let the sentiments of love and confidence spring up along our way, rejoicing that Thy word is as strong as the hand which built the skies. We would not resign ourselves to sadness and gloom, but rather vanish these moods of the night and walk in the day. Thou who dost ask

for the glorified realities of true character and sincere deeds of virtue, help us to stand distinct as the star from the firmament and as a rainbow from the cloud. Make us mindful of those silent forces—the example that has no voice; the common deed that eludes, weighs, and measures; and that precious influence that is as telling and mysterious as the being of man; thus we shall serve our country and bless our generation. In Thy holy name and for Thy sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution to provide for appropriate commemoration of the Centennial of the Telegraph on May 24, 1944.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOSEPH B. EASTMAN

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a short statement from the Herald Tribune, of New York, and that it may be published in the Appendix of the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KENNEDY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the regular business of the day and any previous special orders heretofore granted, my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY] may address the House for 30 minutes on March 30 next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FARM PLAN FOR FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. SPRINGER. 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. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the farmers who resides in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent has sent to me a card which he received from the United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, in which it states:

Your Government is calling on you to produce the most necessary crops in 1944.

Then the card gives the time and place of a proposed meeting which is to be held in that locality for the purpose, as

stated, of completing your "1944 farm plan."

Then this card recites the following:

Remember the Axis is watching whether we farmers are working in unity to produce the foods that will win the war.

A recent ruling provides that future non-highway gasoline allotments will be based on your completing this farm plan.

I understand similar cards have been sent to farmers throughout that section.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this Department of our Government is not going to penalize our people by taking their gasoline allotment away if they fail to join the farm plan which the A. A. A. is promoting. A threat of this kind is unnecessary, and it is not in accord with our policy of government, either in time of war or in peace. Under this policy if a farmer asserts his independence he is to be penalized by having his gasoline allotment revoked. This policy must cease. This is the United States of America!

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the Record and include three letters concerning the mint industry in my district and southern Michigan.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a letter from Mr. L. Metcalfe Walling, of the Wage, Hour, and Contracts Division of the Department of Labor, out of fairness to Mr. Walling. On December 14, 1943, I placed in the Record a letter from a department store calling attention to the efforts of the Wage and Hour Division to bring such stores under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record by inserting a joint resolution of the Vermont Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a very interesting article from the Boston Herald of March 7.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VASSEURE H. WYNN

Mr. TARVER. 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. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, a boy, who a short time ago was a page in the House of Representatives, has established a wonderful record as a flying ace in the

Air Forces of Canada, Great Britain, and of the United States in Malta, England, and over Germany. I think it would be interesting to the membership of the House, and especially to the pages who are now serving in the House, to read the record of this boy's accomplishments.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks an article appearing in the Atlanta Journal of March 19, 1944, giving an account of the distinguished achievements of this young man, V. H. Wynn, who happens to hail from my home city of Dalton, Ga.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The article referred to follows:)

DALTON LIEUTENANT IS ONLY GEORGIA ACE IN BRITAIN—VASSEURE H. WYNN NOW FLYING FIGHTERS IN ESCORTED-BOMBER RAIDS ON GERMANY

(By Wright Bryan)

AMERICAN FIGHTER BASE SOMEWHERE IN ENGLAND, March 17.—"Now, tell this thing straight," said First Lt. Vasseur H. (Georgia) Wynn, of Dalton, Ga. "One fellow talked to me and then wrote a story so flowery I couldn't recognize myself or anything I'd done. I sure hope none of my friends in the Air Corps ever get hold of that story. They would never give me another minute's peace."

So I will tell it straight. And that's all right, too. It is good enough not to need embellishment. Here it is:

Lieutenant Wynn is the only Georgian among the list of more than 60 fighter aces in the European theater of operations.

His record shows six German planes definitely destroyed, three probably destroyed, and two damaged.

He enlisted in the Royal Canadian Air Force in March 1941 and flew at Malta with the British and Canadians.

His outfit took off from a carrier and flew from somewhere in the Mediterranean to Malta when that island was partly isolated and being constantly pounded by Nazis.

Three of his definitely destroyed Jerries, and the three probables and two damaged, he got while helping defend Malta.

He returned from Malta to England in December of 1942, served 5 months as instructor in an R. A. F. operational training unit, and transferred to the American Eighth Air Force June 1943.

NOW AN ESCORT FLYER

Now he is helping escort American Flying Fortresses and Liberators on their deepest penetrations into Germany.

Since transferring to our own Air Force he has downed three more Jerries.

His group got 13 Thursday, and Wynn is fussing because he did not get to go along on that show.

Many pilots in his group were members of Eagle Squadron of the R. A. F. before their transfer to the United States Army Air Forces. Like himself, they wear the R. A. F. wings on the right side of their blouses and American wings on the left side.

Early in his service with the R. C. A. F. he won the nickname "Georgia." Today he wears the name Georgia Wynn in big letters on his leather jacket, and nobody calls him anything but Georgia.

He has fought in British Spitfires and American Thunderbolts, but now his group uses P-5 Mustangs, long-range fighters which combine the best thought of British and American designers and the best efforts of American manufacturers to produce a plane capable of escorting heavy bombers all the way to Berlin.

Georgia considers the Mustang the best plane he ever flew.

His group is stationed at one of the permanent bases which the R. A. F. turned over to Americans. By comparison with the Nissen-hutted bases, it is luxurious, and Georgia calls it the country club of ETO.

ONCE SHOT DOWN

Georgia was shot down once in Malta. There were 15 machine-gun holes in his plane. One through the cockpit got him in the leg. He crash-landed and soon was fighting again.

He wears no Purple Heart, because that was when he was in British service, but he wears the American Air Medal with three clusters and the Distinguished Flying Cross.

Thirty-two pilots went with him to Malta, and nine came back.

He attended Dalton High School and went to Washington with Congressman MALCOLM TARTER as a page in the House of Representatives, later working 2 years in the F. B. I. and 2 years in the United States Department of Agriculture. He learned to fly in Washington and had 150 hours in light planes before joining the Canadians.

His mother is Mrs. Willie Loy Wynn, 2 McAfee Street, Dalton.

And that, without embellishment—as he would wish—is the story of Georgia Wynn.

RESTORATION OF THE TWO-THIRDS RULE IN THE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

Mr. COX. 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. COX. Mr. Speaker, while I know that the vast majority of our colleagues regard the remarks made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] on the floor of the House yesterday in my absence in which he took me to task for advocating the restoration of the two-thirds rule governing the nomination of the Democratic nominations for the Presidency and Vice Presidency to be too inconsequential to merit attention, still I must not let the gentleman's words pass without saying to him that in setting himself up as a censor of the conduct of his fellows he hazards the risk of having the bladder upon which he swims punctured; besides he might be called upon to furnish some of his own hair for his own bite. The gentleman perhaps seized the incident in order to advertise the fact that accidents continue to happen. He tells us that he is a delegate to the next Democratic National Convention. I should like to say to the gentleman that when the Democratic Party is driven to the extremity, if it is ever driven to such extremity, of looking to him for guidance that it will then be so completely bankrupt as to be beyond all hope of repair. The gentleman includes me in an honorable company and derisively calls us Pharisees. Obviously, the gentleman is not a Pharisee. He is exclusive—for the time being. I shall not deflate the gentleman's bloated conceit, for it is probably his sole source of happiness as well as the cause for his delusions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks in the RECORD for the purpose of including a statement by Thomas B. Freeman, president of Butler Bros., of Chicago.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 4219.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including a letter sent to the Office of Price Administration by the Laundry Board of Trade of Philadelphia.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RESTORATION OF THE TWO-THIRDS RULE IN THE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I do not set myself up as a censor for the Democratic Party, but I do lose patience when a gentleman states he wants to have the Democratic Party go forward and make progress by going backward and restoring the two-thirds rule. I assure the gentleman that he is simply affording good grist for the mill of a lot of disgruntled, frustrated, crotchety, "old-maidenlike" men such as Harry Woodring, former Congressman John J. O'Connor, and former Senator Reed, when he advocates the restoration of the two-thirds rule. In common parlance it is merely a stop-Roosevelt movement, and Roosevelt will not be stopped because he will be elected a fourth-term President of the United States.

Under extension of my remarks, I wish to state:

As to bankruptcy, the men mentioned, to whom the gentleman from Georgia gives great comfort, assuredly would bring our glorious party to the low ebb of bankruptcy. The gentleman from Georgia seems exercised over my adverse comments. That is proof positive that they have merit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Wall Street Journal dealing with O. P. A.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LLOYD L. JOHNSON AND P. B. HUME

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3157) for

the relief of Lloyd L. Johnson and P. B. Hume, with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$1,500" and insert "\$2,000."

The Senate amendment was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARIE GEILER

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2743) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Geiler, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$5,577.75" and insert "\$5,000."

The Senate amendment was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES J. GOFF

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2925) for the relief of Charles J. Goff, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after "Idaho", insert "as administrator of the estate of Judson E. Goff, deceased."

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

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARENCE WAVERLY MORGAN

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2212) for the relief of Clarence Waverly Morgan, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$4,000."

The Senate amendment was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Accounts and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read (H. Res. 480) as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 166 Seventy-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Indian Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$15,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee thereof conducting such investigation or any part

thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects, in one to include an editorial by Hon. Chester H. Rowell, editor in chief of the San Francisco Examiner; and in the second to include an editorial which appeared in the Sacramento Bee, the Fresno Bee, and the Modesto Bee.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the grounds of his question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In the Tri-County News, of South Bend, Ind., circulated in Michigan and Indiana, in the issue of January 27, 1944, there was printed the following:

Resolved, That the St. Joseph County Industrial Union Council of the C. I. O., hereby goes on record denouncing CLARE HOFFMAN as a traitor to our Nation, and that the council demands of the Department of Justice to place CLARE HOFFMAN under indictment as a violator of the Espionage Act of our Government.

The statement reflects upon the integrity and the patriotism in his official capacity of the Member from the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, and raises the question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman states a question of personal privilege and is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The resolution adopted by the St. Joseph County Industrial Council of the C. I. O. is so absurd, so venomous, but so characteristic of the methods of the Communists, who apparently rule the C. I. O.'s political activities, that it needs no answer.

Similar false charges were circulated throughout the district prior to the November 1942 election by the C. I. O. organization in a 12-page pamphlet.

The people of the district, many of whom have known me intimately for years, gave the C. I. O. its answer when 69 percent of the voters cast ballots for my reelection.

Let me turn now for a moment to one of the political allies of the C. I. O., the commentator Walter Winchell, and an-

swer his charge and the charge of PM, Marshall Field's smear publication, that I would suppress free speech.

OH, HOW HE CRIES!

Yesterday, March 21, an article appeared in Marshall Field's PM captioned, "Unfair attack on Winchell threatens freedom of press."

Many of us long have known that Winchell and PM were yellow and both reach the height of absurdity when they squawk about unfair attacks upon either.

For years, Winchell has been smirching decent, law-abiding, patriotic citizens and his sponsors, the Jergens Co., have paid him for doing it. He has prided into the private lives of inoffensive people; he has spread scandal and gossip—much of it false—over the radio and through his column, until the name of Walter Winchell and the name of his sponsor, the Jergens Co., have become known throughout the land as synonyms for dirty, malicious, and usually false charges.

While Winchell was wearing the uniform of the United States Navy, his conduct became so offensive to so many Americans that the administration was forced to strip him of his uniform, of his pay, of his duties; but to the disgrace of the Navy be it said, it retained him as a Reserve officer.

Over the air, sponsored by the Jergens Co., Winchell made many statements which, either directly or by innuendo, charged Members of Congress with disloyalty. He has repeatedly attempted to destroy the confidence of the people in their chosen representatives.

The article in PM contains this statement:

The concerted attack on Walter Winchell by a few Congressmen, notably CLARE HOFFMAN, has reached incredible depths of infamy. The significance of this attack is deeply disturbing to those who cherish democratic institutions. It tends to degrade the dignity of Congress, which should stand as the foremost symbol of representative democracy. It is a direct threat to freedom of speech and of the press.

The article also contains the following statement, and I quote:

The second anti-Winchell speech of March 16 was made by CLARE HOFFMAN. It not only attacks Winchell but his sponsor, the Jergens Co. It is a dirty, despicable effort to drive Winchell off the air by subjecting his sponsor to congressional pressure.

"Why," HOFFMAN asks, "does Jergens keep Winchell on his pay roll? Has Jergens something to hide? Winchell once made the statement, in substance, 'orchids to Jergens for his exposure of Nazi spies.'"

"I would like to have Winchell come before a committee of Congress and explain just what he meant by that statement, a statement apparently simple on its face—what is there hiding behind it?"

It's a fine pass we've come to, when a Congressman recommends an investigation against a firm "accused" of anti-Nazi activity and which dares sponsor an anti-Nazi broadcaster.

What an absurdity for Winchell, who over the years has made thousands of statements which tended to disgrace and humiliate good citizens, to, when the falsity of his statements, the harmful ef-

fect of his utterances is pointed out, complain about a denial of free speech.

Perhaps no one has ever more extensively used and abused a free press, the freedom of speech, than has Walter Winchell.

Those who would smirch Members of Congress, destroy the people's confidence in their chosen representatives, intimidate and silence all opponents of the New Deal and the Communists, are now the first to cry, whimper, and whine when their hypocrisy is exposed; when their own words and actions are given the acid test of publicity, when their true purpose and character stand revealed.

Winchell and PM charge that some Members of Congress—and my own name is one of those mentioned—are attempting to suppress free speech, demanding that Winchell be taken off the air.

It is not my desire to limit free speech or a free press. My only demand has been that Winchell, in his public utterances, confine himself, when he makes statements purporting to be fact, to statements of fact; that he cease to falsely accuse not only Members of Congress but all citizens of disloyalty; that he avoid false accusations, which tend to create race prejudice, disunity, discourage our men in the service and lower their morale.

And let the Blue Network and Winchell quit changing his scripts. Not long ago, referring to me, he made a vile, indecent and false statement over the radio; but, in the written transcript of that broadcast, that statement was omitted. But the transcription of the spoken word shows that he uttered that vile and indecent slander.

What must be the state of mind of a man who will pollute the air of our country with that kind of a statement? I know it may please the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY], who is laughing, and it may please the gentleman from California [Mr. ROGERS], who is also laughing, but let me tell you, the decent, respectable citizens of our country condemn that kind of a statement. They are horrified by it and they are resentful that such statements are made.

Let me repeat the last sentence of the article in PM. It is this:

It's a fine pass we've come to when a Congressman recommends an investigation against a firm "accused" of anti-Nazi activity and which dares to sponsor an anti-Nazi broadcaster.

There is a fair sample of how Winchell and PM twist words, attempt to create an impression which is untrue.

That paragraph is a charge that a Congressman has demanded an investigation of a firm, namely, the Jergens Co., which has been engaged in anti-Nazi activity and which sponsors Winchell, an anti-Nazi broadcaster.

What are the facts?

Winchell, who claims to be the Nation's No. 1 reporter, who on Sunday night addresses "Mr. and Mrs. North America and South America and our men overseas," ought to know a few of the facts about his sponsor and his sponsor's activities.

Time and again, Winchell has intimated that he is a buddy of J. Edgar Hoover; that he has access to the confidential files of the Department of Justice, of the F. B. I.

Yesterday came a letter from J. Edgar Hoover, which reads as follows:

My attention has been directed to your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 16 and I received a specific inquiry regarding the following statement appearing on page A1342:

"Perhaps Jergens, if he took the stand, might disclose that the F. B. I., under J. E. Hoover, has in its files information to which Winchell has access, and might show that Jergens associated with individuals who were much closer to the Nazis than any of those who have been indicted for sedition."

I note, of course, that your statement was made in a conjectural manner, yet I wanted you to know the facts, and the facts are that no one outside of the official staff of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has access to its files. Any statement to the effect that a commentator has access to the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is wholly unjustified and is not based on fact.

Mr. Hoover, however, failed to state that there was not in the F. B. I. files information which might show that Jergens associated with individuals who were much closer to the Nazis than any of those who have been indicted for sedition.

Nor did he write that Winchell does not have access to information which would show that Jergens associated with such individuals.

In view of the fact that Winchell time and again has by innuendo, if not directly, created the impression that he was a buddy of Hoover, that he did have access to information in the F. B. I. files or in the files of the Department of Justice, would it not be in the public interest for Hoover and for Biddle to state, emphatically and without equivocation, that, so far as they know, Winchell has no opportunity to get confidential information or information of any kind from the files of either organization or from any agent or representative of either?

That letter should dispose of Winchell's oft-repeated claim that he has a pipe line into the F. B. I. offices.

Winchell has claimed credit for the indictment of the thirty-odd so-called seditionists. He, apparently acting in conjunction with William Power Maloney, who was later branded as a pettifoggish shyster by the United States Supreme Court, made to the country many statements which intimated that those who had been three times arrested but not yet tried were guilty of sedition. He falsely charged that Members of Congress were guilty of sedition.

Winchell has falsely charged that Members of Congress delayed the trial of those indicted. He has falsely charged that Members of Congress claimed that those who were so indicted were innocent.

It is undoubtedly true that some of those who have been indicted are guilty of some criminal offense, for some of them have been tried and convicted.

Winchell, Sunday night, complained bitterly because the head of the Dies committee had not, before exposing his activities on the floor of the House, given him an opportunity to be heard.

The right to be confronted with witnesses, the right to cross-examine, is given to every individual when tried before any court. That right is not given to people who are under investigation.

And who is Winchell and what has been his conduct that he should complain because he was not first given a hearing, confronted by the witnesses? When did Winchell ever, during his long course of vilification and scandalmongering, ever give any of his victims an opportunity to state their side of the case before he went on the air slandering or libeling them or printed his column in the public press?

Winchell should be the last to complain that he has not been given a fair trial. Winchell is yellow. And when he sees exposure coming he hides behind the Constitution, the protection of which he had denied to hundreds of citizens.

Oh, yes; Winchell claims that he is an anti-Nazi broadcaster. Like a hound pup on the trail of a rabbit, Winchell has been pounding those arrested and charged with sedition day after day, week after week, and month after month, but of the activity and conviction of some real Nazi agents, of some Nazi sponsors, he has been as silent as the grave.

Is he blackmailing someone? Or is he in sympathy with the methods of these Nazis?

Here are a few questions which the people of this country would be glad to have Walter Winchell and PM answer, and, may I add, Andrew Jergens can add his answer:

Did Andrew Jergens have in his employ one or two or more persons who were charged with aiding, abetting, or conspiring with Nazi agents?

Was not one of the employees, a confidential employee of Andrew Jergens, president of the Jergens Co., the sponsor of Walter Winchell, charged with and convicted of a Federal offense, the gist of which was either sedition, espionage, or misprision of treason?

Was not a confidential employee of Andrew Jergens convicted of a Federal offense and sentenced to prison?

Was not another confidential employee of the said Andrew Jergens guilty of conduct which required and resulted in her internment or incarceration in a Federal prison?

Is not Andrew Jergens at the present time engaged in an effort to have one of the individuals referred to above released from Federal or Army custody?

Has not Walter Winchell for months known that two of the confidential employees of Andrew Jergens, president of his sponsor, the Jergens Co., or employees of that company, have been charged with disloyalty—one convicted and one interned?

And while questions are being asked, for good measure let me ask the Department of Justice as well as Winchell and Andrew Jergens if it is not true that at least one of Jergens' confidential employees did either give aid to or conspire with some or all of the six saboteurs who were executed?

When will the Department of Justice or the F. B. I., if it has knowledge thereof, bring the files with reference to the two

individuals referred to above before the Dies committee and let "Mr. and Mrs. North and South America and our men overseas" know the facts?

When next Winchell starts a broadcast with "Good evening, Mr. and Mrs. North and South America and our men overseas," let him tell the overseas men whether or not he covered up these two Nazi agents.

Has "your grateful New York correspondent," as he terms himself, been ignorant of the apprehension, arrest, and confinement of two of Jergens' confidential employees?

Or am I just dreaming that something of that kind happened?

Has the great sedition hunter, Walter Winchell, been covering up a real Nazi agent?

Come now, Walter, you are being asked, not for a suppression of free speech; you are being asked to talk, and for once in your life to tell the truth. What, if anything, do you know about the incidents referred to above?

Inasmuch as Winchell is at times rather evasive, apt to stray from the point at issue, and as PM has characterized Winchell as an "anti-Nazi broadcaster" and Jergens as a firm engaged in "anti-Nazi activity," perhaps a few memory-refreshing suggestions may help Mr. Jergens and Mr. Winchell in their efforts to give the public some information.

One Elfrieda Margaret Siddell was Jergens' personal secretary, or an employee graduating to that position from an upstairs maid post in his home. As his secretary, she accompanied Jergens on various trips about the country and to his homes in Florida and California.

In 1942 she was arrested by agents of the F. B. I. as a German enemy alien. Jergens is not a German, but of Danish descent.

It was learned that she had hired as a maid in the Miami Beach home of Jergens one Hedwig Engemann, 34 years of age, formerly of 238 East Eighty-sixth Street, New York City.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Is that hotel the gentleman mentioned there in Miami the one that Walter Winchell occupies when he is down in Miami? Does the gentleman have any information on that fact?

Mr. HOFFMAN. My relation with Mr. Winchell is not of a personal nature.

Miss Engemann was arrested about the time of the capture of the eight Nazi saboteurs who landed here from a submarine in the summer of 1942, and six of whom were afterward executed for sabotage.

Miss Engemann was shown to have aided Edward John Kerling, one of the eight. He was executed and Miss Engemann pleaded guilty in a New York court to a charge of misprision of treason.

Have you heard Winchell saying anything about that? He is after these folks down town here, and I hold no brief for them. I do not say they are guilty or innocent; I do not know anything about

that. But here is a woman who was convicted. She was employed by Winchell's sponsor. Why did he not mention it? Is he blackmailing Jergens? Is he exposing the Nazis? Is he telling about what they are doing, or is he just covering up?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. This lady, Miss Engemann, the gentleman spoke about and the address he gave happens to be in my congressional district. As I remember, when that young lady was arrested, her brother, who was about to be drafted, came to see me. He operated a delicatessen store in the neighborhood for many years, and seemed deeply concerned about the activities of his sister.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Wait a minute. I did not yield to the gentleman for a speech. If the gentleman wants to ask a question, all right.

Mr. KENNEDY. This girl had been employed in her brother's delicatessen store for many years, and her brother seemed and claimed he knew nothing about her activities outside the store. Whether or not she worked for Jergens in addition to working for her brother, I do not know. But, as a matter of fact, I know she lived and worked right in that neighborhood and in the delicatessen store for several years. I do not think she could have been in the employ of Jergens during those years.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All that does not prove that she was not employed by Jergens. The committee can bring Mr. Jergens down here, and he can testify under oath, and we will find out all about it. The gentleman does not deny that she was employed by Jergens?

Treason is defined to be—

Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States, levies war against them or adheres to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort within the United States or elsewhere, is guilty of treason.

Misprision of treason is defined to be—

Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States and having knowledge of the commission of any treason against them, conceals and does not, as soon as may be, disclose and make known the same to the President or to some judge of the United States, or to the Governor or to some judge or justice of a particular State, is guilty of misprision of treason.

After a somewhat lengthy hearing in Cincinnati, Miss Siddell was ordered interned and has ever since been so confined.

Jergens made strenuous efforts to prevent her detention, describing her at one time as "the finest woman I have ever known." He sent her clothing while she was confined in jail and at times called her over the long-distance phone.

It has been charged that Jergens offered money to an individual in the Department of Justice, not to help exonerate Miss Siddell, but to have her held in a hotel suite during her hearing, instead of being held in jail.

It is now reported that Jergens has started action to have Miss Siddell released from the internment camp.

I have been advised by reliable sources that the records which prove this story have been withheld from Congress on the ground that to make disclosure of their contents would be "contrary to the public interest." Later, it was said that the files had been loaned to Jergens' attorney.

It has also been charged that, while the hearing was in progress in Cincinnati, Jergens was greatly concerned about what Winchell, his employee, would say, and in substance, stated, "I wonder what Winchell will say about this."

At that time Winchell was away on a South American "mission" for the Navy. Upon his return his only mention of this incident, so far as I have been able to learn, was to congratulate his sponsor for helping to apprehend an alien enemy.

As to whether Jergens appealed to Winchell for this so-called cover-up, probably only Winchell or Jergens can give the true answer. In any event, Winchell has been silent about Jergens' connection with his two employees, one of whom, as stated, entered a plea of guilty of misprision of treason and the other was found guilty of conduct which required her internment.

It is quite true that the story about Miss Engemann and her associations with Kerling, one of the executed Nazis, has been published in connection with their trial, but her employment in the Jergens home has, so far as I know, not been mentioned.

Suppose Mrs. Dilling or any one of the others accused of sedition had employed a person who was convicted of misprision of treason. How Winchell would have torn the air with his denunciations.

Can it be that his retention on the air at a fee of \$5,000 for approximately 15 minutes is the price of his silence? And why is it that in his broadcasts Winchell has never, so far as I have been able to learn, mentioned the name of Miss Siddell? Why is it that his column has not carried a reference to her pro-Nazi activities?

No; Winchell confines his abuse, his vilification, to those who have been accused of sedition, to Members of Congress, to the denunciation of Congress as the "House of Reprehensibles." He characterized twenty-odd million citizens as being "damned fools."

Yet Winchell is carried on the Navy lists as a Reserve officer. Is it not about time that the Navy purge its organization of this man?

Is it not time that Winchell and Jergens be called before some committee of the House; that the publishers of PM be called and be made to tell what is back of their smear campaign, their efforts to discredit the people's representatives, and to disclose as well the source from which they derive the funds to carry on their campaign of dissension?

The record seems to show that Winchell's sponsor, Jergens, was the employer of at least one Nazi agent who entered a plea of guilty to a charge of misprision of treason.

If Winchell will confine himself to the washing of his own and Jergens' dirty

linen, he will be busy for some time. He might ask the aid of J. Edgar Hoover, of the Department of Justice.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committees:

MARCH 22, 1944.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation from the following committees of the House: Indian Affairs, Irrigation and Reclamation, Labor, Public Buildings and Grounds, the Public Lands, and the Territories.

Respectfully yours,
GEORGE E. OUTLAND.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

COMMEMORATION OF THE CENTENNIAL OF THE TELEGRAPH

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 72, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee to Provide for Appropriate Commemoration of the Centennial of the Telegraph the following Members of the House: Mr. BULWINKLE, of North Carolina; Mr. LEA, of California; Mr. MYERS, of Pennsylvania; Miss STANLEY, of New York; Mr. ROHRBOUGH, of West Virginia.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 469), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union 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. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "exceed", strike out the words "one hour" and insert in lieu thereof the words "two hours."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. BULWINKLE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.)

ELK HILLS NAVAL OIL RESERVE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. 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 to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VOORHIS of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

RIVER AND HARBOR BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3961, with Mr. COSTELLO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Yesterday, at the conclusion of the session of the Committee, debate on the pending amendment was limited to 20 minutes. At that time a number of Members were on their feet asking recognition. The Chair will read the names of the Members who will be recognized on the pending amendment: Mr. WICKERSHAM, Mr. HARE, Mr. WHITE, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana, Mr. HILL, Mr. CASE, Mr. LEMKE, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. DWORSHAK, and the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. MANSFIELD.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the 20 minutes to which debate has been limited on this amendment, divided among the Members whose names the Chair has just read, would not give over 2 or 3 minutes to each Member, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on the pending amendment be extended so that each Member listed may have 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent that the Members who were on their feet yesterday and whose names the Chair has just read be given 5 minutes each to speak on the pending amendment. This would extend the time to 60 minutes.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. This is an issue that was debated fully on the floor yesterday, and it appears that every argument that might be advanced was advanced, and there has been considerable time already spent on this bill, on this particular issue.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman states that this has been fully debated. The gentleman means probably by only the proponents of the amendment. Only one Member spoke of that, and I do not think the gentleman ought to contend that that is so; and if he will reflect, I think he will not do so.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. If the gentleman will remember, an amendment similar to this amendment was debated at length, and was voted down by this House. There was full discussion. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to object.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I move that Committee of the Whole allow 5 minutes to each Member named by the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The House has already determined that by unanimous consent, and that can only be changed by unanimous consent of the House. The motion is not in order.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet yesterday, although my name does not appear there.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's name is on the list.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HILL. I was on my feet yesterday at the time the Chair says that this was done by unanimous consent. I suggest that it was not done by unanimous consent and as far as my memory is concerned it was done by motion, and I think that motion should be amended now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. It was agreed to yesterday by a motion, but the motion can only be amended by unanimous consent.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] for a minute and a half.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, this is such an important amendment, to all the people of the United States, because, after all, food is our most important product, that debate upon it ought not to be limited to a minute and a half. I am in favor of the amendment. We have in Idaho, and in all of these Western States, a demand for water and need for water for reclamation. This use is paramount. I am in full support of the provisions of our State constitution which establishes a priority to premises for use of water in Idaho streams and lakes, and following that, first comes domestic use, and I don't think any Member of this House would consent to take water away from domestic use in cities and towns, and when it comes to production of food, I don't think any Member would take water off the land for the purpose of navigation. This amendment will not disturb navigation. Navigation improvements simply deepen the flow of water by deepening the channel and retarding the flow of the stream.

The use of the waters of the streams of Idaho, in fact of all the Western States, is vital to our farming industry—an industry that provides the eastern manufacturers with one of their best markets.

If navigation of our western streams would take one drop of water away from our irrigated farms or give preference over the future use of water for the irrigation of new lands in any of our Western States, I should be against this bill.

The proposed navigation projects on the Snake River in Idaho are fortunately located. All the water of the Snake River upstream tributary to the irrigable lands can be used for irrigation without being needed for navigation below Lewiston. The two larger tributaries flowing into the Snake River frame the rugged mountainous section of central Idaho. The Clearwater and Salmon Rivers, which can in no way be used for irrigation, will supply more than enough water to provide for river navigation below Lewiston, as confirmed in a telegram just received from the district Army engineer, which telegram is inserted herewith:

PORTLAND, OREG., March 17, 1944.
Representative COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Reference is made to your request for further data on stream flow on lower Snake River. Records at Weiser for the period 1930 to 1940, inclusive, show low flow to be approximately 6,600 cubic feet per second; 90 percent of the time flow exceeds 8,500 cubic feet per second, and 75 percent of the time it exceeds 10,000 cubic feet per second. At Riparia low flow is 11,000 cubic feet per second; 90 percent of the time flow exceeds 15,200 cubic feet per second, and 75 percent of the time it exceeds 18,300 cubic feet per second. Flow required to provide slack-water navigation, when all dams are built, will be less than 1,000 cubic feet per second. Either the Clearwater or Salmon River provides, at all times, flow in excess of this minimum amount.

TUDOR, District Engineer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] for a minute and a half.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, it was suggested a moment ago that a similar amendment to this bill had been acted upon and voted down in the House. I call attention to the fact that this amendment is dissimilar in a fundamental respect to every amendment acted on yesterday. The last few words of this amendment refer to control of water under the laws of the State, and that is what I want to emphasize. This amendment classifies beneficial uses in the order they are classified by State law and makes State law on water prevail in that region.

Out in the West, water is of great importance. In the arid and semiarid regions our streams are not actually navigable, and we feel that there State law should prevail. In fact our own State constitution provides, in the fundamental law for water usage, and that recognition is contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah. I feel that this amendment should be incorporated for our protection, and I ask that it be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, there is no use trying to say anything about this subject in a minute and a half. I am very sorry that the House saw fit to cut off this debate, because a good many

from the irrigated sections have had no chance to discuss the idea that this water belongs to the State where it rises, regardless of what the folks downstream think about it. Let me read what was said yesterday by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL]:

So, if you have any respect or consideration for the common law of your country, you are bound to agree with me when I say that if there is a dispute as to whether there is enough water, you know it must go to those cities which have their rights long established by custom and usage.

And that simply means that all this irrigated territory that we have developed, all these farms, whose title includes title to water, must permit this water to go down to Mr. BELL's folks, while our folks can see their crops destroyed by dry weather, and there will be little food for people down the river.

The rivers and harbors authorization bill (H. R. 3961), which is before the House of Representatives for consideration, sets a pattern of future development for some of the major rivers of the Nation. It accomplishes even more, if passed and approved without amendment, for it would enact into law principles which seriously jeopardize the control under State laws of a limited water supply needed in arid regions for continued irrigated agricultural development. It dedicates for all time to come the waters of certain great river basins for a particular use without just and reasonable recognition of other uses. It invokes congressional approval for such development without adequate coordination of studies and investigations designed to present a plan which would preserve in fair balance and in the highest possible degree all uses of water. It shapes the future economy which is related to a great natural resource.

In the consideration of such legislation there is no place for partisanship. It is too important to indulge in measures of expediency. And, surely, in such matters there is no place to spar for advantage.

Everyone supports the desirability of improving the highways of water traffic; but there is real objection to legislation which assures improved navigation through drastic curtailment of other uses of the waters of a river system. Any legislation which authorizes navigation projects commanding the entire water supplies of a river system for the one purpose, establishes a yardstick of control which rules out for all time any future irrigation development.

The great rivers west of the Mississippi have their sources and flow through areas where irrigation is essential to agriculture. Irrigation is the basis, the measure, and the limit of economic development of that inland region.

To demonstrate the inherent dangers to present and future irrigation found in H. R. 3961, reference is made to the authorization of the development of navigation on the Missouri River between Sioux City, Iowa, and the mouth; House Document No. 214, Seventy-sixth Congress. The import of this authorization cannot be understood without reference

to the House document mentioned. An examination of this document leads to other House documents which become part of the law when referred to in a bill passed by Congress.

Page 199, paragraph 495, House Document No. 238, Seventy-third Congress, referring to navigation development on the Missouri River, reads thus:

The results of the study contained in Appendix XI indicate that a channel of between 8 and 9 feet can be obtained, by the present method of open channel regulation, in the section from Kansas City to Hermann, with a discharge of 35,000 second-feet at Kansas City.

Page 242, paragraph 673, House Document No. 238. Seventy-third Congress, states:

Several methods for the provision of a greater depth than 6 feet for future navigation have been given consideration. A navigable channel of between 8 and 9 feet in depth could be obtained by the method of open channel regulation described in paragraph 666, with a discharge of 30,000 second-feet at Yankton. This discharge could be maintained by enlarging the Fort Peck Reservoir to a capacity of 17,000,000 acre-feet which would involve a total cost of \$84,155,000.

The meaning of this harmless-appearing authorization language is further supported by the committee report on H. R. 3961, which construes this language in the bill as embracing improvements for a channel of 9-foot depth and a width of not less than 300 feet between Sioux City and the mouth of the river.

To appraise the effect of such a navigation development on other uses or proposed uses of Missouri River water, it is only necessary to examine the figures on the annual water supply of this river. The records of the United States Geological Survey disclose that the average annual flow of the river at Kansas City during the last 14 years is 32,520 cubic feet.

Thus with proper regulation of flood flows, it is proposed by H. R. 3961 to construct public works for navigation which will command and substantially utilize all of the Missouri River flow for this one purpose. Such a program would not only thwart future irrigation development in the upper basin but would seriously threaten present consumptive uses of water which have been built up under State laws over many years.

Congress exercises its control over navigation and makes authorizations for navigation improvements under the provisions of the commerce clause of the Federal Constitution. In the absence of congressional enactment to the contrary, the authorization for navigation improvement imposes a Federal control of the water resource involved which transcends State laws governing the appropriation and distribution of water for irrigation, domestic, and industrial purposes. Although the power of Congress is plenary in fixing the conditions for water use for navigation, H. R. 3961 contains no language which protects the present and future uses for beneficial and consumptive purposes in the upper basin. Therefore, the navigation improvement proposed by this bill dedicates

the waters of the Missouri to navigation to the exclusion of other uses, not only by virtue of the physical works planned but by the imposition of Federal jurisdiction over these waters.

The interests of navigation and irrigation and other uses of waters of a river system may be coordinated and often such uses may be mutual in a large degree; but H. R. 3961 neither coordinates nor paves the way for an orderly evaluation and protection in the highest degree possible of these various water uses.

Therefore, to protect the domestic irrigation and industrial water users of the Nation in the river basins affected by this proposed legislation, appropriate amendments should be inserted for this purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin said as I was getting up, "We are dealing here with the case of minority rights."

Mr. KEEFE. Riparian rights.

Mr. CASE. Very well, riparian rights, but I will change it to minority rights. We are dealing with the rights of the Western States, which have a minority as far as population is concerned. I hold in my hand a compilation of a report and recommendations made by a committee of the National Reclamation Association. This committee had representatives from 15 Western States. Recommendation No. 1 is, and I am reading from the text, that the control and regulation and utilization of water in the arid and semiarid area of the United States be in accordance with the principle that the highest use shall be for domestic consumption and for growing crops, and that the multiple-use or power projects shall be so designed and operated that domestic or irrigation use at all times be paramount to the requirements of hydroelectric-energy production, and that the imposition of Federal jurisdiction under the commerce clause to maintain navigable capacity and regulate floods in lower reaches of rivers having their source in the arid and semiarid regions, should recognize the maximum use of water for irrigation purposes.

I urge the House to recognize this petition of the Western States. The power of Congress, the power of the Federal Government to regulate commerce between the States is admitted. The pending amendment simply proposes that in regulating the use of interstate streams west of the ninety-seventh meridian, the provisions of State laws be recognized in certain particulars. It is not an attempt to amend the Constitution by a simple act of Congress; it is merely an exercise of the constitutional power over commerce. The Robinson amendment merely proposes that we regulate the commerce on certain waters in a certain way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, no one respects the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee more than I do. No one has a higher regard for the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] than I have. But that respect and admiration ends when it becomes a question that affects the Nation. Then I reserve the right not only to disagree with them but to oppose a scheme or policy that would deprive the people of a great portion of this Nation of the necessary water for irrigation and domestic uses.

These genial gentlemen tell us that that is not their design or purpose, and I shall agree with them on that. But I think they were taken in, or rather taken for a ride down the river, by that other genial gentleman [Mr. BELL] from Kansas City.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL], in his unguarded moment, frankly admitted that what they wanted was the water from the upper Missouri River States so that he, at Kansas City, could float an empty boat down the Missouri into the Mississippi and down to visit our friend RANKIN, in the State of Mississippi, and join hands with other friends at New Orleans in Louisiana. I said an empty boat because, if he had his way, then the great American desert would soon be on its way and there would be nothing to float down the river.

Human selfishness at times knows no limits. Sectionalism still seems to be strong in this Congress. The time has come that we look at the United States as a whole as our country and not get lost in the local atmosphere of Kansas City.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] need not worry. We will let him have plenty of water for drinking purposes. That is if he has not anything better to drink in Kansas City, but, we are not going to permit him to wreck a great part of our Nation, to turn it into a desert because he wants to float a boat.

Of course, the gentleman from Kansas City is very much mistaken when he tells of the great benefit that navigation on the Missouri River has been to the Dakotas and Montana. This because he says it gives a road to markets. No more erroneous statement was ever made on the floor of this Chamber. The Missouri River, as far as furnishing markets for North Dakota products, has been a dead issue for years. As far as being an avenue for transportation for the upper States it never did exist to any great extent and to what little extent it was used has been so long ago that it no longer remains in the memory of the present generation.

I believe at one time a few barges were pulled up the river by tugboats and canoes. The present civilization has surpassed this slow method of transportation except for some heavy and bulky commodities and even these are now being hauled largely by train and practically all of it above Kansas City is hauled by truck and train. And when the war is over some will be taken care of by plane.

I am not opposed to permitting the gentleman from Missouri and the Com-

mittee on Rivers and Harbors to dig a ditch if they want it. I am perfectly willing that they should be allowed to play around in the mud of the Missouri River, but, I am more interested in giving the first right of the water of the Missouri River and of other rivers to the State through which these rivers pass for irrigation and domestic uses.

Irrigation and flood control go hand in hand. If the water is used at its source it can create no floods. After that it can be used to develop power and for navigation. Let us forget sectionalism. We are 1 Nation and just 48 States.

I submit the following basic facts to show that with a 6-foot channel there is only enough water left to irrigate approximately 2,778,000 acres and that with a 9-foot channel there would be no water at all left for irrigation:

Out of 15,768,000 acre-feet mean annual yield at Yankton:

Requirement with 6-foot channel and reservoirs to regulate 20,000 ¹ x 2 x 240 (navigation period).....	9,600,000
Evaporation from reservoirs.....	1,000,000
Waste to coordinate flood control with navigation.....	500,000
Release during nonnavigation period for various uses.....	500,000
Total	11,600,000

15,768,000—11,600,000=4,168,000 acre-feet for upstream domestic, industrial, and irrigation use (for 2,778,000 acres).

Requirements with 9-foot channel and reservoirs to regulate 30,000 x 2 x 240 (navigation period).....	14,800,000
Evaporation.....	1,000,000
Waste	500,000
Winter release.....	500,000
Total	16,800,000

This permits no irrigation development at all.

¹ 20,000 cubic second-feet converted to acre-feet for the navigation period of 240 days per year.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, the half of the United States west of the ninety-seventh meridian has an annual rainfall that varies from 3 to 15 inches, not sufficient to grow crops without irrigation. Unless we can preserve our present use of water as now decreed by our States we shall lose our economic security so far as agricultural production, mining, and domestic use is concerned. I cannot too strongly urge your support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we in Colorado appreciate the need and value of post-war work to help care for the men returning from the armed services. This is especially true in public works done for the proper control and use of water and waterways. We wish to cooperate and assist in the control of floods, the development of new power and navigation as outlined in this bill, which in turn reduces the cost of transportation, perhaps the greatest liability of our Mountain States. However, we cannot do this unless our water rights in the upper States are properly guaranteed and protected. That is the purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah, Representa-

tive ROBINSON, and it must be adopted or we cannot afford to approve this measure no matter how beneficial it otherwise might be.

In our Colorado mountains, four great rivers rise, two flowing east to the Atlantic, one south to the Gulf of Mexico, and one draining the area west of the Rockies and emptying into the Pacific. One of these rivers, the Platte, becomes the Missouri after it leaves our State and is affected by this law. Another, the Arkansas, runs into the Mississippi farther downstream. Are not we entitled to the prior use of this water for irrigation and domestic use?

Our rainfall is insufficient for crop production without the aid of irrigation, and consequently, the whole future of agriculture in Colorado depends upon the retention by our people and our State of our present and future water rights. The use of water for irrigation means that dams and reservoirs must be built on the headwaters of those streams to hold the melting snows before they rush down to the great rivers below. Later the water is taken from these reservoirs and run through ditches and laterals to produce the moisture so necessary for our hay, sugar beets, potatoes, grain, and other products. Much of the irrigation water is returned to the streams farther down. Take from us the use of this water and our State would again return to the arid region it once was.

The Supreme Court has said that a river "offers a necessity of life that must be rationed among those who have power over it." The rights or decrees for water arising in Colorado have been filed in the courts of our State and are as important—almost more important—than the land itself. It is imperative that these State water decrees and rights be protected from future demands on the lower streams. In 1901, President Theodore Roosevelt stated in his message to Congress:

The distribution of the water, the diversion of the streams among irrigators, should be left to the settlers themselves in conformity with State laws, and without interference with these State laws or with vested rights.

This statement received the approval of Congress in the 1902 Reclamation Act, and we propose to fight any encroachment on this principle as stated in that act.

Colorado is a State larger than the States of New York and the New England States together, with a total population of 1,000,000 people, about the size of 1 large city. Our mining, agriculture, and power development is limited to the proper use of our water resources. To impair these water rights would be unfair to us and would ruin the future of our State.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we ask support for this amendment. It carries out the message to Congress of President Theodore Roosevelt, and without it we cannot support this bill, much as we appreciate its value and wish to cooperate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, next to the winning of the war and the profound hope that we have of a just and lasting peace, I should say the next most important concern to the people living in the semiarid region west of the ninety-seventh meridian would be the assurance of an adequate and secure supply of water for irrigation. I should say their greatest fear next to the losing of the war and the losing of the freedoms that we cherish most would be their justified fear of losing their right to use the irrigation water they have and of being prohibited from its further use and developments.

These are strong statements, but I believe they are true; and I say to the members of this Committee it is not a question that has just now, as was indicated in the discussion yesterday, caught our fancy, but has been a question of great concern from the time that it was discovered that food could be raised by the process of irrigation.

When it comes to a question of irrigation, to those of us who live in this region, knowing as we do that irrigation water is the lifeblood of our economy, we forget party and partisanship and close our ranks for the purpose of defending for us and those that come after us our inalienable right to pursue our way of economic life.

I do not believe, if those who are opposing this amendment really understood its importance to us, that they would oppose this amendment. As has been so well said by previous speakers in support of this amendment, we have no quarrel with navigation or flood-control projects whenever they are useful and necessary, but we do contend that we should have the right in our own way and to our own satisfaction to determine by our own State laws the use of its waters within its boundaries. My own State has done this. Next in importance to the use of water for culinary purposes and that used for the watering of livestock comes water for irrigation. Actually water is owned by the State and can only be acquired if it is put to beneficial use. Any time a user of irrigation water fails to make use of this water for a beneficial purpose the water reverts back to the State and can be allocated to some other person who will use it for a useful purpose.

I repeat again that irrigation is the lifeblood of our western country. It acts as an Aladdin's lamp to our land. For years the Government had an established price of \$2.50 an acre for its land in our section. In many cases this was an exorbitant price but when water was applied through the science of irrigation this same land immediately increased in value to \$100, \$200, \$300 per acre, and in some cases more. Indeed the basic and permanent civilization of the West has come as a result of benefits derived from the use of its streams for the production of food. Furthermore, its growth is and will be determined by the amount of irrigation water that will be available. One only has to travel through the whole western section and observe that every city, town, and hamlet is built on some

stream from whose banks flow the water that makes it possible for the people to live. This is the reason, gentlemen, that our fears are aroused when we see the danger of Federal encroachment. We do not contend for a minute that so far as the Potomac, the Ohio, and the Mississippi River are concerned, their most important use is anything but navigation. Irrigation is not a consideration. Rather than being in many cases an economic blessing, their waters are a menace and we have expended hundreds of millions of dollars to build dikes, dams, and levees to control them and lessen the danger to loss of life and property. So it seems to us that the division line of the ninety-seventh meridian certainly will not in any way injure any part of the country east of that meridian where the rivers are useful for navigation and the best interest of the country is thereby served. Likewise, we contend that no injury will come to any part of the country if the States in the arid section be permitted, by their past experience, to determine the use of their water as defined in the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON], namely, for livestock purposes, irrigation, mining and industrial uses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, those of us who represent the districts which are west of the ninety-seventh meridian are a relatively small minority in this House. On the other hand, we represent half of the United States in area. That half, of course, has its own problems, which are different from the problems of the rest of the United States. We ask your consideration at this time in our interests because of this very special problem of irrigation and reclamation so necessary to our life there. I know it is difficult for those who think of streams and lakes as means of transportation to reorient their minds to think of water as the precious fluid of life. To those of us who live in the arid and semiarid half of our great country water means life itself not only for our own living but for our crops and animals. Water law in the West is based on a different premise than water law in the East. In the West it is based on beneficial use and consumption. In the East it is based on the right of access for such purposes as transportation, fisheries, and so forth.

We from the West ask your indulgence and your support of our needs—your support of this amendment.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, this issue may be of no concern to the eastern part of the United States, but I want to impress particularly upon my colleagues on this side of the House that this is of transcendent importance to all of the arid States of the West. Yesterday it was said by a member of the committee that there have been no abuses of authority in the construction of river and harbor projects by the Army Engineer Corps. If that be true—and I have all the confidence in the world in the Army engineers—I think it is an additional safeguard and a precautionary safeguard

to provide that the water priorities of the western streams, involving the very lifeblood of the irrigated and arid sections of our country, be given precedence under State laws. I particularly appeal to the Members on my side of the House to support this amendment, which gives preference to the use of waters for domestic, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

IRRIGATION OR NAVIGATION

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I am naturally disappointed that the chairman of the committee did not see fit to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]. The amendment makes crystal clear that water within the States shall first be used for domestic, irrigation, and industrial purposes before it can be earmarked for navigation.

I wish it were possible to draw a picture for you folks living in the nonarid country showing how much water really means to a growing crop and the prosperity of a community. Nebraska, I believe, has more miles of running water than any other State in the Union. We have many excellent irrigation projects. If water was not available little or no crops could be raised.

Food has assumed a most important place in the affairs of the world. If we cannot protect the water within our State for domestic and irrigation purposes ahead of navigation then I am fearful that irrigation projects will not continue to develop and indeed some projects already in operation may suffer unless this type of an amendment is accepted in this bill.

I feel that flood control is most important and certainly the Missouri River should be kept within its bounds by dikes and levees and whatever other means may be available to prevent the disastrous floods which so frequently occur outside its channel. I believe that by putting up the dikes, floods can be controlled which have done untold damage to property and at the same time a 9-foot channel might be available for navigation. However, if it is a choice between having water for irrigation or navigation then certainly irrigation should have first place. It does little good to have satisfactory navigation unless you have some crops that can be sent down the river by navigation.

Certainly water is the lifeblood of our semi-arid regions. I urge the House to accept this amendment which will protect the water rights, the domestic and irrigation rights of the people west of the 97th meridian.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I am sympathetic with the people of the West, and there is nothing in this bill that will interfere with any rights of appropriation that they enjoy. If I may characterize the pending amendment, I would say that under the commerce clause of the Constitution Congress has the authority for navigation work such as is embraced in this bill, and for flood control. The purport of the amendment

would be to undermine the legislation for navigation and irrigation that has been passed for the Columbia River, the Sacramento River, the Missouri River, the Willamette River, and other western rivers. Under the guise of water uses and prior water appropriations we would undertake by statute, if the amendment is adopted, to repeal the Constitution of the United States which vests in Congress the supervision of navigable waters. In my judgment the apprehensions advanced by my friends from the West, are not involved, because there is nothing in the bill which would interfere with their vested or statutory rights. These rights have been safeguarded in the bill. The Western States are protected in the continued utilization of the water resources under existing law. We would undertake to amend the Constitution by statute and render void legislation for navigation and irrigation, if the amendment were approved.

I extend by saying that under the commerce clause of the Constitution it was early held that the power to regulate commerce necessarily included power over navigation.

Congress has absolute power over navigation in rivers. At the same time the States possess control of the waters within their borders, but this possession under the Constitution is subject to the jurisdiction of the United States with respect to commerce and navigation of rivers.

Inasmuch as Congress has the power to improve for navigation, any statute that subordinated this power to domestic uses or industrial purposes would be ineffective inasmuch as the commerce clause of the Constitution cannot be amended by statute. Federal, and not State, laws control on navigable streams.

The people of the arid States are unduly apprehensive. I want to protect the States in the utilization of the waters within the States for domestic use and for irrigation. I want to protect the citizens of other parts of the country in their riparian privileges and in the enjoyment of their riparian rights. All such rights, however, whether in the West or elsewhere along navigable rivers, are subordinate to improvements in the discretion of Congress for navigation and flood control.

The pending amendment means the same as a similar amendment that has been circulated among the Members of the House. The words "for the maintenance of a navigable channel" have been omitted in the pending amendment, but the meaning of the amendment without words quoted is substantially as if the words were included. The words "heretofore or hereafter" in the amendment as generally circulated have been omitted and the word "wherever" inserted. The meaning again is the same.

It is said that the amendment is necessary to protect the arid West in view of the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the *United States v. Appalachian Electric Power Co.* (311 U. S. Reports, 377). The decision is criticized because it held that improvements for navigation may

be made not only on a navigable river but on its tributaries. The criticism is without merit. There could be no navigation of a river unless the waters were contributed by its tributaries. The tributaries are the source of waters for navigation. They are also sources of waters for floods. There could be no regulation for navigation without regulation of the tributaries.

If the pending amendment is adopted, it would make the use of water for navigation subordinate to other uses, including mining and industrial uses, that would be inconsistent with the constitutional provision giving Congress the power to provide for navigation, for flood control, for power, irrigation, and conservation, as the said case, page 426, holds that flood control or protection, watershed development, and power are parts of commerce control.

Congress has been appropriating money for navigable rivers in the West for navigation for years. No conflict with respect to the domestic use of water or the use of water for irrigation has ever arisen.

Again, as I have stated, the power of Congress to authorize dams and other works for flood control on navigable streams and their tributaries is based upon the commerce clause of the Constitution. The Court has held that this power is vested in the Federal Government because these works preserve and protect navigable waterways. Such preservation and protection is a proper function of the Federal Government.

The Supreme Court has held that in the improvement of navigation and in the protection of navigable waterways, Congress may provide for other beneficial uses of water such as irrigation, recreation, and power development. Multiple-purpose reservoirs provide for flood control and for irrigation. Penstocks are installed wherever there are power probabilities.

But if the other uses than navigation were declared to be superior to navigation, as is provided in the pending amendment, Congress by such declaration would be undertaking to destroy the constitutional basis upon which these works can be built by the United States. The adoption of the amendment would undertake to repeal the commerce clause of the Constitution with respect to the power of Congress to improve rivers for navigation west of the ninety-seventh meridian. Navigable waters west of the said meridian, as well as navigable waters east of the said meridian under the commerce clause of the Constitution are under Federal control.

The proposed amendment if adopted would be unconstitutional. Certainly if the proposed amendment were adopted, navigation and flood-control projects located west of the ninety-seventh meridian would be unconstitutional.

There is no real conflict between navigation, flood control, and irrigation. Those who undertake to promote discord among the advocates of reclamation on the one hand and flood control on the other are rendering a disservice.

The Supreme Court has held on navigable rivers that navigation is the supreme and not the subordinate or incidental question. The Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *United States v. Arizona* (295 U. S. 174), held that Congress could authorize a dam across the Colorado River without regard to the jurisdiction of an adjoining State in respect of the appropriation, use, and distribution of its equitable share of water. The decision is based upon the commerce clause of the Constitution. Navigation under the Constitution is superior and not subordinate to the use, appropriation, or distribution of water.

I repeat therefore that the pending amendment to make navigation subordinate under State law is in violation of the Constitution and would render void much beneficial legislation for the arid West, including legislation to provide not only for navigation but for flood control and reclamation. The amendment should be rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, a person cannot make much of a speech on the Constitution within a minute and a half. But this amendment prohibits the use of the water for war purposes, while the war is on. It is for no purpose on earth which would benefit them. They are getting all the water they can use. They have 15,000,000 acre-feet in Fort Peck Dam now that they are not using. They could use it. Why do they not use it? The amendment would interfere with the effort of the War Department in the present war. The Secretary of War has put in the machinery there free of cost to the Reclamation Bureau, not only to pay for the cost of installing the machinery, but for its operation, all free of cost to the Reclamation Bureau. The water that is being released there now is for war purposes, to help take the ships down over the chain of rocks in the Mississippi River. It is appealed for by both the War Department and the Navy Department for that purpose. If you pass this amendment and put it in the statute then it will be left to the State law out there, which has already declared that the water cannot be used for navigation when they need it for irrigation.

The gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] requests me to state that he is in thorough accord on the opposition to this amendment. I see no reason on earth for it. They cannot benefit by it. They are getting all the water they can use and more too; and they are not using it. Why do they not use it if they are so anxious for it? There is no reason in this amendment. There is none whatever. It is unnecessary, and on the other hand, it will work a great harm, perhaps, upon the Nation in time of war.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HILL. May I inquire as to the statement of the gentleman about having all the water they need? The gentleman does not refer to Colorado, does he?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. No.

Mr. HILL. We do not have all the water we need.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. No, sir; you do not get water from Fort Peck Dam in Colorado, and you have no way of getting access to it.

Mr. HILL. We are now building a tunnel under the Rocky Mountains to bring water over from the west side to supply our dry lands, so we are not getting the amount of water we need.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Inasmuch as this bill is not effective until 6 months after the war, how can this amendment affect the war effort?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. It will be effective from the day of its approval if you pass this amendment. The only thing to be postponed until after the war will be the appropriation for the expenditures.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. If this amendment is passed, is it not true that the States up the river can cut off the water supply of the cities downstream, the great cities of Sioux City, Omaha, St. Joseph, and Kansas City, by storing up water, and we would have no recourse, and we would be cut off from the water?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. That would be possible, and before our committee some of them claimed the right to do that.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the water that we are now getting in the Missouri River and Mississippi River is diverted, it would mean there would not be a 6-foot channel in the Missouri and a 9-foot channel in the Mississippi? We will not have sufficient water. Right now ships built for the Navy come down the Mississippi. Without a 9-foot channel they could not be delivered.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Does the gentleman contend that if this water is needed for the irrigation of crops, for culinary purposes in the upper regions of the Missouri River and in these other States, that those people should be deprived of that water in order to make navigation available?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I say that if it stops every farm in America, if it closes every port in my State, for war purposes, I am for it if it is necessary for the war. I am opposed to putting anything in the statute that would prevent this Government from exercising every power necessary to win this war.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does not the gentleman believe that the production of essential food is highly important?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. It is all important; yes, sir. It is also important for you to market that.

Mr. DWORSHAK. We have got to produce it before we can market it.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Absolutely, and if you produce it and cannot market it you might as well not produce it.

Mr. DWORSHAK. We will produce it all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] has expired.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment to this bill (H. R. 3691) offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]. As a Member at Large from Nevada, a typical arid-land State west of the ninety-seventh meridian, I feel that this Congress, by express inhibition incorporated into this bill, should terminate the executive and judicial legislation which is aimed at the destruction of the rights of the people to the use of flowing waters for irrigation and reclamation.

The only title the Federal Government has to control flowing waters springs from clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, giving to Congress the power—

To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

That power has been exercised in the improvement of navigable streams in the interest of interstate commerce and the public safety. It has never been expressly extended in any statute to the control of any unnavigable stream. An unnavigable stream, by the force of the term itself, cannot serve commerce, whether interstate or local.

Under the riparian doctrine or the appropriation doctrine and under both doctrines combined, from the time of the Louisiana cession in 1803 and the Guadalupe-Hidalgo cession in 1848, and the admission of Nevada in 1864, governments never claimed the corpus of the water at all or the right to the use of water, except as subordinate to the right of the people to use it for agricultural, domestic, and power purposes. When Congress passed the Reclamation Act it provided that the Interior Department should conform to State laws in acquiring water rights to be held in trust for the use of settlers.

The abuse sought to be checked here is of modern origin. In the beginning navigability was defined as navigability in fact. But now it has been stretched to cover streams potentially navigable or formerly navigable, or to cover all the miscellaneous tributaries, headwaters, and creeks that might conceivably augment the firm or seasonal flow of a river capable of carrying commerce. Under recent decisions the definition of navigability has been so whittled away as to constitute a menace to all the rest of the public who make use of flowing waters for agricultural purposes. If this goes on farms may be dried up and farmers wiped out in aid of a mythical river-steamboat

trade so remote that its smoke will never come within a hundred miles of the farmers' homes.

Mr. Chairman, we are in the arid-land States and do not oppose commerce, although, outside of the railways, the highways, and the air transport, we see very little of it west of the ninety-seventh meridian. What we ask is protection of irrigation and reclamation which has built up the West under rights and customs, enjoyed and followed under the riparian and appropriation doctrines. We want protection through a positive statutory inhibition, against a definition of navigable waters that has no basis in any statute thus far enacted. It seems to me that when it comes to definitions Congress should be the fountainhead—not the victim.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROBINSON of Utah) there were—ayes 45, noes 70.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah and Mr. DWORSHAK demanded tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. ROBINSON of Utah and Mr. PETERSON of Georgia to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 48, noes 77.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARRETT: On page 21, strike out lines 11, 12, and 13, and the semicolon at the end of line 13.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I am going to be brief about this matter. The House has been very patient.

The amendment that I have offered is to strike lines 11, 12, and 13 on page 21. The purpose of the amendment is to strike out all reference to the Missouri River. The reason I offer that amendment is this: The Bureau of Reclamation will submit a report within 60 days, which will deal primarily with the Missouri River Basin. I think that before the House takes any action on this bill, certainly on this section of the bill, we should have before us the report of the Bureau of Reclamation. Only when that report is submitted can we intelligently discuss a comprehensive plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Do I understand that that report will amount to something like \$500,000,000?

Mr. BARRETT. As to the Missouri River Basin, I think it will amount to considerably less than the amount that is considered necessary to carry out the purposes of this particular section, which I understand is \$125,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. But the section the gentleman intends to strike out by his amendment amounts to only a few million dollars.

Mr. BARRETT. I may say to my distinguished colleague from Michigan that my understanding is that in order to

carry out effectively this particular section of the bill the committee is considering the advisability of asking for an appropriation of \$125,000,000, which will include several dams on the main stem of the Missouri River.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. Certainly, I yield to my colleague from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The purpose of the gentleman from Wyoming is to let the Bureau of Reclamation get in its report before May 1.

Mr. BARRETT. That is right.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. And on that basis perhaps some sort of reasonable agreement can be worked out between the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation which will work to the interest of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. BARRETT. That is right. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, the over-all development of the Missouri River Basin comes before this House only after consideration by three separate and distinct committees of the House. In addition to the Rivers and Harbors Committee, the Flood Control and the Committee on Reclamation and Irrigation will submit reports on various phases of the entire problem. Certainly common sense and good business should dictate that the reports of each of these committees should be considered at the same time and with relation to each other. Accordingly it seems to me that this section should be stricken from the bill until the report of the Bureau of Reclamation on the development of the Missouri River Basin is completed.

Mr. Chairman, from February 22 to date I have endeavored to obtain from the Office of the Chief of Engineers a definite statement of the amount of water presently authorized for navigation purposes between Sioux City and the mouth of the Missouri River. Although I have repeatedly requested a specific statement as to the exact amount of water necessary to fulfill the demands of a 9-foot channel 300 feet wide, as authorized by this bill, I must confess that I am as much in the dark now as before I commenced this inquiry.

Because of the fact that the people of my State are afraid that the construction of this channel, having a capacity from 32,000 to 35,000 cubic feet per second at Kansas City, notwithstanding the fact that the average annual water supply of the Missouri River at that point over a 14-year period is only about 32,250 cubic feet per second, is a dangerous threat to the future development of the State of Wyoming, and we are fearful that if this legislation is passed that by use a priority will be built up whereby that amount of water will be required and that it will thereby prevent the complete development of the irrigable areas in the upper reaches of the Missouri in my State.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the Record the correspondence in question:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 22, 1944.
Maj. Gen. THOMAS M. ROBINS,
Acting Chief of Engineers, Office of the
Chief of Engineers, War Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL ROBINS: In connection with H. R. 3961 and particularly in connection with the amendment voted by the committee, on line 13, page 21, of the bill reading as follows:

"Provided, That such improvements when accomplished shall not create any demand on the water resources of the Missouri Basin over that now authorized by existing law."

I shall appreciate it very much if you will let me know how much water is presently authorized for navigation purposes at Sioux City.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK A. BARRETT.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, February 28, 1944.
Hon. FRANK A. BARRETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BARRETT: Reference is made to your letter of February 22, 1944, referring to the item in H. R. 3961 relating to the 9-foot navigation channel in the Missouri River below Sioux City, Iowa, and the amendment thereto providing that such improvements when accomplished shall not create any demand on the water resources of the Missouri River basin over that now authorized by existing law. You ask to be informed as to how much water is presently authorized for navigation purposes at Sioux City.

The physical control of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin for navigation purposes presently authorized by Congress is limited to that effected by the creation of the Fort Peck Dam and Reservoir in Montana, some 1,100 miles upstream from Sioux City. The completion of channel improvements from the mouth to Sioux City and the construction of the Fort Peck Dam were authorized in the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935, in accordance with the plans recommended in House Document No. 238, Seventy-third Congress, second session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

In House Document No. 238, the Chief of Engineers recommended that " * * * 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 * * *." The act of Congress approved May 18, 1938, providing for the installation of facilities for the generation of electric power, recognized the navigation improvement to be the primary purpose of this reservoir. The dam proper has been completed, forming a reservoir with a maximum storage capacity of 19,412,000 acre-feet and a normal operating storage capacity of 18,400,000 acre-feet. In general, the water impounded by the dam is released systematically during low water periods to augment the natural stream flow as may be required in the interest of commerce and navigation.

As indicated in the above-cited authorizations, there is no fixed amount of water authorized by statute for navigation purposes other than the capacity of the reservoir itself. The Department merely impounds a portion of whatever stream flow actually reaches the Fort Peck Reservoir and releases

the stored waters in a manner consistent with the primary demands of navigation.

Sincerely yours,

E. REYBOLD,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 3, 1944.

Mr. GLEN PARKER,
United States Geological Survey, Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PARKER: I would like very much to know the average annual yield of the waters above Fort Peck for the past 20 years.

I shall appreciate it if you will get this information for me as soon as possible.

Yours very truly,

FRANK A. BARRETT.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
THE INTERIOR,
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1944.

Hon. FRANK A. BARRETT,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BARRETT: In reply to your letter of March 3 to Mr. Parker requesting information on the flow of Missouri River above Fort Peck:

The principal inflow to the Fort Peck Reservoir is measured at the gaging station known as Missouri River at power-plant ferry, about 30 miles southeast of Zortman. The Musselshell River enters the reservoir below the station at the power-plant ferry, and records of its flow are obtained at Mosby. Records at the power-plant ferry were started in February 1934, and supplementary records have been obtained at the Mosby station.

A summary of the records for Missouri River and tributaries in Montana collected by the Geological Survey and cooperating State and Federal agencies up to September 30, 1933, was published last year as Water Supply Paper 917. I believe this paper will be useful to you and I am enclosing a copy. The records in the form of monthly and annual figures for the station on Missouri River at power-plant ferry will be found on pages 128-129, and those for the Mosby station on Musselshell River on pages 324 to 326. The available annual figures in acre-feet for the years after 1938 are as follows:

Water year	Power-plant ferry (acre-feet)	Mosby (acre-feet)
1938-39.....	4,718,000	121,800
1939-40.....	3,761,000	16,330
1940-41.....	3,502,000	49,010
1941-42.....	7,149,000	443,300

You will note that these records cover only 8 complete years. Records have been obtained, however, on the Missouri River at Fort Benton since 1882, and these afford a good indication of the supply available for the reservoir over a long period of years. The annual figures for the Fort Benton station will be found on pages 126-127 of Water Supply Paper 917. The figures for the years following 1938 for this station are as follows:

Water year:	Fort Benton
1938-39.....	3,954,000
1939-40.....	3,136,000
1940-41.....	2,962,000
1941-42.....	5,776,000

The average annual flow for the Fort Benton station for the 61 years of record has been computed as 5,940,000 acre-feet, and the concurrent records indicate that the flow at Fort Benton is about 80 percent of the flow at the station at power-plant ferry.

The figures of annual flow for the years 1939 to 1942 have been inserted in the copy of Water-Supply Paper 917, which is enclosed.
Sincerely yours,

W. E. WRATHER,
Director.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1944.
Maj. Gen. E. REYBOLD,
Chief of Engineers, War Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL REYBOLD: I wrote your office on February 22 asking for information in connection with the amendment to H. R. 3961, agreed to by the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House, providing that the 9-foot navigation channel on the Missouri River between Sioux City and the mouth when accomplished shall not create any demand on the water resources of the Missouri River Basin over that now authorized by existing law. I acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 28, and I appreciate your prompt and frank statement contained therein.

I might state that the people of Wyoming and other States in the upper Missouri River Basin are very much concerned that if a channel 300 feet wide and 9 feet deep, having a capacity of 32,000 cubic feet per second is constructed from Sioux City to the mouth of the Missouri River, that by use, a priority may be built up whereby that amount of water will be required for navigation purposes, and consequently will prevent the complete development of the irrigable areas in the upper reaches of the Missouri and its tributaries.

It seems, therefore, highly desirable that we determine very definitely the exact amount of water that is presently authorized for navigation purposes from Sioux City to the mouth of the Missouri, in the event H. R. 3961, with the amendment referred to above, is enacted into law. In your letter of February 28, you state that "The physical control of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin for navigation purposes presently authorized by Congress is limited to that effected by the creation of the Fort Peck Dam and Reservoir in Montana . . ." In order to know the average annual yield and inflow to Fort Peck Reservoir, I wrote the United States Geological Survey on March 3 and requested that information. I am enclosing herewith a copy of the letter of Mr. W. E. Wrather, Director of the United States Geological Survey, under date of March 8.

From this letter it appears that the average annual flow, as recorded at the Fort Benton station for the 61 years on record, is 5,940,000 acre-feet. From the records as supplied in Mr. Wrather's letter, and from Water-Supply Paper 917, I have computed the inflow to the Fort Peck Reservoir as measured at the gaging station known as Missouri River at power-plant ferry and the Musselshell River at Mosby station for the 8-year period from 1934 to 1942, inclusive, a copy of which I am herewith enclosing. Over that 8-year period, it appears that the average inflow into Fort Peck is 4,589,277 acre-feet. It appears that the computations as taken over this 8-year period should be more reliable than those taken over the 61-year period at Fort Benton.

If the average annual yield at Fort Peck is 4,589,277 acre-feet, I assume that this is the entire amount of water presently authorized for navigation purposes at Sioux City. Of course, there will be a certain amount of loss before the water reaches Sioux City, and so the exact amount available will be somewhat less than that figure. I assume also that more water could be released in one year than another, although over a period of years navigation would be compelled to restrict its use to the average inflow at Fort Peck.

I will appreciate it if you will advise as soon as possible if I am correct in my assumption.

Yours very truly,

FRANK A. BARRETT.

[Enclosures.]

Summary of the records for Missouri River and tributaries in Montana collected by the United States Geological Survey and cooperating State and Federal agencies from 1934 to 1942, showing the inflow to the Fort Peck Reservoir as measured at the gaging station known as the Missouri River at power-plant ferry, about 30 miles southeast of Zortman as well as at Mosby station:

Water year	Power-plant ferry (acre-feet)	Mosby (acre-feet)
1934-35.....	4,027,000	18,420
1935-36.....	3,851,900	96,500
1936-37.....	3,213,000	77,760
1937-38.....	5,397,000	272,200
1938-39.....	4,718,000	121,800
1939-40.....	3,761,000	16,330
1940-41.....	3,502,000	49,010
1941-42.....	7,149,000	443,300
Total.....	35,618,500	1,095,320

Totals for 8-year period

	Acre-feet
Power-plant ferry.....	35,618,900
Mosby station.....	1,095,320
Total.....	36,714,220
Average for 8-year period, both stations.....	4,589,277

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,

Washington, D. C., March 11, 1944.

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT,

House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BARRETT: I have your letter of March 2, with the accompanying enclosures, in which you requested any comments regarding the probability of Fort Peck storage, if used wholly for navigation purposes, being sufficient to provide flow for a 6-foot channel at Sioux City.

Fort Peck Reservoir has a capacity of 19,400,000 acre-feet. The flow of the Missouri River at Wolf Point, Mont., according to the reports of the United States Geological Survey, has averaged for the period 1929-42, inclusive, 6,652 cubic feet per second or 4,816,000 acre-feet per year. Wolf Point, Mont., is about 40 miles below Fort Peck and also below the mouth of Milk River.

I do not have available the storage yield of the Milk River but perhaps 1,000,000 acre-feet a year would be a fair assumption and this would have to be deducted from the 4,816,000 acre-feet at Wolf Point to determine the amount which would enter Fort Peck Reservoir. Fort Peck Reservoir, therefore, has capacity to store about five times the mean yearly flow entering it.

With 3,816,000 acre-feet entering and being released from Fort Peck for a navigation season of 240 days, a flow of 7,950 c. f. s. could be maintained. This is not enough by itself to supply a 6-foot channel at Yankton. According to the Army engineers' report, House Document No. 238, Seventy-third Congress, second session, 20,000 c. f. s. is the requirement at Yankton for the 6-foot channel.

I assume therefore that it is expected to draw on other tributaries of the Missouri to furnish the additional over that made available by Fort Peck Reservoir to meet the requirements of the 6-foot channel. How the law might be construed as to the right to use such water for navigation is something which I cannot answer.

The situation appears quite complicated when one remembers that legislation for the Army engineers' work usually says that it is in accordance with plans and reports of the Chief of Engineers.

Very truly yours,

H. W. BASHORE, Commissioner.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,

Washington, March 13, 1944.

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT,

House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BARRETT: I have received your letter of March 10, with which you enclosed copies of recent correspondence on H. R. 3961.

With particular reference to the data which you enclosed from the United States Geological Survey, I note that the Survey record shows that the average annual inflow into Fort Peck Reservoir amounted to 4,589,277 acre-feet. This was for the period 1934 to 1942, inclusive. This is an average annual amount of 773,277 acre-feet in excess of the 3,816,000 acre-feet which I estimated in my letter to you of March 11, and would maintain a flow of 9,561 cubic feet per second at Yankton during the navigation period of 240 days. However, the comments which I made in my letter of March 11, regarding the sufficiency of the supply of 7,950 cubic feet per second apply as well to this amount.

Sincerely yours,

H. W. BASHORE,
Commissioner.

MARCH 14, 1944.

Maj. Gen. E. REYBOLD,

Chief of Engineers, War Department,

Washington, D. C.:

The Big Horn River flows from Wyoming into Montana; the North Platte River flows from Wyoming into Nebraska; both are tributaries of the Missouri River. Part of the stream flow of each of these rivers is presently used for irrigation of high-priced agriculture lands in Wyoming; the balance of the stream flow of each of these rivers must be conserved by storage and used for additional irrigation in Wyoming; naturally we in Wyoming are vitally concerned and accordingly I shall appreciate it very much if you will advise by wire if the present authorization for navigation on the Missouri River between Sioux City and the mouth or the proposed channel changes as provided in H. R. 3961 will hold static the present flow of the Big Horn and North Platte Rivers at the points where these rivers cross the State line of Wyoming.

FRANK A. BARRETT,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 15, 1944.

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.:

Reurlet dated March 14 I am pleased to inform you that maintenance of existing 6-foot channel or construction and maintenance of proposed 9-foot channel between Sioux City and mouth of the Missouri River will have no natural physical effect on the present flow of Big Horn and North Platte Rivers at the points where these rivers cross the State line of Wyoming. Spewr 262.

ROBINS, Acting Chief of Engineers.

MARCH 16, 1944.

Maj. Gen. E. REYBOLD,

Chief of Engineers, War Department,

Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate your wire of March 15. However am still seriously concerned as to effect of amendment to H. R. 3961 that improvements contemplated shall not create any demands on Wyoming and other waters over that now authorized by existing law. House Document 238, Seventy-third Congress, sec-

ond session, states that the operation of a 6-foot channel requires 20,000 cubic feet per second at Yankton. Do you consider that this amount of water must be supplied at Yankton? If your reply is yes, how much is to be supplied from Fort Peck now and in the future and how much, if any, is to be supplied by the tributaries below Fort Peck? In supplying the 20,000 feet at Yankton, must developments in Wyoming for irrigation consumptive use be restricted in order to meet the requirements of the channel? Under the proposed 9-foot channel which H. R. 3961 authorizes, what additional demands on upstream water would be made? Appreciate answer to this and my letter of March 9 today by wire.

FRANK A. BARRETT,
Member of Congress.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, March 17, 1944.
HON. FRANK A. BARRETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BARRETT: Reference is made to your letter of March 9, 1944, relating to the amendment to the authorization item in H. R. 3961 for the 9-foot navigation channel in the Missouri River below Sioux City, providing that such improvements when accomplished shall not create any demand on the water resources of the Missouri River Basin over that now authorized by existing law. In referring to the Department's letter of February 28, 1944, in reply to your inquiry as to the amount of water presently authorized for navigation, you state that it seems desirable that you determine very definitely the exact amount of water presently authorized for navigation purposes below Sioux City. Your letter presents a figure, based on certain stream-flow records, reported to be the average annual inflow of water into the Fort Peck Reservoir, and states that you assume the figure is the entire amount of water presently authorized for navigation. You state that you assume more water could be released in 1 year than in another and that the amount available at Sioux City will be somewhat less than the figure mentioned in your letter as the average annual yield at Fort Peck due to losses before the water reaches Sioux City. You ask to be advised if you are correct in the assumption.

Since there is no fixed amount of water authorized by statute for navigation purposes on the Missouri River other than the capacity of the Fort Peck Reservoir, it cannot be assumed that the average annual inflow into that reservoir cited in your letter is the amount of water authorized for navigation between Sioux City and the mouth of the river. The stream-flow records for the past 50 years indicate that the period between 1934 and 1942, which was used as the basis for the average annual inflow into the reservoir cited in your letter, was embraced within a dry cycle. By interpolating discharges as recorded by the Fort Benton gaging station during the period prior to 1933, the average annual flow of the river at Fort Peck since 1890 is about 65 percent greater than that during the 8-year period ending 1942. As the flow may fluctuate considerably from year to year, the amount of inflow into the reservoir is unpredictable. Accordingly, it would appear that no equitable figure could be chosen as the definite amount of water available for navigation purposes.

It is true that more water can be released from the reservoir in 1 year than in another provided such regulation of the impounded water is consistent with the demands of navigation. During a dry period the amount and duration of the releases would necessarily be greater than during a wet year when it is possible no releases would be required for

navigation. The water, instead of going to waste, is stored in the Fort Peck Reservoir for future use in the interest of navigation and other beneficial uses as now authorized by law. With respect to the volume for the releases from the Fort Peck Reservoir that actually reaches Sioux City, it may be stated that the run-off from the watershed between the dam and Sioux City, not otherwise appropriated for irrigation and related purposes, augments the reservoir releases to the extent that the average stream flow at the head of the recommended 9-foot channel is several times the amount of inflow into the reservoir.

You may be assured that the importance of conserving the water resources of the Missouri River Basin is recognized and that operation of the Fort Peck Reservoir is being so scheduled as to conserve all possible water consistent with providing for the requirements of navigation in accordance with the act of Congress authorizing its construction. In my opinion there is sufficient water supply available in the Missouri River Basin to meet all existent requirements. In order to meet the future requirements for irrigation additional reservoirs will be required. Any action in that direction, instead of restricting the use of water for navigation purposes, would advance the development of the Missouri Basin.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS M. ROBINS,
Major General, Acting Chief of Engineers.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, March 17, 1944.
HON. FRANK A. BARRETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BARRETT: Reference is made to your letter of March 9, 1944, relating to the amendment to the authorization item in H. R. 3961 for the 9-foot navigation channel in the Missouri River below Sioux City providing that such improvements when accomplished shall not create any demand on the water resources of the Missouri River Basin over that now authorized by existing law. In referring to the Department's letter of February 28, 1944, in reply to your inquiry as to the amount of water presently authorized for navigation, you state that it seems desirable that you determine very definitely the exact amount of water presently authorized for navigation purposes below Sioux City. Your letter presents a figure, based on certain stream-flow records, reported to be the average annual in-flow of water into the Fort Peck Reservoir and states that you assume the figure is the entire amount of water presently authorized for navigation. You state that you assume more water could be released in one year than in another and that the amount available at Sioux City will be somewhat less than the figure mentioned in your letter as the average annual yield at Fort Peck due to losses before the water reaches Sioux City. You ask to be advised if you are correct in the assumption.

Since there is no fixed amount of water authorized by statute for navigation purposes on the Missouri River other than the capacity of the Fort Peck Reservoir, it cannot be assumed that the average annual inflow into that reservoir cited in your letter is the amount of water authorized for navigation between Sioux City and the mouth of the river. The stream-flow records for the past 50 years indicate that the period between 1934 and 1942, which was used as the basis for the average annual in-flow into the reservoir cited in your letter, was embraced within a dry cycle. By interpolating discharges as recorded by the Fort Benton gaging station during the period prior to 1933, the average annual flow of the river at Fort Peck

since 1890 is about 65 percent greater than that during the 8-year period ending 1942. As the flow may fluctuate considerably from year to year, the amount of in-flow into the reservoir is unpredictable. Accordingly, it would appear that no equitable figure could be chosen as the definite amount of water available for navigation purposes.

It is true that more water can be released from the reservoir in one year than in another provided such regulation of the impounded water is consistent with the demands of navigation. During a dry period the amount and duration of the releases would necessarily be greater than during a wet year when it is possible no releases would be required for navigation. The water, instead of going to waste, is stored in the Fort Peck Reservoir for future use in the interest of navigation and other beneficial uses as now authorized by law. With respect to the volume for the releases from the Fort Peck Reservoir that actually reaches Sioux City, it may be stated that the run-off from the watershed between the dam and Sioux City, not otherwise appropriated for irrigation and related purposes, augments the reservoir releases to the extent that the average stream flow at the head of the recommended 9-foot channel is several times the amount of in-flow into the reservoir.

You may be assured that the importance of conserving the water resources of the Missouri River Basin is recognized and that operation of the Fort Peck Reservoir is being so scheduled as to conserve all possible water consistent with providing for the requirements of navigation in accordance with the act of Congress authorizing its construction. In my opinion there is sufficient water supply available in the Missouri River Basin to meet all existent requirements. In order to meet the future requirements for irrigation additional reservoirs will be required. Any action in that direction, instead of restricting the use of water for navigation purposes, would advance the development of the Missouri Basin.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS M. ROBINS,
Major General, Acting Chief of Engineers.

MARCH 18, 1944.

MAJ. GEN. E. REYBOLD,
Chief of Engineers, War Department,
Washington, D. C.:

Re your wire March 17, 1944, navigation proposals for Missouri River. You express opinion these proposals will not adversely affect irrigation uses in Wyoming and I assume you mean also in other upper States. It would appear that in view of this opinion on your part you would have no objection to protective language in H. R. 3961 to insure such upper uses against possible adverse effects. Shall appreciate answer by wire today.

FRANK A. BARRETT,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D. C.,
March 20, 1944.

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Reurtel 18 March under departmental regulations and practice of long standing official expressions of opinion of merits of proposed legislation are made only through established channels and in response to formal request from congressional committee having such legislation under consideration. Compliance with your request would therefore not be appropriate spewr 280.

ROBINS,
Acting Chief of Engineers.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this proposed expenditure between Sioux City and Kansas City on the Missouri River is to complete work now in process. The work on this section, according to Colonel Freeman, the district engineer, is 91 percent completed. The total Missouri River project is a \$200,000,000 development and is approximately 95 percent completed.

The appropriation involved is \$6,000,000 on a small segment of the Missouri River. It is supplemental with the larger project of flood control throughout the entire basin.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment. The Army engineers have carefully gone into this Missouri River project, have issued their report, and have recommended that the project be authorized. As the gentleman from Nebraska just said, the project is 91 percent completed at this time. It seems to me that in considering this bill we should do so from the viewpoint that it is an over-all development of a particular program, and we should not let these sectional interests enter in. In my judgment, no section along the Missouri River, or any river, as far as that is concerned, has any priority on the rainfall which ultimately gets into the channels of the river.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I may state, in regard to the amount of wheat and flour shipped in 1 year down the Missouri River, it has already saved over \$400,000 to the farmers there.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Judging from the official reports, it seems to me that there is going to be enough water in the Missouri River Valley to take care of all the needs for reclamation, irrigation, navigation, and whatever is involved in this particular program.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I should like to point out in that connection that an amendment which was adopted yesterday, the so-called committee amendment to the Missouri project, states that the accomplishment of this project shall be done without increasing the water demanded beyond the projects previously authorized by law. Those projects previously authorized by law as far as the Missouri River is concerned are a 6-foot channel and the Fort Peck Reservoir.

With that amendment in the bill this project does not change the water demands on the Missouri River one iota, and with that limiting amendment it should not be involved in any further consideration of the Missouri River; that is whatever the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers may agree upon for new uses of the river above Sioux City is not going to be affected by this project in view of the amendment which has been adopted, and I think the chairman of the committee will confirm that that was the in-

terpretation of the amendment at the time it was discussed with the committee, and it has been the interpretation accepted here in the House during all the debate.

Mr. HOEVEN. In the light of all the amendments which have been introduced here it seems that there is some organized attempt to hamper the proposed Missouri River program.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that at the point where I interrogated the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] I may extend my own remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this occasion to call the attention of the House to what is perhaps the smallest item in this bill, but which in a way, nevertheless, is one of the most significant items.

You will find on page 25 of the bill a little item for the improvement of the Salmon River in Oregon. It is the smallest of the many projects in the State of Oregon which are authorized in this bill, and which range in cost from a few thousand dollars to several million dollars. It involves an expenditure of only \$5,000 for the purpose of removing a large rock from the entrance of a very small coastal river in Oregon.

A few small fishing vessels, having a draft of 2 or 3 feet use the estuary of this little stream as a home port and sometimes as a harbor of refuge. Some of them have been wrecked in bad weather on this rock. There was no sea-borne commerce, of course, on this little stream, and nobody had ventured a suggestion that there ever would or could be any. Likewise, on account of its small volume of water nobody ever suggested that it contained any hydro-electric power possibilities. Such a suggestion would have been ridiculous. We simply wanted that rock removed so that it would not wreck the fishing boats and that was the entire purpose and scope of the project.

This little project was first proposed by me in 1938, when I introduced a resolution authorizing a survey by the Army engineers with a view to improving the entrance to this stream by removing the rock. This resolution was approved and the survey was authorized by H. R. 10298, Public Law No. 685, Seventy-fifth Congress. The survey was made and the project was recommended by the district engineer, the division engineer and the Board of Army Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and was duly transmitted to the Congress by the Secretary of War, as provided by law, in 1940.

Now why, Mr. Chairman, do I say this simple little project is significant. It is

significant because it was the first piece of legislation, so far as I can learn, with which an executive agency of the Government, unauthorized by any act of Congress, openly tried to interfere. That agency was the National Resources Planning Board, which the Congress has since abolished because of its unauthorized, pernicious interference with the orderly processes of legislation.

In the debate on the 1940 appropriation bill, in which I endeavored to prevent the appropriation of any further funds for this agency, I took occasion to cite this little Salmon River project as an example of the methods used by the National Resources Planning Board to interfere with and to undermine constitutional and orderly processes of Congressional legislation. The speech will be found on pages 4455-56 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 12, 1940.

That was a long time ago. We have not had a general river and harbor bill since that time. And so I am going to briefly recite the facts here in connection with the pending bill, which again revives and authorizes this little project.

When the Secretary of War on January 8, 1940, transmitted to the Congress, through the Speaker of the House, the favorable report of the Army engineers on the Salmon River project (H. Doc. No. 551, 76th Cong., 3d sess.), his letter of transmittal contained this statement:

In forwarding this report your attention is invited to the accompanying memorandum from the President in which he indicates his disapproval of the project on the ground that it is not justified by the population or water-borne commerce affected, and because it is a part of a larger comprehensive project on the Columbia and Salmon Rivers.

Knowing, of course, no comprehensive project either of power or navigation on this very small stream was involved in the engineers' report, and that all that was intended was to remove a rock so that small fishing boats could enter and leave the entrance without being destroyed, I undertook to find out, if I could, why the President should go out of his way, before the report even reached the Congress, to put in an objection to it. The memorandum to which the Secretary of War referred was printed at the very beginning of the engineers' report, and was boldly initialed, "F. D. R." This is what the memorandum said:

I cannot approve this project for the entrance of the Salmon River. The population of less than 200 does not warrant it; existing water-borne commerce does not justify it, and this is essentially a part of a larger project which will undoubtedly be undertaken by the Government in connection with the development of navigation and power on the Columbia and Salmon Rivers. It should wait until then.

I found out that the President, of course, knew nothing about the Salmon River, and it was obvious that he could not have read the Army engineers' report to which he had attached this memorandum, and which was simple, plain, and unambiguous, and which comprehended only the removal of this rock. The President had undertaken, nevertheless, to veto this little item prior to the time it

was considered by the Congress. I learned he had done this upon the recommendation of the National Resources Planning Board, to whom the engineers' report had been submitted without any authority of law whatever. The law requires that these reports be submitted by the Secretary of War directly to the Congress. Not even the President is entitled to receive them, or in any way to interfere with their direct transmission to Congress. Yet here was the National Resources Planning Board, which had never been even authorized by Congress, holding up this report and recommending to the Congress what it ought to do about it.

I found also, upon further investigation, that this National Resources Planning Board had undertaken to interfere with other legislation in the same way, in connection with a half-dozen other similar bills, but, as I said in the beginning, it was in my speech of April 12, 1940, that this pernicious and illegal interference of the Board in legislation was first brought directly to the attention of the Congress and the country.

From that time to this I have overlooked no opportunity to make known the unauthorized and harmful activities of the National Resources Planning Board, one of the main objectives of which has been to interfere with the ordinary processes of legislation in this Congress, and I have never ceased in demanding that this agency be abolished.

I am glad to say that the Congress of the United States since that time has decided that this agency, which it never authorized in the first place, should no longer exist, and that in the last session of Congress we finally took away the appropriations from the National Resources Planning Board so that it could no longer operate.

I am particularly happy, Mr. Chairman, now that the National Resources Planning Board is a thing of the past, that this little Salmon River project is included in the pending bill. Its history, as I have said, is significant for the reason I have stated, but only for that reason. It is not, as the President's memorandum stated, an essential part of a larger and more comprehensive project involving navigation and power. It is just a project to remove a rock in a very small stream so that little fishing boats may safely use it; and yet I think it has played its part in contributing to the abolishment by Congress of one of the most harmful executive agencies the Congress has ever dealt with.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to allot not to exceed \$300,000 from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for any one fiscal year for improvement of rivers and harbors, for removing accumulated snags and other debris, and for protecting, clearing, and straightening channels in navigable harbors and navigable streams and tributaries thereof, when in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers such work is advisable in the interest of navigation or flood control.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: On page 29, after line 21, insert new section, as follows:

"SEC. 3. That (a) the consent, permission, and authority granted to the Commissioners of Lincoln Park, now superseded by the Chicago Park District, a municipal corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Illinois to exercise jurisdiction over the navigable waters of Lake Michigan which lie within the following-described boundaries:

"Beginning at a point at the intersection of the existing bulkhead along Lake Shore Drive in Chicago, Ill., with the existing pier which is parallel to and north of Ohio Street extended and south of Ontario Street extended; thence easterly along said pier to a point in a line parallel to and 350 feet easterly of said bulkhead along the Lake Shore Drive; thence northwesterly along said last-described line to a point in a curve of 200 feet radius and tangent both to said last-described line and to a line 350 feet southerly from the southerly side of and parallel to the shore arm extension breakwater extending into Lake Michigan from a point near the intersection of Oak Street and Lake Shore Drive; thence along said curve to a point in said line last described; thence easterly along said line to a point in a line at right angles with said shore arm extension breakwater at the eastern extremity thereof; thence northward along said last-described line to said shore arm extension breakwater; thence westward along said shore arm extension breakwater to the shore line; and (b) the right granted to said The Commissioners of Lincoln Park, now superseded by the Chicago Park District, to destroy the navigability of the above-described waters altogether, and (c) the right granted to said The Commissioners of Lincoln Park, now superseded by the Chicago Park District, to erect an additional breakwater to connect the said shore arm extension breakwater near the intersection of Oak Street and Lake Shore Drive with the shore line, and (d) the transfer of possession of said shore arm extension breakwater to said The Commissioners of Lincoln Park, now superseded by the Chicago Park District, and the obligation for the permanent care, custody, and maintenance of said shore arm extension breakwater by The Commissioners of Lincoln Park, now superseded by the Chicago Park District, all as provided for by the act entitled "An act granting to The Commissioners of Lincoln Park the right to erect a breakwater in the navigable waters of Lake Michigan, and transferring jurisdiction over certain navigable waters of Lake Michigan to The Commissioners of Lincoln Park", approved March 3, 1931, be rescinded.

"The United States of America hereby resumes jurisdiction over the above-described waters and above-described shore arm extension breakwater, and hereby discharges the Chicago Park District, successor to the superseded The Commissioners of Lincoln Park, from its liability for the permanent care, custody, and maintenance of said shore arm extension breakwater.

"Said Chicago Park District shall signify its acceptance of this act by written notice to the Secretary of War within 60 days after the passage of this act, and this section shall become effective immediately upon its acceptance by said Chicago Park District. In the event of nonacceptance within 60 days this section shall become null and void."

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this merely involves property that was turned over to a local concern out there for certain purposes. The

property belonged to the Government. This concern no longer wants to use it for that purpose and wants to return it to the Government free of cost.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to rescind the act approved March 3, 1931, and to provide for resumption of jurisdiction by the United States over the waters and shore-arm extension breakwater, and for the discharge of the Chicago Park District from its liability for the permanent care, custody, and maintenance of said shore-arm extension breakwater. It requires acceptance by the said Chicago Park District, to be signified by written notice to the Secretary of War within 60 days after passage, and provides that upon failure of said Chicago Park District to so signify its acceptance this section shall become null and void.

The shore-arm extension breakwater was built by the United States in 1914-17 as part of the project authorized by Congress to provide an anchorage basin and protect the Navy pier. The maintenance of this breakwater is still necessary for the protection of the harbor, but is no longer required or being maintained by the Chicago Park District.

The item was originally included in H. R. 6264, river and harbor bill, which passed the Congress in April 1940, but was vetoed by the President on May 1, 1940. It was again included in the river and harbor bill introduced in the Seventy-seventh Congress. However, the bill died with the adjournment of the Seventy-seventh Congress. The War Department and the Bureau of the Budget have approved the proposed legislation—see letter from the War Department to the Honorable JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, chairman, Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, dated May 15, 1939, printed in House Report 1431, Seventy-seventh Congress.

It is believed the proposed legislation is essential at this time, and I hope it will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: Page 29, after line 21, insert the following section:

"SEC. 4. The excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not be applicable to lands which will receive a water supply from the Central Valley project, California, reauthorized by section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937."

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment just offered on the ground that it modifies the fundamental reclamation laws, therefore is not germane to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] desire to be heard?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] to reply.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, in regard to the point of order made by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], permit me to say that the Central Valley project as stated in the amendment was reauthorized by section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937; therefore this amendment is germane to the pending bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. It is an amendment to that act.

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COSTELLO). The Chair is ready to rule.

In view of the fact that the amendment is directed to an amendment of the River and Harbor Act of 1937, the Chair believes the subject matter of the pending amendment is in keeping with the rules of the House regarding germaneness. For that reason the Chair overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California as a substitute for the committee amendment: Page 29, after line 21, insert the following section:

"SEC. 4. The excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation lands shall not be applicable to any tract of land that may receive water from the Central Valley project, California, reauthorized by section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937, which is held by any one landowner having equitable or legal title on August 26, 1937, or by the heir or devisee of such owner, and which has been farmed by irrigation each crop season since and including 1937: *Provided*, That veterans shall, under suitable regulation, have preference in obtaining, under applicable legislation, the family-sized farms that will be made available on the Central Valley project."

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very important and serious proposition. First of all, I would like to say that I understand the purpose of its having been offered. It will be said by people who disagree with me, and with some justification, that there are already holdings in excess of 160 acres, some of them very, very much in excess of that amount, whose owners now are irrigating them, and that an application of this limitation would work a hardship on those holdings.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment, I want to point out clearly, will not affect any land that was already being irrigated on the date that the Central Valley Project Act was passed, but it will affect the possibility of thousands upon thousands of acres of undeveloped land belonging, in many instances, to large commercial land

companies, being tremendously appreciated in value, because those companies will be able to take advantage of this reclamation water, made possible by expenditure of public money, in the first instance, at least, to enhance the value of those lands and sell to the working farmers at that greatly increased price.

It seems to me if we are looking forward to making it possible for the veterans of this war to settle on the lands of America, if we want to have family-sized farms be the rule under the reclamation projects, the committee amendment is vastly too broad and my substitute should be adopted instead.

In addition, the Reclamation Bureau is at the present time making a study of this whole question, and substantial legislation will, in the near future, be considered by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, where this matter really belongs, and not as an amendment to a river and harbor bill. I agree there are problems. But they need mature and careful consideration, which cannot be given here.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. Is the gentleman aware that a similar provision has been enacted into law in connection with the Colorado-Big Thompson and other reclamation projects where the land was held in private ownership that was within the reclamation district?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I know it was done in the case of the Colorado-Big Thompson. I do not know about the facts in that situation. I do believe, however, wherever that limitation is lifted and it is allowed to affect undeveloped land, that we are doing something that will cost the working farmer money—sometimes a lot of money—and that is what I want to prevent. I think the purpose of a reclamation project is to make it possible for this water to be used on family-sized farms and not for the purpose of enabling land companies to speculate as a result of the reclamation project.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman know that the very thing he advocates has been done by this House in passing a bill to prevent speculation in the great Columbia River district?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right, and it seems to me that this committee amendment is a backward step from the action the House took in that connection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will yield to the gentleman, and then I hope I will not be asked to yield again. I do not have much time and other people are going to get time after I am through.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Since he has mentioned it, will the gentleman name some of the large companies that will be benefited, as he says?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not think it important to do that, but if the gentleman insists, the Kern County Land Co. is one of them, which would, I believe, be affected.

Mr. ELLIOTT. What other companies?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not believe it makes any difference about the names of companies.

Mr. ELLIOTT. All right; that one company.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That one company and others own a very considerable amount of land much of which is still undeveloped. If we are interested in our returning veterans, if we are interested in the small farmers, if we really want this reclamation project to be a benefit to the family-farm type of American agriculture, in which I believe, at any rate, my substitute ought to be put in instead of the committee amendment.

There has been a good deal of money expended on the Central Valley project, and irrigation is perhaps the most important single part of the whole project.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Would not the effect of the gentleman's amendment be to make this project conform to the general reclamation law?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It would come a lot closer. I thank the gentleman for that contribution. My substitute would bring the thing into conformity with the reclamation law, with the exception that anyone who did have under irrigation lands in excess of 160 acres on the date when the Central Valley Act was first passed, and therefore when people were put on notice that the reclamation laws would in the future apply, could continue to get water on a larger acreage, but otherwise they could not go against the basic reclamation law.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. Do I understand the committee amendment to mean that it raises the limitation of 160 acres that anyone can take under the irrigation and reclamation law?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right. The committee amendment is wide open. There would be absolutely no limit on the amount of land that any one owner could have and get reclamation water for, which means, of course, that the small man would be shut out; and not only that, if he did buy land he would pay the appreciated, higher value, due to the fact that the big holder had the water already.

Mr. IZAC. Does the gentleman think it will help the speculators who are out to sell land to the returning soldiers?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is exactly what it would do.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Would the gentleman's amendment tend to bring the existing law into conformity with what we did in the Columbia River Basin situation?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman. That is precisely what it would do.

Mr. Chairman, there has not been very much time since I learned about the adoption of this amendment to work on the matter. My amendment is an attempt to see if we cannot do something within reason here in the House in order that the whole matter may be threshed out in some fundamental fashion, with due consideration being given to it. I realize there is a problem in certain instances here, but I certainly do not want to see the House in a moment of time "chuck" the whole basic reclamation law in regard to the Central Valley project, without raising my voice in protest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to have 5 additional minutes in opposition to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Then I ask unanimous consent that all debate close in 10 minutes, the 10 minutes to be allotted to the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I happen to be the one Member in Congress whose people the committee amendment would benefit and whose people the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] would affect.

In the first place, the Central Valley project was authorized to give water to the south San Joaquin Valley. All of that territory, with the exception of a few acres, lies in my congressional district.

To date the Federal Government has spent \$150,000,000 for an irrigation project to give the people water to produce food upon their land, yet to date not one gallon of water has been given to the farmer.

To show you that the gentleman from southern California [Mr. VOORHIS] does not know anything about this at all, he named one big company, the Kern County Land Co. The Kern County Land Co. will not need any of the water from the Central Valley project, I would like to inform the gentleman from southern California. I cannot conceive of any Member of Congress coming up out of his own congressional district to interfere with people whom he does not represent.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? He ought to yield to me.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I am not going to yield to the gentleman because he does not know anything about it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman has mentioned my name. I yielded to him in my time. If the gentleman does not want to yield, it is all right with me.

Mr. ELLIOTT. It is?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to ask the gentleman whether it is not true that a very considerable amount of the land that will be affected is owned in large holdings and undeveloped at the present time by various land owners?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is not a true statement. There are about a million and a half acres of land that this project was set up to assist with a supplemental supply of water. The new acreage that the gentleman talks about amounts to 285,000 to 300,000 acres of land in the San Joaquin Valley. This project was set up to take care of all farmers that are already farming, and whose water tables are being depleted. Lord help this country if we have farmers today sacrificing all holdings more than 160 acres of land.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. When this came before our committee it was shown that 60 percent of the land was owned by people owning more than 160 acres of land.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct.

Mr. DONDERO. And that 40 percent of the little owners were asking for this particular amendment in order to relieve them.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes. I hold in my hand telegrams and resolutions that represent practically every farmer in the San Joaquin Valley, asking that this provision be taken out, little and big all alike, and I have not one asking the opposite. My people, not the gentleman's people of Los Angeles—my people have been paying the bill, and paying it most dearly. We have been endeavoring to get water to help produce food, and it is this kind of propaganda being put out in the State of California that has today stopped the Central Valley project from going ahead—false propaganda, misrepresentations; and I hold in my hand again the plea of my people, and the time has come when we must listen to the people who will pay the bill. My people are going to pay for this water, not the gentleman's people in southern California, and when we had a fight on this issue in the State of California at the time one of the finest Governors we ever had was in office—his brother is now a Member in this House—Governor Rolph, he pleaded with the people of southern California to assist, and the southern California group voted against the project, but we were able to defeat them at that.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yielded to the gentleman once, and I do not believe that

he can enlighten me on this project any more.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I just wanted to say that I supported that project strongly and was for it from the beginning.

Mr. ELLIOTT. And I point out to the House that 60 percent of our farmers own more than 160 acres. All of those farmers should have more than 160 acres of land to make a decent living. This project should not be held down to 40 percent of the small farmers, because the cost would be too great. Let us be sensible. Would I be in the well of this House pleading with you if I did not have the full support of my people who are going to pay for this project in the San Joaquin Valley? I certainly would not. I hold telegrams and resolutions from every water district, and you must have those water districts formed in order to purchase this water when the project is complete. But this project has been set up, so far, not to provide water for the farmers.

As recently as this week, before the Committee on Appropriations, members of the Interior Department Reclamation Division admitted that they had spent all the money for power and nothing for water. A group of five committee members visited that locality last summer. They saw the Friant Dam complete. It has been complete for practically 2 years, except for the gates, and they are available. Nine hundred thousand acre-feet of water wastes through the gates going to the sea. Twenty million dollars of your money has been spent, and not 1 dollar spent to open up the canal so that the farmers can get the water. It is imperative that we form these water districts. My people are not going to form them to be strangled by not being allowed to have more than 160 acres of land. I know the gentleman's program, but I do not go along on that sort of line—socialistic. If we would listen to some people in the United States, each farmer would be farming 5 and 10 and 15 acres, and we would be paying subsidies and asking the taxpayers to make up the difference. We have to get away from that. Let us give a man enough to make a living. Let us give a man enough to make a living, I say, so that he does not have to have a subsidy from the Government. I have been watching this project. I am a farmer, I own my own land, and I know what it is to till the land. The average man who can rear a family today in California in certain types of farming, dairying, needs more than 160 acres to operate a decent kind of a dairy. Anybody knows that. This is not anything new. All we ask is to take this limitation off, so that the small farmer can afford to pay for the water, and so that the large farmer will not have part of his land destroyed. He has been paying taxes and owns water rights. Let us give them all proper protection and pass the committee amendment and defeat the amendment that the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] offered as a substitute. I say to the House again, and I speak in all earnestness, that the Central Valley project is what I came

to Washington for and nothing else. It was to try to get water for the people of the San Joaquin Valley. In my congressional district last year, the richest in all the United States, we produced over \$200,000,000 worth of food and fiber. We are helping to win the war. We have been strangled and sold down the river. We have been driven into a power project, from a water project supposed to be given to the farmers. There are Members sitting on the floor here who can stand up, members of the Committee on Appropriations, who will tell you that I am speaking the truth. I am not for large holding companies to make easy money out of this project, but, gentlemen, these companies have been farming out there for years. I have not seen anybody getting rich. People are trying to leave the farms, instead of coming to them. I saw a piece of property just after the first of the year, and we are talking about the big farmer, where they are operating today and where one man takes the place of 23 in their operation, and we could not feed the Nation if it were not for the large farmer and his operations. If we are going to limit the farmer, we might as well say to Henry Ford that he can only make 20 automobiles in a year, because Charlie across the road only wants to make that many.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. As I understand it a committee amendment is before the House, and the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis] has offered an amendment to the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has offered a substitute for the committee amendment. The question before the House is, Shall the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from California be agreed to?

The question was taken, and the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, one of the most important duties of our Government and especially this Congress is to plan and prepare now for the after-war program of providing work and employment for the millions of boys who are today sacrificing everything to preserve free government in America.

I have the honor of representing one of the greatest industrial areas in the United States, located on the shores of Lake Michigan and immediately adjacent to the southern borders of the city of Chicago. At no spot in America are there greater possibilities for manufacturing expansion than the Calumet region of Indiana, with its present railroad and water transportation on Lake Michigan to the north, and its river and canal connections with the Mississippi to the southwest.

The provisions in H. R. 3961 calling for an authorization to develop the natural water transportation opportunities in

the Illinois-Indiana Calumet area is of prime importance, and its construction would bring to this district hundreds of industries and the giving of employment to thousands of workers and returning war veterans. We hear a great deal of lip service, conversation, and resolutions about post-war planning and the necessity of giving employment to the millions of boys who in a short time will return from the battle front. The only practical way to provide jobs is to lay the foundation for industry and manufacturing. The authorization by Congress of this Indiana-Illinois river and canal project would be a major step in post-war planning in the Middle West.

This district is the center of steel manufacturing, and on the Indiana side we have East Chicago with fifty-odd important industries, the city of Hammond with approximately 80, and Whiting with its large oil refineries and other industries. Immediately to the southeast we have Gary with the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation and its subsidiaries which produce millions of tons of steel per year. This corporation owns and maintains its own harbor, known as the Gary Harbor, on Lake Michigan and receives at this port many tons of iron, coal, and stone by deep-draft vessels on the Great Lakes.

The Universal Atlas Cement Co. is also located between Gary and Indiana Harbor with its Buffington Lake Harbor where it receives many tons of material by deep-draft vessel.

In addition to the above, the city of Gary has the American Bridge Co., the Tubular Alloy Steel Corporation, the Union Drawn Steel Corporation, the Standard Steel Spring Corporation, and the Gary Screw & Bolt Co. and other smaller industries shipping many thousands of tons annually out of this area. I am mentioning the above regarding the city of Gary because with a very small comparative expense the Army engineers could extend the barge canal along the Grand Calumet River from the juncture of the Indiana Harbor Canal in East Chicago to Clark Road at the city limits of Gary and afford these industries inland waterway transportation to points south.

I might say that the State of Indiana, the administrative and the State planning board, along with the municipalities of all the industrial cities in the Calumet area, their chambers of commerce, all civic organizations, and various labor groups have been advocating for years the development of the Calumet region's natural inland-waterway possibilities. Organized labor in my district can see the unlimited possibilities if this great Government improvement is made; it might prove to be the barrier which would protect us from another unemployment depression similar to 1930, 1931, and 1932.

If this additional transportation facility becomes a reality, grouped with our railroad and lake transportation, we would in 20 years see an industrial development along the south shore of Lake Michigan which will give employment to hundreds of thousands of American citizens. This development, based on its

phenomenal growth in the last 25 years, undoubtedly will come. Heavy industry throughout the State of Indiana is confined greatly to the Calumet district, and this rapid growth has taken place in spite of only a limited, one-way water transportation.

The freight transportation problems of this region are common to both Indiana and Illinois, and the Army engineers who have given this area so much of their time and constructive thought are deserving of the thanks and gratitude of all our citizens.

This bill, as far as it pertains to the Illinois-Indiana Waterway and Canal, calls for the widening of the Calumet Sag Channel from 60 to 160 feet and keeping it at the present depth of 9 feet; the Grand Calumet River would be widened from 100 feet and depth to 6 feet, to 160 and 9 feet. It also calls for the replacement of an inadequate lock in the Little Calumet River and providing for railroad bridges. Local interests pay for the highway bridges and also provide for all adjacent land.

If this project receives the final approval of the Army engineers, within a short time after its completion there will be hundreds of new industries demanding perfect rail and water transportation move in to this Indiana Calumet district. In a short time the freight transportation of this area would be more than tripled. This great influx of industries will extend to our railroads a greater volume of business in freight transportation, far more than they enjoy in and out of this area at the present time. It was water transportation down Lake Michigan to Gary and East Chicago that provided the iron ore for the mammoth steel mills which produce the finished products for the railroads to transport in all directions. In numerous areas throughout our Nation railway and water transportation are interdependable. The growth of one assures the progress of the other and vice versa.

I am not familiar with all the proposed projects set out in this legislation, H. R. 3961, but I am thoroughly acquainted with the project referred to as the Illinois Waterway, Illinois, and Indiana Harbor and Canal, Indiana, House Document Number 145, in this bill. This project has been certified as economically sound after long study by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army.

We have found that the future of the democratic world depends upon ships and shipping; let us not retard commercial progress, as we would be in a deplorable condition today if it were not for our present Federal waterway system. When initiated, other waterway projects, vital to us now, were criticized or condemned by selfish interest and short-sighted groups.

I have every confidence that if there are any projects in this legislation not meritorious and economically sound, they will be refused by the War Department and Army engineers if Congress makes this authorization.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the next section in the bill is section No. 3 for surveys. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of section 3 be dispensed with and that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Section 3 reads as follows:

Sec. 3. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to direct to cause preliminary examinations and surveys to be made at the following-named localities, the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such purposes: *Provided*, That no preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate for new works other than those designated in this or some prior act or joint resolution shall be made: *Provided further*, That after the regular or formal reports made as required by law on any examination, survey, project, or work under way or proposed are submitted no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law: *And provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this act until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law: *Provided further*, That reports of surveys on beach erosion and shore protection shall include an estimate of the public interests involved, and such plan of improvement as is found justified, together with the equitable distribution of costs in each case: *And provided further*, That this section shall not be construed to interfere with the performance of any duties vested in the Federal Power Commission under existing law:

Beals Harbor, Maine.
Blue Hill Harbor, Maine.
Macks Point, Searsport, Maine, with a view to the construction of a harbor.
Scarboro River, Maine, between Prouts Neck and Pine Point.
Bunganuc Creek, Maquoite Bay, Maine.
Cathance River, Maine.
Winterport Harbor, Maine.
Cundys Harbor, Maine.
Wood Island Harbor, Maine, and the pool at Biddeford.
For a continuous waterway between Portland, Maine, and Boston, Mass., inland where possible.

Waterway from Plum Island Sound to the Annisquam River, Essex County, Mass.
Ipswich River, Plum Island Sound and Fox Creek, Mass.

Fall River Harbor, Mass.
Channel to Hog Island, Hingham Bay, Mass.

Eightmile River, Conn.
Moriches Inlet, N. Y.
Centerport Harbor, Long Island, N. Y.
Shinnecock Inlet, Long Island, N. Y.
Fire Island Inlet, N. Y.
Saw Mill River, N. Y.
Bronx River, N. Y.
Westchester Creek, N. Y.
Hutchinson River, N. Y.
Steinway Creek, Astoria, N. Y.
Champlain Canal, N. Y., with a view to its improvement without taking title to said canal and its appurtenances.

Hudson River, at or near North German-town, Columbia County, N. Y.

Hudson River at the mouth of Endikill Creek, N. Y., with a view to constructing a small boat anchorage basin.

Mohawk River, N. Y.
Hackensack River, N. J.
Salem River, Salem County, N. J.
Fishing Creek, Cumberland County, N. J.
Cheesapeake Creek, N. J.
Schuylkill River, Pa., to determine whether navigation conditions may be improved, and

if the increasing cost of maintenance due to silting in the channels of the Schuylkill and Delaware Rivers may be lessened, and flood heights controlled, by the construction of impounding and settling reservoirs to prevent the encroachment of mining wastes.

Waterway from Indian River Inlet to Rehoboth Bay, Del.

Marumsc Creek, lower Somerset County, Md.

Websters Cove, Somerset County, Md., with a view to constructing a jetty in the project channel.

Taylor's Landing, Worcester County, Md.
Channel from Charlestown, Northeast River, Md., to Havre de Grace.

Channel from Havre de Grace, Md., to Red Point, via Stump Point and Carpenter Point.
Honga River and Tar Bay, including channel into and harbor in Back Creek, Hooper Island, Md.

Channel in Honga River, to the plant of White and Nelson, Hoopersville, Md.

Harbor at Public Landing, Worcester County, Md.

Cambridge Harbor, Md.

Rockhall Harbor, Md.

Ross Cove (Magothy River), Md.

Cambridge Harbor, Md.

Coxes Creek, tributary of Stony Creek, Md.

Channels to Lake Ogleton and Walnut Lake, Anne Arundel County, Md.

Channel from Kent Island Narrows to Well Cove, Chester River, Md.

Port Tobacco Creek, Md.

Hellens Creek, Calvert County, Md.

Channel from Rhodes Point to Tylerton, Somerset County, Md.

St. Patricks Creek, Md.

Big Kingston Creek, St. Marys County, Md.

Tanners Creek, St. Marys County, Md.

Parkers Creek, Calvert County, Md.

Chester River Channel, Md.

Potomac and Anacostia Rivers and adjacent waters in and near the District of Columbia, with a view to attaining a comprehensive and coordinated improvement and development of such waters and their shores. In determining the recommendations to be made with respect to such improvement and development, consultations shall be had with, and consideration given to the recommendations of, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Potomac River and tributaries at and below Washington, D. C., with a view to elimination of the waterchestnut.

Potomac River at and near Washington, D. C.

Potomac and Anacostia Rivers at and near Washington, D. C., with a view to providing a municipal sailing base.

Farnham Creek, Richmond County, Va.

Southwest side of Rappahannock River, in vicinity of Bowers Wharf, Essex County, Va., to secure harbor of refuge and connecting channels.

Finneys Creek, Accomac County, Va., and the channel connecting said creek with Wachapreague Inlet and the Atlantic Ocean.

Jackson Creek, Westmoreland County, Va.

Bonum Creek, Westmoreland County, Va.

Kings Creek, Northampton County, Va.

Bransons Cove, lower Machodoc River, Va.

Taskmers Creek, Northumberland County, Va.

Davis Creek, Mathews County, Va.

Dyer Creek, Mathews County, Va.

Deep Creek, Accomac County, Va.

Browns Bay, Gloucester County, Va., and the channel connecting said bay with Mob-jack Bay.

Parrotts Creek, Middlesex County, Va.

The Hague (Smith Creek), Va.

Southern Branch of Elizabeth River, Norfolk Harbor, Va.

Chuckatuck Creek, Nansemond and Isle of Wight Counties, Va.

Little Creek, Princess Anne County, Va.

Channel from the Thoroughfare to Albe-marle Sound, N. C., either by way of lower Cashie River, Middle River, and Bachelors Bay, or by way of any other route.

Purviance Creek, New Hanover County, N. C.

Little Pee Dee River, S. C., from junction of the Lumber River to the Great Pee Dee River, with a view to removing logs, debris, and other obstructions.

Jefferys Creek, Florence County, S. C.

Murrells Inlet, S. C.

North River, Ga.

St. Marys River, Ga. and Fla.

Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville to Miami, Fla., with a view to providing an auxiliary side channel from the Intracoastal Waterway near Titusville through, and easterly of, Merritt Island via Banana Creek and River, to, or near, Eau Gallie, Fla.

Side channels, or spur channels, leading from the Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville to Miami, Fla., to, and turning basins or harbors at, the various communities on or near the banks of said waterway, having particular reference to providing such improvements to and at Titusville, Flagler Beach, New Smyrna, Fort Pierce, and to the Lighthouse Service Depot at Taylor Creek, adjacent to Fort Pierce Harbor.

St. Augustine Harbor, and vicinity, Fla.

Kissimmee River, Fla.

Jupiter Inlet, Fla.

Oklawaha River, Fla., from Lake Apopka through Lake Dora to Lake Eustis and adjoining waterways.

Oklawaha River, Fla., from Lake Eustis to Lake Griffin, and thence from Lake Griffin to Silver Springs Run.

Oklawaha River and its tributaries, Fla., with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation, flood control, and related purposes.

Orange Lake Basin, Fla.

Wacassas River and its tributaries, Fla., with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation, flood control, and related purposes.

Channel and harbor at Everglades, Collier County, Fla.

Bakers Haulover Inlet, Fla.

Waterway from packing house and railroad terminal at Belle Glade, Fla., to Lake Okeechobee and to the Intracoastal Waterway through the Hillsboro and West Palm Beach Canals.

Peace River, Fla.

Channel to Pahokee, on Lake Okeechobee, Fla.

Lake Okeechobee and its tributary streams, Fla., with a view to removing the water-hyacinth.

Fisheating Creek, Fla.

Channel from bridge at Bradenton, Fla., to deep water in Gulf of Mexico (Tampa Bay).

Channel from Tampa Bay to Safety Harbor, Fla.

Channel from Old Tampa Bay to Oldsmar, Fla.

Channel leading from Tampa Bay Channel directly north to the vicinity of Maximo Point near St. Petersburg, Fla.

St. Petersburg Harbor, Fla., to provide for a channel up to the depth of 30 feet from the main Tampa Bay ship channel past the port of St. Petersburg in front of the recreation pier.

Channels through Big Pass and Little Pass, from Clearwater Bay, Fla., to deep water in the Gulf of Mexico.

Sarasota Bay, Fla.: Channel from Casey's Pass (Venice Inlet), through Dona Bay to the bridge on the United States Highway No. 41, including a turning basin at the eastern terminus of the channel.

Hudson River, Fla.

Channel from the deep water in St. Joseph Sound to, and turning basin at, Ozona, Fla.
Chassahowitska River, Fla.

Channel, turning basin, and improvements at Horseshoe, Dixie County, Fla.

Sante Fe River, from bridge on Federal Highway No. 41, near High Springs, to the Suwannee River, and from this bridge upstream to Camp Blanding, Kingsley Lake, Fla.

Waterways from Camp Blanding, Kingsley Lake, Fla., via Black Creek to St. Johns River, and (or) via Black Creek and Doctors Inlet to St. Johns River.

Canal from Saint Marks to Tallahassee, Fla.

Chipola River, Ala. and Fla., with a view to its improvement in the interest of navigation, flood control, power, and other related purposes.

Waterway from the Intracoastal Waterway south across Santa Rosa Island, Fla., to a point at or near Deer Point Light.

La Grange Bayou, Fla.

St. Josephs Bay, Fla.

Entrance to Perdido Bay, Ala. and Fla., from the Gulf of Mexico to deep water in Perdido Bay, via the most practicable route.

Waterway from the Escambia River to the Alabama River, Fla., and Ala.

Tennessee, Tombigbee, and Mobile Rivers, with a view to securing a through waterway of 12 feet depth and suitable width between the Ohio River and the Gulf of Mexico.

Fly Creek, Fairhope, Ala.

Grand Bayou Pass, La., from the Gulf of Mexico to Buras and Empire.

Bayou Schofield, La., from the Gulf of Mexico to Buras and Empire.

Ship canal to extend from the Mississippi River at a point at or near the city of New Orleans, La., to the Gulf of Mexico, by way of the best available route or routes.

Grand Bayou, connecting Bayou Boeuf and Bayou Chevreuil, La.

Barataria Bay and connecting channels, La., to provide a continuous waterway from the Gulf of Mexico to the intracoastal waterway.

Bayou Boeuf, La Fourche Parish, La.

Lake Pontchartrain, La., with a view to the construction of a seaplane base in the vicinity of New Orleans.

Mermentau River, La., from Grand Chenier to the Gulf.

Bell City Drainage Canal, La.

Bayou La Fourche, La., from the Gulf of Mexico to Leesville or to Golden Meadow.

Bayou La Fourche, La., from Donaldsonville to the Intracoastal Waterway, via Bayou Boeuf, Assumption Parish.

The shore of Galveston Bay, Tex., with a view to preventing its erosion.

Pine Island Bayou, Tex.

Cedar Bayou Pass, Corpus Christi Pass, and Pass at Murdocks Landing, Tex.

Little Bay, Tex.

Sabine River, Tex.

Neches River, Tex.

Big Sandy Creek, Tex.

Cypress Creek, Tex.

Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex., with a view to further improvements in the interest of navigation and the prevention of damage by floods.

Waterway from the Neches River, by way of Pine Island Bayou and extension, to Trinity River, Tex.

Colorado River, Tex.

Waterway from Alvin, Tex., to the Intracoastal Waterway.

Ouachita River, with a view to the construction of a dam at or near Rockport, Ark., in the interest of navigation, flood control, and the development of hydroelectric power.

Loosahatchie River, Tenn., from its mouth to the O. K. Robertson Road and including the area west of the Illinois Central Railroad and north of Wolf River, with a view to extending the navigation facilities of Memphis Harbor.

Mississippi River: Davenport (Iowa) harbor of refuge.

Mississippi River at Cassville, Wis.

Mississippi River at Prairie du Chien, Wis.

Mississippi River at Alma, Wis.

Mississippi River at Malden Rock, Wis.

Illinois and Mississippi Canal, Ill.

St. Croix River Basin, Minnesota and Wisconsin, including consideration of the construction of dam below the mouth of Kettle River.

Red River of the North Drainage Basin, Minnesota, South Dakota, and North Dakota.

Missouri River in South Dakota.

Tofte Harbor, Minn.

Lake Kabetogama, Minn.

Waterway connecting Lake Superior and Lake Michigan, from Au Train Lake to Little Bay de Noc, Mich.

Harbor at mouth of Au Train River, Mich.

Sheldrake Harbor, Mich.

St. Marys River at Sault Sainte Marie, Mich., with a view to providing facilities for light-draft navigation.

Algoma Harbor, Mich.

Gallen River, Berrien County, Mich.

Pine River, Mich.

Pinconning River, Mich.

Waterway from Lake Erie, at or near Toledo, Ohio, to the southerly end of Lake Michigan by way of the Maumee River and the city of Fort Wayne, Ind., or other practicable route.

St. Marys River, Ohio and Ind.

Maumee River, Ind. and Ohio.

Harbor at Ballast Island, Ohio.

Vermillion Harbor, Ohio, with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation and related purposes.

Rocky River, Ohio.

At or near North East, Pa., with a view to constructing a harbor of refuge.

Harbor at Hamburg Township, N. Y.

Little River (branch of Niagara River), at

Cavuga Island, Niagara Falls, N. Y.

Port Bay, N. Y.

Chaumont River, N. Y.

At and in the vicinity of Henderson, N. Y., with a view to constructing a harbor.

At and in the vicinity of Sacketts Harbor, N. Y., with a view to providing additional harbor facilities.

Point Dume, Calif.

Santa Monica Harbor, Calif.

The coast of southern California, with a view to the establishment of harbors for light-draft vessels.

Pillar Point, Half Moon Bay, San Mateo County, Calif.

Nelscott, Oreg., with a view to protection of the beach.

Harbor at Empire, Oreg.

Alsea Bay, Oreg., with a view to the construction of a harbor of refuge.

Channel at Charleston, South Slough, Oreg.

Grays Harbor, Wash., with a view to constructing a channel into Bay City.

Grays Harbor, Wash., with a view to providing a breakwater and other improvements at and near Westport.

Friday Harbor, Wash.

Sitka Harbor, Alaska.

Cordova Harbor, Alaska.

Kodiak Harbor, Alaska.

Neva Strait and Olga Strait, Alaska.

Upper Kvichak River, Alaska.

Skagway Harbor, Alaska.

Kalaupapa Landing, Island of Molokai, Hawaii.

Kalepolepa Boat Harbor, Island of Maui, Hawaii.

Aguadillo Harbor, P. R.

Humacao Playa, Punta Santiago, P. R.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr.

Chairman, I will state there are 28 amendments to be offered to section 3. I

ask unanimous consent they may be considered en bloc and printed at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The committee amendments are as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: Page 29, line 22, strike out "3", and insert in lieu thereof "5."

Committee amendment offered to the preliminary examination and survey section of the pending bill by Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: Insert the following items on the pages and places hereinafter designated:

Page 31, after line 13:

"New Bedford and Fairhaven Harbors, Mass.; particularly with a view to providing greater depth in the eastern portion of the anchorage basin."

Page 31, after line 17:

"The southern coast of Long Island, from the New York City line to Montauk Point, N. Y., with a view to the improvement and protection of the beaches along said coast, such examination and survey to be made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, and the act entitled 'An act for the improvement and protection of the beaches along the shores of the United States,' approved June 26, 1936."

Page 32, after line 6:

"Arthur Kill, N. Y. and N. J., between a point 1,000 feet north of the mouth of Smiths Creek and a point 1,000 feet south of Buckwheat Island."

Page 32, after line 7:

"Coast of New Jersey, from Sandy Hook to Cape May, with a view to the improvement and protection of the beaches along said coast, such examination and survey to be made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, and the act entitled 'An act for the improvement and protection of the beaches along the shores of the United States,' approved June 26, 1936."

Page 32, after line 17:

"Mispillion River, Del., up to Milford."

Page 32, after line 22:

"Pocomoke River, Md., from Old Rock Buoy to Williams Point."

Page 33, after line 14, insert:

"Walnut Creek, Anne Arundel County, Md., lying between Bay Ridge and Arundel-on-the-Bay."

Page 36, after line 25:

"For a system of interlocking open-river and canalized channels having a depth of 12 feet, and of suitable width, to be constructed through rivers and lakes, and by land cuts, as follows: From Palatka, Fla., to the Indian River at Sebastian, Melbourne, Eau Gallie, Cocoa, or such other locality as may be found most suitable; from Titusville westerly to the St. Johns River, thence to Lake Tohopekaliga; from Lake Tohopekaliga to Leesburg, on Lake Harris; from Lake Harris to the St. Johns River near Dexter Lake, or alternately from Lake Harris to the Wekiwa River, thence to the St. Johns River; and from Lake Tohopekaliga via the Kissimmee River and Lake Okeechobee to a connection with the Okeechobee Cross-Florida Channel; all with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation, flood control, and water conservation."

Page 38, after line 2:

"Hillsboro Inlet, Fla., in the vicinity of Pompano."

Page 39, after line 5:

"Aucilla River, Fla."

"Bayou Texar, Fla."

Page 40, after line 13:

"Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and connecting streams, lakes, and bays in Louisiana between Bayou Sale ridge and the Calcasieu River in the interest of navigation, flood control, irrigation, and drainage."

Page 41, after line 2:

"Dickinson Bayou, Tex."

"Jones Creek, Tex., with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation and flood control."

Page 42, after line 3:

"Allegheny River, up to Warren, Pa."

Page 42, after line 4:

"Grand Portage Harbor, Minn."

Page 42, after line 11:

"Harbor at St. Ignace, Mich."

"Mackinac Harbor, Mich."

Page 42, line 12: Strike out "Algoma Harbor, Mich."

Page 42, after line 15:

"Clinton River, Mich."

Page 42, after line 21:

"The coast of Lake Erie, with a view to the establishment of harbors of refuge for light-draft vessels for commercial and, or, recreational purposes."

Page 42, after line 24:

"Minnesota River, Minn., up to a point 10 miles above New Ulm, with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation and related purposes."

Page 43, after line 6:

"Oswego Harbor, N. Y."

Page 43, after line 17:

"Monterey Harbor, Calif."

"Carquinez Strait and Alhambra Creek, Calif., with a view to providing harbor improvements at, and in the vicinity of, Martinez."

Page 43, after line 22:

"Willapa Harbor, Wash., with a view to providing a channel to, and turning basin at, Tokeland dock; also with a view to providing a mooring basin and breakwater at and near Nahcotta dock, Nahcotta."

Page 44, after line 9:

"Valdez Harbor, Alaska, with a view to its improvement, and particularly with respect to the expansion of facilities for harborage of small boats."

"Cook Inlet, Alaska, with a view to improvement for navigation, providing harbor facilities for the city of Anchorage, and the development of hydroelectric power."

"Anchorage Harbor, Alaska, with a view to its improvement, and with the view of determining the advisability of providing additional harbor facilities for small boats."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments. The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS of New York: On page 43, line 4, change the letter "v" in the last word to the letter "y", so that it will read:

"Cayuga Island, Niagara Falls, N. Y."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to section 3? The Chair hears none. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COSTELLO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration H. R. 3961, a bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of cer-

tain public works on rivers and harbors and for other purposes, and pursuant to House Resolution 464, reported the same back to the House, with sundry amendments agreed to in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Tombigbee Inland Waterway amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendments? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The other amendments were agreed to.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 47]

Allen, Ill.	Gale	Monroney
Andersen,	Gamble	Morrison, La.
August H.	Gibson	Morrison, N. C.
Baldwin, Md.	Gifford	O'Connor
Baldwin, N. Y.	Green	O'Toole
Barry	Hall	Phillips
Bates, Mass.	Edwin Arthur	Plumley
Bonner	Harless, Ariz.	Price
Buckley	Hendricks	Rees, Kans.
Bulwinkle	Horan	Rizley
Burgin	Kee	Scanlon
Busbey	Kelley	Short
Celler	Lambertson	Smith, Maine
Chenoweth	Lane	Stearns, N. H.
Disney	Larcade	Sullivan
Feighan	LeFevre	Taylor
Fernandez	Luce	Thomas, N. J.
Fogarty	McGehee	Vorys, Ohio
Fuller	McLane	Vursell
Fulmer	Manasco	Winter
Furlong	Merrow	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifty-seven Members are present, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

THE RIVER AND HARBOR ACT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 17 strike out all of lines 10 to 14, inclusive.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONDERO. A vote to sustain the amendment would be a vote "aye," and a vote against the amendment would be a vote "no"; is that correct?

The SPEAKER. That is always the case.

Mr. RANKIN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. A vote "aye" would be against the committee; a vote "no" would be to sustain the committee.

The SPEAKER. That is hardly a parliamentary inquiry, but it is undoubtedly true.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DONDERO) there were—ayes 113, noes 122.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 195, nays 157, answered "present" 1, not voting 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—195

Andersen,	Gossett	Norrell
H. Carl	Graham	Norton
Anderson, Calif.	Grant, Ind.	O'Brien, Ill.
Andrews, N. Y.	Griffiths	O'Brien, N. Y.
Arends	Gross	O'Hara
Arnold	Gwynne	O'Konski
Auchincloss	Hale	Plumley
Beall	Hall	Poage
Beckworth	Leonard W.	Poulson
Bender	Halleck	Powers
Bishop	Hancock	Pracht,
Blackney	Harness, Ind.	C. Frederick
Bolton	Herter	Pratt,
Boren	Hess	Joseph M.
Bradley, Mich.	Hill	Ramey
Bradley, Pa.	Hoch	Randolph
Brehm	Hoeven	Reece, Tenn.
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman	Reed, Ill.
Brumbaugh	Holmes, Mass.	Reed, N. Y.
Buffett	Howell	Rizley
Burch, Va.	Hull	Robertson
Butler	Jeffrey	Robison, Ky.
Carrier	Jenkins	Rockwell
Carson, Ohio	Jennings	Rodgers, Pa.
Carter	Jensen	Rogers, Mass.
Celler	Johnson,	Rohrbough
Chapman	Anton J.	Rolph
Chilperfield	Johnson, Ind.	Russell
Church	Johnson,	Sauthoff
Clevenger	J. Leroy	Schiffler
Cochran	Johnson, Ward	Schwabe
Cole, Mo.	Jones	Scott
Cole, N. Y.	Jonkman	Shafer
Compton	Judd	Sheppard
Costello	Kean	Simpson, Ill.
Crawford	Kearney	Smith, Ohio
Crosser	Keefe	Smith, Va.
Cunningham	Kilday	Smith, W. Va.
Curtis	Kinzer	Smith, Wis.
Day	Kunkel	Snyder
Dewey	Landis	Springer
Dickstein	LeCompte	Stanley
Dingell	Lesinski	Stefan
Dirksen	Lewis	Stevenson
Dondero	Ludlow	Sumner, Ill.
Douglas	McConnell	Sundstrom
Durham	McCowan	Taber
Dworshak	McGregor	Talbot
Eaton	McWilliams	Talle
Eberharter	Maas	Tibbott
Elliott	Madden	Towe
Ellis	Mahon	Treadway
Ellison, Md.	Maloney	Troutman
Elston, Ohio	Martin, Iowa	Vincent, Ky.
Fellows	Martin, Mass.	Wadsworth
Fenton	Mason	Ward
Fish	May	Wasielewski
Fisher	Michener	Weiss
Flannagan	Miller, Conn.	Wigglesworth
Gavin	Miller, Mo.	Willey
Gerlach	Miller, Nebr.	Wilson
Gilchrist	Miller, Pa.	Wolcott
Gillette	Monkiewicz	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gillie	Mruk	Wolverton, N. J.
Goodwin	Mundt	Woodruff, Mich.
Gordon	Murray, Wis.	Woodrum, Va.
Gorski	Myers	Worley

NAYS—157

Abernethy	Barry	Boykin
Allen, La.	Bates, Ky.	Brooks
Anderson,	Bell	Brown, Ga.
N. Mex.	Bennett, Mich.	Bryson
Andrews, Ala.	Bennett, Mo.	Burchill, N. Y.
Angell	Bland	Burdick
Barrett	Bloom	Byrne

Camp	Holifield	Peterson, Fla.
Cannon, Fla.	Holmes, Wash.	Peterson, Ga.
Cannon, Mo.	Hope	Pfeiffer
Capozzoli	Horan	Philbin
Carlson, Kans.	Izac	Pittenger
Clark	Jackson	Ploeser
Clason	Jarman	Priest
Coffee	Johnson	Ramspeck
Colmer	Luther A.	Rankin
Cooley	Johnson	Rees, Kans.
Cooper	Lyndon B.	Rivers
Courtney	Johnson, Okla.	Robinson, Utah
Cox	Kefauver	Rogers, Calif.
Cravens	Kennedy	Rowan
Curley	Keogh	Sasser
D'Alesandro	Kerr	Satterfield
Davis	Kilburn	Scrivner
Delaney	King	Sikes
Dies	Kirwan	Slaughter
Domeneaux	Kieberg	Sparkman
Doughton	LaFollette	Spence
Drewry	Lanham	Starnes, Ala.
Ellsworth	Lea	Stewart
Elmer	Lemke	Stockman
Fay	Lynch	Sullivan
Fitzpatrick	McCord	Summers, Tex.
Folger	McCormack	Tarver
Forand	McKenzie	Thomas, Tex.
Ford	McMillan	Thomason
Fulbright	McMurray	Tolan
Gathings	Magnuson	Torrens
Gearhart	Mansfield	Vinson, Ga.
Gore	Mont	Voorhis, Calif.
Granger	Mansfield, Tex.	Walter
Grant, Ala.	Marcantonio	Weaver
Gregory	Mills	Weichel, Ohio
Hagen	Mott	Welch
Hare	Murdock	Wene
Harris, Ark.	Murphy	West
Harris, Va.	Murray, Tenn.	White
Hart	Newsome	Whitten
Hays	Norman	Whittington
Hébert	O'Brien, Mich.	Wickersham
Heffernan	Outland	Winstead
Heldinger	Pace	Wright
Hinsaw	Patman	Zimmerman
Hobbs	Patton	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Rowe

NOT VOTING—75

Allen, Ill.	Gale	Morrow
Andresen	Gallagher	Monroney
August H.	Gamble	Morrison, La.
Baldwin, Md.	Gibson	Morrison, N. C.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gifford	O'Connor
Barden	Green	O'Neal
Bates, Mass.	Hall	O'Toole
Bonner	Edwin Arthur	Phillips
Buckley	Harless, Ariz.	Price
Bulwinkle	Hartley	Rabaut
Burgin	Hendricks	Richards
Busbey	Johnson	Sabath
Canfield	Calvin D.	Sadowski
Case	Kee	Scanlon
Chenoweth	Kelley	Sheridan
Dawson	Klein	Short
Dilweg	Knutson	Simpson, Pa.
Disney	Lambertson	Smith, Maine
Engel, Mich.	Lane	Somers, N. Y.
Engle, Calif.	Larcade	Stearns, N. H.
Feighan	LeFevre	Taylor
Fernandez	Luce	Thomas, N. J.
Fogarty	McGehee	Vorys, Ohio
Fuller	McLean	Vursell
Fulmer	Manasco	Weichel, Ga.
Furlong	Merritt	Winter

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rabaut for, with Mr. Manasco against.
Mr. Canfield for, with Mr. Buckley against.
Mr. LeFevre for, with Mr. Baldwin of Maryland against.

Mrs. Smith of Maine for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Gibson against.

Mr. Fuller for, with Mr. Merritt against.

Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Fernandez against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. O'Toole against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Somers of New York against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Green with Mr. Short.
Mr. Whelchel of Georgia with Mr. Knutson.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Feighan with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Busbey.
Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Price with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Burgin with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Furlong with Mr. Vursell.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Calvin D. Johnson.
Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Scanlon with Mr. Vorys of Ohio.
Mr. Barden with Mr. August H. Andresen.
Mr. Dilweg with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Engle of California with Mr. Case.
Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. McLean.
Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Disney with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
Mr. Harless of Arizona with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. KING changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ROGERS of California changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. KEOGH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. COLE of Missouri changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. PLUMLEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, how is the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN] recorded?

The SPEAKER. He is recorded as voting "nay."

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am certain there is an error, inasmuch as Mr. McLEAN, as I understand, is not present and is not in the city.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the roll call will be corrected accordingly.

There was no objection.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio) there were—ayes 213, noes 46.

So the bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, the Savannah River project, better known as the Clark Hill Dam project, carried in the bill we have just passed upon, was considered by my predecessors in Congress from the standpoint of navigation and flood control for many years, but no definite action was taken looking to a final solution of the problems until 1927, 2 years after I first came to Congress, when the River and Harbor Act carried

a provision for a survey and study of these problems as they related to rivers in the southeastern United States. The report was to be prepared and submitted to Congress under the direction of the Secretary of War and the Chief of the Board of Engineers.

The survey and report on the Savannah River were not completed and submitted to Congress until November 1934. The feasibility of flood control, navigation, and power development by one or more reservoir dams above Augusta was recommended, the reasons therefor being set out at considerable length and detail in the report.

On August 15, 1935, the President of the United States addressed a communication to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, directing that a three-member board be created, consisting of one representative from the Board of Engineers, one from the National Resources Committee, and one from the Federal Power Commission, to make further study and prepare a report on the advisability of proceeding the following year with the Savannah River improvement by erecting a dam at a point approximately 21 miles above the city of Augusta. On February 29, 1936, this Board submitted its report and filed same with the Rivers and Harbors Committee for consideration. In November following, the National Resources Committee, in a report entitled "Comprehensive Report on the Savannah River Drainage Basin," made further reference and suggestions relative to this proposal in cooperation with a report of the Eastern Georgia Planning Council.

In April 1937, the Federal Power Commission submitted a report entitled "Power Market" showing that approximately 400,000,000 kilowatt-hours of primary electric current annually and 200,000,000 kilowatt-hours of secondary power could be generated and fully disposed of on the local market and still not satisfy the demands. That is, the National Resources Committee and the Federal Power Commission, after careful study and consideration, have concluded that the industrial possibilities of the Savannah River Valley and adjacent territory are practically in their infancy and insist there is ample and suitable markets for all the power to be generated at this plant when completed.

Mr. Speaker, this is a project in which I have been interested for approximately 20 years, and my interest has been based on the grounds that the proposal was fully justified from the standpoint of flood control and navigation, and when we add to that the tremendous economic value of electric power to be furnished, coupled with the extraordinary necessity for such power, in the section of the country to be accommodated, I am convinced the proposal is not only justified from every standpoint but well commanded the favorable consideration just shown by the Congress.

The record will show that surveys have been made by engineers of the War Department time and time again for the

past 15 or 20 years and without exception favorable reports have been submitted in each instance. In addition the proposal has been considered on several occasions by the National Resources Planning Board, the United States Federal Power Commission, and representatives of the War Department, all of which have concluded without exception that it is a worthy project and well justified by facts and evidence submitted by the different disinterested investigators.

The initial cost will approximate \$28,000,000 but the undisputed evidence is that it will be a self-liquidating and self-supporting project and the Government will be fully repaid for all expenditures made, and that the added income from industrial developments and contributions otherwise will add greatly to our national wealth and national economy.

I am very grateful for the interest manifested in this project and the highly valued services rendered by my friend and neighbor, the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable PAUL BROWN, who represents the district adjoining me across the Savannah River since he came to Congress 10 years ago, including a number of others who have manifested a great deal of interest in this proposal. I am also grateful to members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee for the patient and fair consideration given to the justifications submitted, and I am deeply grateful for the favorable consideration taken by the House of Representatives in authorizing an appropriation for the development of this project.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4410. An act to extend for an additional 90 days the period during which certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed may be imported from foreign countries free of duty.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 6.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 7, and 8; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: At the beginning of said amendment insert "Sec. 5."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the section number "5" and insert in lieu thereof "6"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 7. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservation:

"That it is understood that the provision in paragraph 11 of resolution numbered 12 adopted at the first session of the council, referred to in section 3 of this joint resolution and reading 'The task of rehabilitation must not be considered as the beginning of reconstruction—it is coterminous with relief', contemplates that rehabilitation means and is confined only to such activities as are necessary to relief."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 8. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservation:

"That the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall not be authorized to enter into contracts or undertake or incur obligations beyond the limits of appropriations made under this authorization and by other countries and receipts from other sources."

And the Senate agree to the same.

SOL BLOOM,
LUTHER A. JOHNSON,
CHARLES A. EATON,

Managers on the part of the House.

TOM CONNALLY,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
ARTHUR CAPPER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The House bill provided that in expressing its approval of this joint resolution it is the recommendation of Congress that insofar as funds and facilities permit, any area important to the military operations of the United Nations which is stricken by famine or disease may be included in the benefits to be made available through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. This amendment excepts

from the application of this recommendation areas "within enemy territory and while occupied by the enemy." The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment provides that no amendment under article VIII (a) of the agreement involving any new obligation for the United States shall be binding upon the United States without approval by joint resolution of Congress. The House recedes with an amendment inserting a section number.

Amendment No. 3: This amendment provides that in adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with a reservation that in the case of the United States the appropriate constitutional body to determine the amount and character and time of the contributions of the United States is the Congress of the United States. The House recedes with an amendment changing the section number.

Amendment No. 4: This amendment provides that in adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the reservation that it is understood that the provision in paragraph 11 of resolution numbered 12 adopted at the first session of the Council, referred to in section 3 of the joint resolution and reading "The task of rehabilitation must not be considered as the beginning of reconstruction—it is coterminous with relief," contemplates that rehabilitation means and is confined to relief only. The House recedes with an amendment providing that the provision in question contemplates that rehabilitation means and is confined only to such activities as are necessary to relief, in lieu of "relief only."

Amendment No. 5: This amendment provides that in adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with a reservation that the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall not be authorized to enter into contracts or undertake or incur obligations beyond the limits of appropriations made therefor. The House recedes with an amendment to the effect that such authority shall not extend beyond the limits of appropriations made under this authorization and by other countries and receipts from other sources.

Amendment No. 6: This amendment provides that none of the funds appropriated in pursuance of the authorization shall be expended in the promotion of any educational, religious, or political program in any country in which rehabilitation is carried on. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 7: This amendment changes a section number; and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 8: The House bill provided that the authorization contained in this joint resolution shall expire at the conclusion of 2 years following the termination of hostilities on all fronts unless specifically extended by an act of Congress. This amendment provides that this authority shall expire on June 30, 1946. The House recedes.

SOL BLOOM,
LUTHER A. JOHNSON,
CHARLES A. EATON,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I think there should be no difficulty in the House adopting the conference report on this U. N. R. R. A. resolution. The only changes that have been made in the resolution will serve to satisfy rather than displease those who were not in favor of the resolution before. I do not believe that in any substantial respect there has been any

change made except to make clearer the meaning of Congress with reference to our participation therein.

The Senate adopted several amendments, none of which materially changed the resolution as it passed the House, but they were limitations which were designed to clarify, somewhat, and to check upon the power of U. N. R. R. A. insofar as our participation in it is concerned. I think the amendments do not change its meaning. I think the resolution as it passed the House has not been materially changed, or in fact changed at all insofar as its intent is concerned, by the Senate amendments that have been agreed to by the conferees.

Amendment No. 1, which was adopted by the Senate, was with reference to an amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. The amendment as we passed it said:

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

The Senate amendment left that amendment intact except it added this limitation:

Except within enemy territory and while occupied by the enemy.

In other words, U. N. R. R. A. cannot operate in any country while it is occupied by the enemy, and while our military forces are there.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Does not the gentleman agree with me that the Senate amendment, while it can in no way interfere with my amendment, seems to be unnecessary?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I think so. I think the meaning of the amendment as it passed the House is clearly expressed. I think the Senate amendment is surplusage, but to satisfy the Senate, we agreed. I see no objection to it.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman propose to discuss the amendment that limits rehabilitation and reconstruction?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes; that is one of the amendments that will be reached in just a moment.

Amendment No. 2 was a new amendment placed by the Senate, which says "that no amendment under article VIII (a) of the agreement involving any new obligation for the United States shall be binding upon the United States without approval by joint resolution of Congress." The language of the resolution as it passed the House referred to "constitutional authorities" rather than by Congress. We placed that in there in language which I think anyone could understand. That limitation was already applied. We said "constitutional authorities." Everyone familiar with our Gov-

ernment knows that the constitutional authority of the United States is vested in the Congress of the United States, but we had no objection to the resolution specifically naming the Congress. So that amendment was accepted with the understanding that the amendment, instead of being a subsection, should be a different numbered section. That is the only change made with reference to that.

Amendment No. 3 was a Senate amendment which reads:

In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with a reservation that in the case of the United States the appropriate constitutional body to determine the amount and character and time of the contributions of the United States is the Congress of the United States.

What I have said with reference to the preceding amendment applies to this one also.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. In the Senate there was some discussion in regard to the use of these funds for educational purposes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. That is one of the amendments I will reach in a moment, if my time permits.

The next amendment is amendment No. 4, in which the Senate said in section 6:

In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the reservation that it is understood that the provision in paragraph 11 of resolution No. 12 adopted at the first session of the Council, referred to in section 3 of the joint resolution and reading "The task of rehabilitation must not be considered as the beginning of reconstruction—it is coterminous with relief," contemplates that rehabilitation means and is confined to relief only.

The language of this amendment does not in the slightest degree change the meaning of the resolution as it passed the House, but merely reemphasizes that the funds and activities of U. N. R. R. A. are to be used for relief, and the only rehabilitation involved would be that confined to relief only. This is what U. N. R. R. A. proposes to do and the resolution in no respect changes the proposed and declared intention of U. N. R. R. A. in its Atlantic City meeting.

Mr. BLOOM. And it further states, "that such activities as are necessary to relief."

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes. That is all there is to it. "Only such activities." That means just what it says, that this is not a rehabilitation measure. We are not going to rehabilitate Europe. These funds are to be used for relief in the distressed areas for temporary relief, and anything else that is so spent must grow out of relief. There is no permanent rehabilitation as such.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. With reference to rehabilitation, just what is that limited to? Is that understood as we use the term in rehabilitation of injured human beings?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. It would be primarily with reference to human beings. That is, food, medicine, clothing; and it might be for a temporary shelter where they had to be taken care of.

Mr. REED of New York. Would it include rehabilitation as we know it?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. No; it does not. The only rehabilitation would be that incident and necessary in administering relief to those in stricken areas.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. FISH. To be a little more specific, does this mean that any reconstruction can be made at the expense of this \$1,350,000,000?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. No.

Mr. FISH. No reconstruction at all?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. No. Relief only, or expense incidental to granting relief. No reconstruction.

Mr. FISH. That means there can be no building of factories?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Oh, no. That is absolutely clear both in the resolution and also in the meeting at Atlantic City, which set forth this meaning.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. It may be perfectly clear, but I would like to have the record show whether this is so broad that it would require the shipment of farm machinery and things of that kind for the rehabilitation of the farms.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Well, it might include some small amount of farm machinery, but in limited quantities only. U. N. R. R. A. is designed to help these people help themselves, and funds will be used to supply and equip them with farm implements, but only in such small quantities as might be necessary for a temporary emergency, and such quantities will be infinitesimally small.

Mr. REED of New York. Then there has been some talk and plans along that line.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes; there has been some talk, and speeches made in the House that are erroneous and not based upon facts. I think there has been a misunderstanding about the question of farm machinery, because there was a speech made by one Member a short time back, in which he talked about our already having spent and contracted for large sums for farm machinery under U. N. R. R. A. The truth is there have been no commitments, no allocations made. There has been nothing done with reference to that. I can give the gentleman the facts fully about that.

Mr. REED of New York. I think they should be in the Record.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I will be glad to do that. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON] recently made a statement in which he said that already there had been allocated to certain countries—

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. If the gentleman will permit, I have a photo-

static copy, a complete record, which I intend to present concerning my statements as soon as I am given time.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. On which subject?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Farm machinery.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I have here a letter from Mr. Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, of this date in which he states that there has been no allocation to U. N. R. R. A. with reference to any farm machinery. The War Production Board does this; it plans ahead with reference to the allocation of steel for the ensuing year and there was an allocation made which might be used if called upon. Nothing has been done so far, but it could be used with reference to farm machinery abroad if it became necessary so to do. That amounted to about 30,000 tons of steel to cover the period from July 1, 1944, to June 30, 1945.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas 8 additional minutes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. That 30,000 tons of steel would be used by the countries that wanted to buy machinery for cash, that is, foreign countries. It also would include any supplies that might be sent to our armed forces in the occupied countries if that occasion should arise. It would also include any demands that should come from U. N. R. R. A. That allocation to foreign countries represents less than 2 percent of the allocation for the same period for steel for farm implements to be used in the United States; in other words the War Production Board has already allocated 1,799,573 tons of steel for the production of farm machinery for American farmers for the period from July 1, 1944, to July 1, 1945, and if, therefore, this 30,000 tons which has been only tentatively allocated for abroad should be used it would be less than 2 percent—about 1½ percent—of that allocation, but none of it may be used. It is simply planning ahead if the occasion should arise.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Can the gentleman give the House and the farmers of the Nation the assurance that as long as they are in such crying need for farm machinery no greater allotment than this 30,000 tons will be made to foreign nations?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that I am in thorough sympathy with his position because I have a farming district myself and I know the shortage and the great need of farm implements at this time. I have gone into this question very thoroughly with Mr. Nelson and Mr. Crowley. I believe the gentleman need have no fear but what that is the maximum amount that will be al-

located for the next year; and it may not be used. The reason I say that is because U. N. R. R. A. will not use anything until an occupied country has been evacuated by the military. When that time comes demands for steel will grow less for military needs in this country, and there will be plenty of steel for farm implements everywhere when the fighting stops.

Mr. PACE. On the basis of conferences the gentleman has had he gives us the assurance that this 30,000 tons is the maximum?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. That is the assurance given us as to the year July 1, 1944, to July 1, 1945.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. If I understand correctly, this farm machinery is of the type that could also be used here.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. And, first, U. N. R. R. A. must come before the Committee on Appropriations. The Committee on Appropriations must approve the appropriation. There is no pending commitment made until that time, but the steel is ready.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The resolution we are now considering is an authorization measure; and when it becomes the law, Congress will then appropriate funds for participation in U. N. R. R. A., and until Congress appropriates the money U. N. R. R. A. will make no contracts or commitments for the expenditure of money which is to be secured from the United States Government.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE. What has the gentleman to say as to the definite statement that has been made in responsible circles that orders have already been placed for so many yards of cloth or woollens to be made from foreign wools?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. There is no commitment made by U. N. R. R. A. There has been no money spent by U. N. R. R. A. in any way, shape, or form up to the present time. That is positive. U. N. R. R. A. has not spent one penny of the money they are supposed to get under this authorization, and they have not made any commitments.

Mr. CASE. I may say that Dean Ackerman, who is secretary of the Wool Association, has made that positive statement.

Mr. BLOOM. That is in error. I wish the gentleman from Texas would read the letter from Mr. Donald Nelson so we can get that clear.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. This relates to steel. I will read the letter if the gentleman wishes, but I was trying to save time. I will read it anyway. It reads as follows:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1944.
Mr. SOL BLOOM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BLOOM: This will refer to your inquiry concerning the recent allocation made by the War Production Board to the Foreign Economic Administration of 30,000 tons of carbon steel to meet a portion of the farm machinery requirements of the liberated areas.

I understand that in the course of making this allocation we came to refer to it as a U. N. R. R. A. program and I would like to make clear to you just what we had in mind in using this phrase.

As you can well appreciate, the War Production Board must, if it is adequately to meet the essential demands placed upon it, plan a long way in advance the production of such complicated items as farm equipment and machinery. In establishing recently a farm-machinery program for the coming fiscal year, we found that no provision whatsoever had been made for the needs of the liberated areas, even during the initial period of military responsibility. Although the U. N. R. R. A. had not submitted any such requirements to us, it seemed clear that they might later on develop in considerable proportions. Accordingly, we arranged to allocate to F. E. A. for this purpose some 30,000 tons of steel, this being an amount which we could make available during the farm-machinery program year starting on July 1, 1944, without interfering with essential programs.

Strictly speaking, therefore, the phrase "U. N. R. R. A. program" was a misnomer, since no farm-machinery program was or has yet been submitted to us by U. N. R. R. A. I hope this will clarify the matter for you, but if you wish further details, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. NELSON.

While I am discussing farm machinery, I want to read a letter of this date to me from Leo T. Crowley, Administrator of Foreign Economic Administration, which is as follows:

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1944.
Hon. LUTHER JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JOHNSON: You have inquired as to the production of farm machinery in the current year particularly in comparison with the years preceding the war.

The current farm-machinery-program year ends on June 30, 1944, and it is now estimated that the production of farm machinery for this year will be something in excess of \$500,000,000. This means that production of farm machinery in the current year is at a level as high as that of any year immediately preceding the war. Current farm-machinery production, in fact, is substantially higher than production in the pre-war years with the possible exception of 1937 when about \$514,000,000 of farm machinery was produced domestically.

Notwithstanding the high level of current farm-machinery production there have been domestic shortages of certain types of farm machinery. These shortages are accounted for to a considerable extent by the increased need for mechanization resulting both from shortages of manpower and from the increased production of food.

Sincerely yours,

LEO T. CROWLEY.

With reference to the inquiry in regard to cloth I will say that no commitments whatever have been made by U. N. R. R. A. Until an appropriation is made by Congress and the funds are authorized to be spent there will be no obligation, no commitments of any kind for any material whatever. We are assured of that.

Mr. CASE. But according to what Jesse Jones, of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and others at this meeting said, whereas we have some 900,000,000 pounds of wool in this country, a great portion of which has come from abroad and which we bought up to keep out of the hands of the enemy, that all attempts to get U. N. R. R. A. to agree that when they place orders they will use this wool have been refused, yet at the same time orders have been placed for some 8,000,000 pounds of wool elsewhere.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Some tentative plans may have been drawn up, but I feel sure there has been no contract made and no commitments made.

Mr. CASE. There may have been some secret understanding.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I might say to my colleague from Texas that it is my understanding that the Procurement Division of the Treasury the first of this month asked for bids or commitments for something over 4,000,000 yards of part-wool textiles on behalf of U. N. R. R. A.

I am advised that the specifications require only 20 percent of new wool of 58's grade or lower; 30-percent reused wool or shoddy; and 50 percent cotton or rayon.

Furthermore, during January and February of this year U. N. R. R. A. asked for bids on about 8,000,000 additional yards of part-wool fabrics, which makes 12,000,000 yards over a period of 3 months, or at the rate of 50,000,000 yards a year. As may be seen the quality of goods being ordered is of the lowest grade. The clothing made from these goods will be unhealthful and generally unsatisfactory and with the American trade-mark will give us a bad name all over the world. We have a tremendous surplus of wool in this country. With the new clip coming on it is estimated that the United States will own over 1,500,000,000 pounds of wool. By just a little increase in the cost of garments the U. N. R. R. A. could use some of our surplus wool and at the same time get a fabric that will wear 50 percent longer and give us good instead of bad advertising.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman's understanding that the Procurement Division of the Treasury has asked for bids for cloth for U. N. R. R. A. is not correct. The Treasury has not asked for bids for cloth for U. N. R. R. A., so I am informed. The Treasury, I understand, has asked for bids for some cloth within the general Army require-

ment for use in the liberated areas during the period of military responsibility, and it will be distributed under the direction of the commanding generals. U. N. R. R. A. will not operate in any of the countries until after the evacuation of the military authorities, and U. N. R. R. A. at this time has not made any commitments or attempted to buy cloth or any other commodities, so I am reliably informed by the authorities of that organization. And the statement by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] about wool is incorrect, insofar as U. N. R. R. A. is concerned.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. My understanding is that the United States has not put any money in U. N. R. R. A. at all. Is that right?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Not a cent.

Mr. WRIGHT. There has not been any appropriation by the United States, but some other nations have put money in.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I do not know what other countries may have contributed to U. N. R. R. A.

Mr. WRIGHT. It might be possible that some of the money that has been put in by other nations might have been used to place orders for some of these things.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. That may be true; there may have been some other funds from other countries, of this I am not advised, but we are not concerned with funds coming from other countries. We are concerned only with what comes from our own country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON]; and I want to say that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], a member of the committee, asked for time but very courteously allowed the gentleman from Illinois to proceed first.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 3 I disclosed to the Congress the farm machinery program of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and charged that it was the intention of the crystal gazers heading that organization to send hundreds of thousands of pieces of farm machinery to Europe, although every item demanded was needed by American farmers. At that time I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of approximately one-half million pieces of farm equipment which these world planners had marked for export to 15 nations—every one of which is now wholly or in part occupied by the Axis.

I disclosed that their program called for 30,000 tractors to be sent to all parts of Europe where, in many instances, the intended recipient had never seen one; 30,000 plows were to be scattered all over Europe and paid for with American dollars; 30,000 separators; 50,000 mowers;

17,000 reapers; 22,900 horse-drawn hay rakes; 40,000 harrows and harrow sections; and 12,000 binders—every item of which Members of Congress have endeavored to obtain for needy American farmers.

Thirty thousand pieces of machinery were to be sent to the Netherlands, 15,000 pieces of equipment to Belgium and Luxembourg, 14,000 to Czechoslovakia, 21,000 to Denmark, 212,000 to France, 8,900 to Greece, 12,000 to Norway, 115,000 to Poland, 36,000 to Yugoslavia, 20,000 to the Baltic states, and 10,000 to Italy. In addition they had listed 13,000 tons of spare parts to repair machinery in Europe although our American farmers are using baling wire to hold their equipment together.

I further stated that despite the critical shortage of farm machinery in this country that these Utopian dreamers were demanding delivery of portions of this machinery by August 1, 1944.

Subsequent to my charges, Mr. Leo Crowley, Director of Lend-Lease and head of the Foreign Economic Administration, appeared before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and stated:

I am surprised that there is a list made available at all, because I imagine that what has appeared is merely this, that those people are just listing items that might be helpful for these people to help themselves.

Mr. Crowley further stated:

I read this Congressman's statement but I did not think it had anything in it of what we are doing.

On March 22, in a statement addressed to Congressman SOL BLOOM, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. Crowley further disclaimed any knowledge of an U. N. R. R. A. program.

Mr. Speaker, such statements appear to be a clear-cut case in which the right hand knoweth not what the left hand doeth.

It appears, Mr. Speaker, that through an oversight, Mr. Crowley's member on the Foreign Machinery and Equipment Division Requirements Committee, Mr. H. Swanburg, has neglected to keep Mr. Crowley informed as to what was happening in his own agency. It is very apparent from Mr. Crowley's statement that Mr. Swanburg neglected to notify him that a meeting was held by the Division Requirements Committee, under date of January 22, 1944. He further neglected to inform him that under decision No. 8, which was unanimously approved by the committee, farm machinery was to be built for U. N. R. R. A. He neglected to inform him that this machinery was to be built from a 15,000-ton allotment made to O. F. R. A. for the first quarter of 1944. He further neglected to inform him that it was the decision of the committee to stock-pile this machinery, if necessary, because of the shortage of crating materials.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to embarrass any one in this matter. My desire is to save this machinery for American farms and American farmers. Al-

though the fathers of this program have denied its paternity, it was prepared by the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, United States Department of Agriculture, for Liberated Areas Branch, Bureau of Areas, Foreign Economic Administration, as is attested by the photostatic copy which I submit for the Record. I also submit for the Record a copy of the official order placing this program into operation, and charge that manufacturers were called before the committee and inquiry was made as to what portion of this machinery they could produce.

I also charge that certain portions of this machinery are being produced at the present time. It is my hope that this machinery, since this exposure, will be diverted into regular American channels.

The material I submit for the RECORD contains the date upon which the committee met, it contains their decision, and its number. It contains a list of machinery that was slated for delivery by August 1 and the program determination number by which the steel was al-

lotted O. F. R. R. A., and the order that stated it should be used for U. N. R. R. A. It also contains a list of 7,500 tractors that were to be taken from an allotment to War Foods Administration to supplement this program.

From the statements of Mr. Crowley and of various other officials of Government, namely, Mr. Cox, attorney for F. E. A., and Mr. Acheson, Assistant Director of U. N. R. R. A., it is apparent that the administration is rapidly getting out from under this farm machinery program. I feel that my mission has been accomplished.

I shall, however, Mr. Speaker, continue to oppose this program and try to prevent its adoption until safeguards protecting the American public are adopted, for, as it is now constituted, these globe-girdling globats can spread our wealth as a lush green carpet over the entire earth.

I submit my proof.

At the bottom of this photostat which I hold in my hand, and which I submit as proof that there was a definite U. N.

R. R. A. program that had been placed in operation, appears this statement:

Total number of machines equals the number agreed upon by the Combined Supply Committee. Does not include items not classified as farm machinery by W. P. B. One part of this machinery, at the most corresponding to 30,000 tons of steel, may be delivered from the 1944 United States production. Another part may be delivered from Canadian and British factories. The size of these countries' contribution is to be determined by the Combined Production and Resources Board. The major part of the machinery is to be scheduled for production by United States manufacturers during the first part of the 1945 production year—July 1, 1944–June 30, 1945. This machinery will be needed in Europe in the fall of 1944 and early spring of 1945.

The total tonnage of machinery listed is about 186,000 tons, including approximately 100,000 tons of carbon steel.

Prepared by Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, United States Department of Agriculture, for Liberated Areas Branch, Bureau of Areas, Foreign Economic Administration.

The order that placed this program in effect reads thus:

Agricultural machinery rehabilitation requirements for European countries¹

[Number of machines and tons of spare parts]

Item No.		Belgium and Luxemburg	Czechoslovakia	Denmark	France	Greece	Netherlands	Norway	Poland	Yugoslavia	Albania	Baltic states	Italy	Total
24	Grain drill:					150								150
25	3-7 disk.....						50							50
26	Fertilizer.....						250	200	11,575	200	25		100	17,600
30	Planters, hand.....	109		250	4,900									250
32	Fertilizer distributors.....	500					1,250							1,750
42	Plows, moldboard, walking				5,000	2,500	2,300		5,000	10,000	200			25,000
43														
	Plows, moldboard, tractor (total).....													30,000
48	2-bottom, drawn.....	250	550	800	7,395	25	870	600	2,300	200		850	265	14,105
53	2-bottom, mounted.....	30	100	100	1,200	50	130	50	700	50		150	175	2,735
49	3-bottom, drawn.....	70	350	300	5,020	25	500		3,700	250		750	195	11,160
50	4-bottom, drawn.....				500				1,500					2,000
	Extra shares, 2 per bottom.....	1,540	4,700	5,400	68,500	450	7,000	2,600	46,200	2,500		8,500	2,930	150,320
63	1-way disk plow with seeding attachment.....				3,600								100	3,700
	Harrow sections:													
78	Spike.....	180	1,200	200	6,000	300	530	100	4,100	2,300		300		15,210
79	Spring.....	170		1,000	8,600		970	800	4,100		50	1,450		17,140
80	Harrow, disk with tandem.....	100	200	400	2,475		715	325	3,000	50		280	635	8,150
82	Rollers.....								1,200					1,200
91	Cultivators, 1-horse.....								2,000					2,000
96	Field cultivators.....	200	350	800	5,102		300	250	1,048	50				8,100
99	Mounted toolbar.....		150		800	75		75		100		250		1,450
108	Power sprayers.....						1,000							1,000
111	Hand sprayers.....	2,300				4,500	2,500			13,500	200			23,000
	Reapers.....								6,800					6,800
	Binders:													
129	Ground-drive.....	965		3,500	4,445	150	550	200		500			315	10,625
130	Power take-off.....	70		250	400		150		415					1,285
139	Potato diggers.....	50			400		50		175					725
141	Beet lifter.....	150			500		150		350					1,150
146	Mowers, ground-drive.....	5,000	1,965	4,000	26,400	200	4,000	2,000	2,000	800		3,000	635	50,000
	Rakes:													
148	Sulky dump.....	1,000	485	800	12,000		1,000	1,000		200		1,500	315	18,300
149	Combination, side-delivery.....	200			3,900		500							4,600
167	Reaping attachments—mowers.....	1,000		635	2,300	50	100	200	450	50			315	5,000
	Threshers:													
168	Power.....	120				50		100	250	100		50	100	770
	Hand.....									3,000				3,000
	Tractors:													
194	Under 30 horsepower.....	280	650	900	8,280	75	1,000	650	3,000	250		1,000	500	16,585
195	30-horsepower and over.....	70	350	300	5,520	25	500		5,200	250		750	450	13,415
209	Trailers, farm, 2-wheel.....	350	1,000	1,200	13,800	100	1,500	650	8,200	500		1,750	950	30,000
	Separators:													
288	Under 250 pounds.....		2,000	800	13,800	200	1,500	1,500	2,500	1,000			1,800	25,100
289	Over 250 pounds.....			200	2,000		1,500		500	500			200	4,900
274	Incubators.....							150		300				450
	Parts for—													
	New machinery (tons).....	230	253	492	4,063	49	540	219	2,597	289	1	430	258	9,421
	Present machinery (tons).....	267		45	3,331		230	7					45	3,955

¹ Total number of machines equals the number agreed upon by the Combined Supply Committee. Does not include items not classified as farm machinery by the War Production Board. 1 part of this machinery, at the most corresponding to 30,000 tons of steel, may be delivered from the 1944 United States production. Another part may be delivered from Canadian and British factories. The size of these countries' contribution is to be determined by the Combined Production and Resources Board. The major part of the machinery is to be scheduled for production by United States manufacturers during the first part of the 1945 production year (July 1, 1944-June 30, 1945). This machinery will be needed in Europe in the fall of 1944 and early spring of 1945.

² The total tonnage of machinery listed is about 186,000 tons, including approximately 100,000 tons of carbon steel.

Prepared by Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, U. S. Department of Agriculture, for Liberated Areas Branch, Bureau of Areas, Foreign Economic Administration.

Mr. Speaker, I also submit for the RECORD a copy of the order that placed this program into effect. This copy contains a list of machinery to be delivered by August 1 and is self-explanatory. It also contains the directives and order numbers and I contend it proves my statement completely. It refutes the contention of Mr. Crowley and various other persons that no U. N. R. R. A. farm machinery program existed, and nails to the cross various and sundry statements made on this floor to that effect.

Mr. Speaker, I herewith submit as evidence a copy of the order which reads as follows:

To program implementation officer, War Production Board.

From Farm Machinery and Equipment Division Requirements Committee.

Subject: Divisional Requirements Decision No. 8, U. N. R. R. A. program, to be built in the third quarter of 1944 from a 15,000-ton first-quarter steel allotment to O. F. R. R. O.

I. This decision relates to an application from the Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Organizations to have built for the

United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, certain items of farm machinery and equipment and repair parts therefor, to be exported to liberated European countries for farm use. This program is hereinafter referred to as the U. N. R. R. A. program. The subject program was approved unanimously at the Divisional Requirements Committee meeting held January 22, 1944.

The U. N. R. R. A. program, described in detail, hereinafter, provides for delivery of the products during the third quarter of 1944 or prior thereto, if possible. It further provides that the allotments of controlled materials to producers shall be made from the allotment of 15,000 tons of carbon steel and complementary quantities of other controlled materials made to O. F. R. R. O. by the W. P. B. Requirements Committee by Program Determination No. 494, for the first quarter of 1944.

II. An allotment of 15,000 tons of steel to O. F. R. R. O. in the fourth quarter has not yet been implemented. The allocation was combined with the War Food Administration program subject to later adjustment depending upon U. N. R. R. A.'s needs. The implementation of this portion of the rehabilitation program has been presented to the Program Bureau for recommendation and decision.

III. Controlled materials required first quarter, 1944

	Code 450	Code 471	Code 813	Total
Carbon steel (tons) 2001-2061.....	6,801	4,356	1,529	12,686
Alloy steel (tons) 2501-2561.....	123	1,533	73	1,729
Copper (pounds) 3011.....	3,041	27,151	3,930	34,122
Copper (pounds) 3021.....	5,617	1,529	4,677	11,823
Copper (pounds) 3041.....	6,472	659	9,124	16,255
Copper (pounds) 3051-71.....	26	8,018	1,299	9,343
Copper (pounds) 3161.....	19	5,902	1,080	7,001
Copper (pounds) 3201-3211.....	12,090	14,102	25,923	52,115
Aluminum (pounds) 4021-4151.....	6		11	17
Aluminum (pounds) 4202-4218.....	340	1,220	77	1,637
Aluminum (pounds) 4251-4311.....			20	20
Aluminum (pounds) 4351-4601.....		9	7	16

III. Statement of approved production schedule of farm machinery and equipment for U. N. R. R. A. for delivery in the third and fourth quarters of 1944, or prior thereto, if possible

L-257 items	Equipment	Total units	Delivery date
TILLAGE AND PLANTING EQUIPMENT			
24.....	Grain drill, 3-7 disk.....	150	Aug. 1
26.....	Grain drill, plain, 14-run and under.....	2,175	Do.
42.....	Plow, moldboard, horse walking, steel bottom.....	2,000	Do.
48.....	Plow, moldboard, tractor-drawn, 2-bottom.....	3,225	Do.
49.....	Plow, moldboard, tractor-drawn, 3-bottom.....	1,675	Do.
63a.....	1-way disk plow.....	900	Do.
63b.....	1-way disk plow, seeding attachments for 1-way plow.....	900	Do.
79.....	Harrow section, spring tooth.....	5,900	Do.
80e.....	Harrow, disk.....	1,000	Do.
80d.....	Harrow, disk-tandem attachment for disk harrow.....	1,000	Do.
96.....	Field cultivator.....	1,200	Do.
96a.....	Do.....	700	Do.
194.....	Tractors, wheel, all-purpose under 30 belt horsepower.....	13,300	Do.
195.....	Tractors, wheel, all purpose over 30 belt horsepower.....	12,200	Do.
	Parts (tons).....	1,425	Do.
HARVESTING AND MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT			
111.....	Sprayers, knapsack.....	4,000	Dec. 30
129.....	Binder, ground-drive.....	2,250	Do.
146.....	Mower, ground-drive.....	4,700	Do.
148.....	Rakes, dump.....	2,000	Do.
149.....	Rakes, combination, side delivery and tedder.....	1,700	Do.

¹ As indicated in par. I (a), the tractors will be supplied from the production under the War Food Administration program.

IV. Controlled materials required for first and subsequent quarters of 1944

	Code 450	Code 451	Code 813	Total
Carbon steel (tons), 2001-2061.....	5,339	3,175	1,360	9,874
Alloy steel (tons), 2501-2561.....	97	24	65	186
Copper (pounds), 3011.....	2,387	4,527	3,496	10,410
Copper (pounds), 3021.....	4,932	304	4,160	9,396
Copper (pounds), 3041.....	5,081	574	8,116	13,771
Copper (pounds), 3071.....	20	454	1,156	1,630
Copper (pounds), 3101.....	15	582	960	1,557
Copper (pounds), 3201-3211.....	9,491	1,798	23,058	34,347
Aluminum (pounds), 4021-4121-4151.....	5	0	10	15
Aluminum (pounds), 4202-4218.....	267	10	69	346
Aluminum (pounds), 4251-4301-4311.....	0	0	18	18
Aluminum (pounds), 4351-4361-4601.....	0	1	6	7
Aluminum (pounds), 4401-4411.....	0	15	0	15

IV. Statement of approved production schedule of farm machinery and equipment for U. N. R. R. A. for delivery in the third quarter of 1944 or prior thereto if possible

L-257a item	Description	Units
26a.....	Grain drills, plain, over 14-run.....	2,148
48.....	2-bottom, 12-inch, tractor-drawn plows.....	4,697
49.....	3-bottom, 12-inch, tractor-drawn plows.....	2,025
50.....	4-bottom, 12-inch, tractor-drawn plows.....	300
53.....	2-bottom, 12-inch, tractor-mounted plows.....	478
63a.....	One-way disk plows, 5 feet and under 8 feet.....	250
63b.....	One-way disk plows, 8 feet and over.....	250
78.....	Spike-tooth harrow sections, tractor-drawn.....	6,830
79.....	Spring-tooth harrows, tractor-drawn.....	2,443
80d.....	Disk harrows, single and tandem, 6 feet and under.....	387
80e.....	Disk harrows, single and tandem, over 6 feet and under 11 feet.....	2,090
96.....	Field cultivators, spring tooth, 7 feet and under.....	1,076
96a.....	Field cultivators, spring tooth, over 7 feet.....	230
96b.....	Field cultivators, stiff tooth, 7 feet and under.....	1,612
96c.....	Field cultivators, stiff tooth, over 7 feet.....	420
194.....	Tractors, under 30 horsepower.....	5,100
195.....	Tractors, over 30 horsepower.....	2,400
	Repair parts (total tons of steel).....	1,602

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing is the actual record. It is taken from the files of the departments who have denied its very existence.

I have listened to the statements made by the gentlemen of the committee that such procedure will not continue, and I sincerely hope they are right. I ask the Congress to join with me in opposing this measure and serve notice that I will not, as an individual, approve such programs for these crystal-gazing Pied Pipers who lead us onward toward bankruptcy.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, in answer to what the gentleman has just stated, I want to call your attention to a statement that was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which sets forth fully and in detail a letter with accompanying statement from Mr. Leo T. Crowley, Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration, found on page A1527. This goes thoroughly into the question.

I will just read the first paragraph:

1. No farm machinery has yet been procured for U. N. R. R. A. and no United States funds will be used for that purpose until money is appropriated for U. N. R. R. A. by the Congress.

2. The so-called U. N. R. R. A. program for which the War Production Board made an allocation to F. E. A. of 30,000 tons of steel is a misnomer. This allocation, when put into production, is primarily intended to meet the farm-machinery requirements of the liberated areas during the period of military responsibility, when the equipment will be distributed under the authority of the theater commander.

This bears out what I have said that that amount will be used only for three different purposes, if foreign countries should buy or have the money to buy, or the areas under military domination should require it, or U. N. R. R. A. should have need of it.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I understand that no commitments have been made and I believe the House understands that, but do we also understand that the gentleman and his committee understand at least from those in authority and who will have the disposition of this matter that it will be a breach of faith on their part as to what they have told you if they authorize the use of more than 30,000 tons of steel during the next year for the manufacture of farm machinery to be shipped or sold to U. N. R. R. A.?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. That is our understanding, and I may say the Appropriations Committee can safeguard that when they go to appropriating the money. They may make any limitations they desire.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I believe the statement of Mr. Crowley and the statement I made agree in this, that the fathers of this particular legislation are denying its paternity in the very fact this letter has come through.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. There is no question about the statement. It was labeled for U. N. R. R. A. and it was not so intended for U. N. R. R. A. It was 30,000 tons for military areas and U. N. R. R. A., only if they used any. The chances are there will be none used by U. N. R. R. A. in the coming year because it looks now as if it will be some time before we get into those countries and U. N. R. R. A. cannot begin to operate until our military authorities evacuate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I can shed any further light after my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has spoken. My understanding from the testimony we have had is that we have a certain amount of steel production in the country. We plan and program that steel production. We allocate it to the various essential uses. It is necessary to plan in advance to give this 30,000 tons of steel either to lend-lease or U. N. R. R. A., either one or the other, depending upon whether the military still occupies the territory. There is no commitment, there is nothing binding, there is no procurement, there is no obligation until there is an appropriation agreed to by Congress, and there cannot be. There is no money in U. N. R. R. A. for the appropriation.

Another question arose as to whether the Lend-Lease Administration might be buying this equipment and turning it over to U. N. R. R. A. We were given to understand very definitely and very clearly by Mr. Crowley and by Mr. Cox that no such thing had been done; that no

business has been done by U. N. R. R. A. up to the present time, and will not be until Congress has acted.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Would the gentleman be interested in obtaining the names of manufacturers that were called in and asked how much U. N. R. R. A. machinery they could produce in addition to the regular allotment of American machinery?

Mr. WRIGHT. That does not disprove my point unless there is an obligation and a definite order—of course, they call in manufacturers, otherwise how could they find out what the potentialities of the plants are? Possibly they want to increase their production. That does not mean to say there is any order binding on the United States Treasury.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the testimony before us on lend-lease it was stated that in Australia today men are diverted from certain work and, reading between the lines, I can see that they were diverted from the Army, many thousands of them, to raise agricultural products. If that is true at the present time, you can imagine what will happen when they are asked to raise agricultural products for U. N. R. R. A.

The House knows, Mr. Speaker, that I voted against U. N. R. R. A. in committee, although it was stated repeatedly that the bill came out reported unanimously. I appeared before the Rules Committee against it, not that I did not want to cooperate and help other nations that are starving, for that is only decent. After all, it is rather to our self-interest to do that. But today relief and even reconstruction are being administered and administered well by the military, who know what pestilence and famine mean. They know how to administer relief wisely.

The military will never for one instant give away a military secret. Today there are many persons in U. N. R. R. A. who have never had any experience in any foreign country and know nothing about international relations. Think of the possibilities of what could happen in the way of giving information to the enemy.

I would like to have the House think for a minute just what the grocery bill will be that this country will pay under U. N. R. R. A., the military, lend-lease, and the bill that has already come out of the Foreign Affairs Committee and passed the Senate, to feed the starving and hungry of many nations. We are going to have quadruple groups administering relief.

Under U. N. R. R. A., no relief agency can operate without the permission of U. N. R. R. A. The International Red Cross even cannot function without their permission.

I pointed out in the House when the bill came up that the military should

continue to administer relief and then turn it over to the Red Cross, to persons who are used to handling relief, persons who want every religion to have its chance and the people to have the sort of education they want. The Red Cross administers impartially.

Mr. Speaker, the House remembers that I offered an amendment that would prohibit the use of funds for the control of education or religion. That would be the thing that should be done under the Atlantic Charter, and the way things are done in our own country. It failed. Senator WILLIS, of Indiana, secured the adoption of a somewhat similar amendment to the bill when it passed the Senate. Unfortunately that was thrown out in conference. Many of you have read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the proceedings of yesterday in the Senate, and all through it the debate is upon this very amendment by Senator WILLIS as to control of religion and education. If they do not intend to try to control religion and education, why did they refuse to put it in? Senator after Senator said there is nothing in U. N. R. R. A. that provides for control of religion or education, and yet, if that were true, why did they not accept that amendment? The Senate accepted it once. What is the mysterious something that prevents it? Senator CONNALLY states, if you will refer to page 2803, that it could be done in the Appropriations Committee. I am awfully tired of having the Appropriations Committee legislate for the House. Why does not the House legislate for itself?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Did I correctly understand that the Senate said this fund would not be used for control of education or religion in foreign countries?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is correct.

Mr. REED of New York. Is the gentleman aware that a survey is being made to see how many refugee students can be taken by the universities of this country that will be financed by U. N. R. R. A.?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is correct. At the present time I understand that U. N. R. R. A. is operating by means of the War Refugee Board. U. N. R. R. A. has already taken a good many of our doctors that we need so much for the care of our men. There is and will be a greater shortage in the Veterans' Administration of many doctors.

Mr. REED of New York. In many of our universities we educated Japanese, who have been fighting and killing our boys ever since.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is true. I repeatedly warned the House when the neutrality legislation was under consideration, and I warned against cash-and-carry, that Japan would do the very thing she did, get our scrap iron and get our war commodities very likely to use against us. There are many boys

from my own district that were killed in the South Pacific and at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Does the gentleman mean to state that she understands that some of this money is going to be used to bring boys from foreign countries over here and educate them?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is my understanding of the plan.

I called up two persons in the State Department and spoke about my amendment, and said I would like to put it in, and I was asked not to, because we might want to reeducate the people, we might want to give them a different form of religion. After all, we may not like the religions in other countries but we certainly do not want to control them, neither do we want their ideologies to be given to our own people. Think of the power of the purse and the tremendous influence U. N. R. R. A. can exercise.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. Is it not a fact that none of this money can be spent in any country unless it has been an occupied country or an occupied territory of that country?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Unless it is a liberated area.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman does not want to convey the idea that any of this money can be spent over here in this country?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They can be exchanged with students of this country. That is my understanding.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I was very much interested in the gentleman's amendment regarding education and religion. Has the gentleman looked at page 17 of the bill, as amended by the Senate, section 8, amendment No. 6? Was that stricken out in conference?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It was stricken out in conference.

Mr. STEFAN. I feel that this amendment ought to remain in the bill. It reads:

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

Do I understand that the Senate debated that amendment, and that it was stricken out in conference?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It was debated carefully and adopted by a vote of 45 to 18, but it seems the Senate was apologetic about throwing out that amendment in conference, because they repeatedly said there was nothing in the bill that provided for it. However, in our own national W. P. A., we know that both religious and educational philosophies and other types were attempted and somewhat promulgated under the

W. P. A. I leave it to the membership of the House to decide exactly what will happen in the countries abroad when any such thing is attempted under this international W. P. A., and this is a huge international W. P. A. By the way, Governor Lehman, the Administrator of U. N. R. R. A., is not a representative of the United States, but he is a representative of U. N. R. R. A. In the hearings I asked him if he was asked to go out and get supplies, natural resources in the United States, if there was a shortage in this country, if he would do so, and his reply was, "Yes." Then I said to him, "You are a creature of U. N. R. R. A.?" and he replied, "Yes."

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Take items 1 and 2, dealing with relief supplies and relief services, rehabilitation supplies and services; materials such as seeds, fertilizers, raw materials, and so forth, and the money can be used in procuring such material.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It is not in order to refer to statements or speeches or arguments made in the Senate.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I am referring to hearings on U. N. R. R. A. Is that out of order?

The SPEAKER. Statements from the hearings in the Senate are out of order.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Hearings before the Senate committees?

The SPEAKER. Certainly, if the hearings were used in the proceedings of the Senate.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Very well. That is in our own hearings, about rehabilitation of public utilities and services. Some of the money can be used in securing material and equipment for the rehabilitation of educational institutions. That is in our own hearings. Also, I would call attention to the fact that the Director General in charge of the Bureau of Areas is a Russian, Mr. Menshikov.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman is correct, and I ask unanimous consent at this point to insert information that I have as to U. N. R. R. A. regarding the personnel and the background of the personnel already engaged.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The following is the information requested:

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 20, 1944.
The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I am transmitting herewith a list of the employees of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, recently requested by your office.

Sincerely yours,

W. B. PHILLIPS,
Acting Chief, Division
of Public Information.

Employees of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration

Name	American—legal residence	Non-American, national of—
Abbot, Adeline	New Jersey	
Abbott, Lucy	New York	
Adams, Wayne W.	New Mexico	
Alband, William C.	New York	
Alcorn, Virginia N.	North Dakota	
Alden, Frances Burke	Maine	
Alt, Freda H.	Kansas	
Anderson, Dewey H.	California	
Applebee, Francis B.	New York	
Archer, Laird	(In field)	
Aquino, Virginia	Illinois	
Armstein, Margaret	New York	
Bacot, Dixie	South Carolina	
Bagby, Jessie Bell	Arkansas	
Baron, Anna	New York	
Bass, Gertrude	Ohio	
Bates, Victoria J.	Washington, D. C.	
Beall, Jane A.	Arkansas	
Beckelman, Moses	Washington, D. C.	
Bell, Edwina Mary	Florida	
Bell, Hazel M.	New York	
Bellows, Fredrick M.	do	
Benjamin, Jessie P.	Maryland	
Bennett, Mary J.	Mississippi	
Berger, Marie	Illinois	
Berry, Bessie	Maryland	
Bettman, Carol Helen	Ohio	
Bewley, Thomas	California	
Blaisdell, Catharine M.	Washington, D. C.	
Blinn, Robert K.	California	
Bonk, Stella N.	Massachusetts	
Boorady, Edna A.	New York	
Booz, Paul	Kansas	
Borders, Karl	Illinois	
Borne, Dorothy M.	Louisiana	
Borine, Ethel	(Not shown)	
Brennan, Mary Virginia	Washington, D. C.	
Bridges, Marion	Pennsylvania	
Brook, Myron R.	Nebraska	
Brookbank, Richard	Washington State	
Brown, Aldean	Michigan	
Brown, Emerson M.	do	
Brownbridge, Albert E.	New York	
Brunkard, Thomas V.	do	
Buffmire, Dorothy E.	Wisconsin	
Burd, Treva M. E.	Virginia	
Burton, Mortimer	Florida	
Byron, Gertrude	New York	
Caustin, H. E.	England	
Caldwell, Elsie M.	North Carolina	
Campbell, Ned	Arizona	
Campbell, Stuart	Virginia	
Cantrell, Catherine	Arkansas	
Chace, Mary G.	Virginia	
Chamberland, N. O.	Massachusetts	
Chamoud, Simone	New York	
Chan, Yau-Pik	China	
Cheplak, Mitzi F.	Washington, D. C.	
Childress, William C.	Virginia	
Chubbuck, Kathryn	New York	
Chudson, Walter A.	do	
Church, Irene	Kansas	
Cisna, Elsie D.	Mississippi	
Clark, Carnzu	Massachusetts	
Clark, Virginia	Georgia	
Coddington, Edna	New York	
Cohen, Myer	California	
Cohn, Emma	New York	
Cole, Mary C.	Alabama	
Compton, Carl O.	Massachusetts	
Condliffe, John B.	Massachusetts	
Conley, L. Ann	Massachusetts	
Conhain, Herbert J.	New York	
Connel, Howard Joseph	Pennsylvania	
Conroy, Abigail	Massachusetts	
Cover, John	Illinois	
Cowell, Charles C.	Ohio	
Crawford, Vera	Virginia	
Dalton, Margaret	Massachusetts	
Darling, George S.	New York	
Davies, Dilys Mary	England	
Dayton, Kenneth	New York	
Dean, Vera M.	do	
Decatur, Anne	New Jersey	
Dees, Lola	Alabama	
Delgado, Frank	Florida	
Denbo, Beatrice Shirley	New York	
Dennis, Madison	Ohio	
Diamond, Lillian	New York	
Dickens, Elizabeth J.	Washington State	
Dickinson, Edwin Dewit	do	
Donovan, Lucille	Indiana	
Dorr, Laurie D.	New York	
Douglass, Bette M.	Iowa	

Employees of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration—Con.

Name	American—legal residence	Non-American, national of—
Doull, James A.	Ohio	
Dula, John Edmond	New York	
Dunkleberger, Mildred L.	California	
Dykstra, Walling		Netherlands.
Edwards, Marguerite M.	Maryland	
Ekins, Mary C.	(Not shown)	
Eikleberry, Helen B.	South Dakota	
Eliot, Lois A. J.	Massachusetts	
Elkinton, Charles M.	Virginia	
Elliott, John E.	Maryland	
Elwin, Atha C.	do	
Emrich, Marion Vallat	New York	
Erickson, Florence	Pennsylvania	
Fack, Elizabeth	Colorado	
Factor, Norma	New York	
Fenov, Nicolai		Russia.
Felck, James	New York	
Feller, Abraham H.	Connecticut	
Filbert, Robert B.	(Not shown)	
Fillman, Gwendolyn	Nebraska	
Fingeroth, Elizabeth	New York	
Finkel, Alice	(Not shown)	
Fisher, Dorcas	Maryland	
Flexner, Carolin	New York	
Flynn, Jane Mary	do	
Fox, Grace E.	Washington, D. C.	
France, Helen M.	New York	
Franklin, Gladys J.	Washington, D. C.	
Franklin, Harry Lee	Kentucky	
Frazier, Frances	Virginia	
Fried, Anthony		Czechoslovakia.
Fritch, Jessie	Illinois	
Funkhouser, Richard L.	New Hampshire	
Garrett, Doris Yvonne	Ohio	
Gaumnitz, Richard K.	Minnesota	
Gaus, John M.	Wisconsin	
Gerstenzang, Leo	New York	
Gill, Olive A.	Texas	
Girard, Stephan	Illinois	
Glasse, Helena	New York	
Gold, Estelle	Washington, D. C.	
Goldberger, Leo Julius	New York	
Goodloe, Jane	Tennessee	
Gordon, Alexander	New York	
Graham, Helen V.	do	
Grantham, Josephine K.	Alabama	
Greene, James D.	Washington, D. C.	
Greene, Katrine	(Not shown)	
Greenstein, Harry	Maryland	
Grogg, Florence	Tennessee	
Grosvenor, Gordon	Pennsylvania	
Gubin, Justice F.	Indiana	
Gulick, Luther	District of Columbia	
Gumpper, Ada L.	Pennsylvania	
Gumpper, Evelynita	do	
Gunn, Selskar M.	Connecticut	
Hackman, Abe	New York	
Hammer, Philip G.	Virginia	
Handy, Martin A.	Maryland	
Harakas, James T.	(In field)	
Harrell, Elizabeth	North Carolina	
Harris, Joseph P.	California	
Harrison, Leslie H.	Washington, D. C.	
Hartlove, Emacita	Hawaii	
Huang, Robert T.		China.
Harvey, Frances H.	Illinois	
Helmers, Gladys	North Dakota	
Hendrickson, Roy F.	Iowa	
Hedquist, Euid	(Not shown)	
Henson, Edwin R.	Texas	
Herwitz, Harry K.	Illinois	
Higgins, Doris M.	(Not shown)	
Hill, Edna Margaret	New York	
Hobson, Gertrude	(In field)	
Hoehler, Fred Kenneth	Massachusetts	
Holland, Amy C.	New York	
Holzmann, Margaret	Illinois	
Hooper, Patricia	New Jersey	
Howard, Donald S.	Washington, D. C.	
Hyde, Alice	New York	
Iberg, Lowell	do	
Isikoff, Harry L.	do	
Jackson, Hugh	do	
Jacobs, Samuel	do	
Janus, C. George	Illinois	
Jerchow, Otille	New York	
Johnson, James G. Jr.	Maryland	
Johnson, Warren J.	Washington, D. C.	
Johnston, Lillian Jane	New York	
Jonisch, Sylvia	Washington, D. C.	
Jones, Mary Bagot	Washington, D. C.	England.
Kalichstein, Rita E.	do	
Kay, Hildred	(Not shown)	

Employees of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration—Con.

Name	American—legal residence	Non-American, national of—
Keenan, Harold E.	Massachusetts	
Keene, Mabel L.	Maryland	
Keeny, Spurgeon M.	New York	
Keller, Eugenia	Indiana	
Kelsey, Lincoln D.	New York	
Kent, Martin	do	
Kenworthy, Jane C.	Indiana	
Kerr, Peyton	California	
Kerr, Sybil P.	Georgia	
Kerze, Therese	New York	
Kettle, Fletcher	Illinois	
Kiernan, C. Jean	(Not shown)	
King, Viola	Washington, D. C.	
Kirkbride, Mary E.	Colorado	
Kolodny, Leo	New Jersey	
Krane, Jay B.	(In the field, England)	
Krause, Mary	Washington, D. C.	
Kugaczewska, Wanda	Maryland	
Lancaster, James B.	Washington, D. C.	
Lapin, Raye	New York	
Lariviere, Frances	Iowa	
Lawford, Geoffrey	(Not shown)	
Lay, Elizabeth	Washington State	
Lazarus, Theodore	New York	
Leff, David	California	
Lehman, Herbert H.	New York	
Leibovitz, Roberta	Rhode Island	
Leslie, Grey	New York	
Levin, Mable Foy	Maryland	
Lewis, Virginia B.	do	
Lina, Myrtle	Iowa	
Longley, Elizabeth	Maryland	
Lott, Eleanor	Illinois	
Leonard, Larry	New York	
Loucheim, Kathleen	Washington, D. C.	
Loewy, Harris	New York	
Luloff, Elaine	Connecticut	
Luria, Dorothy	do	
Lynch, Eleanor	Massachusetts	
MacMonnies, Wallace	New Jersey	
McMillen, Frederick	Washington State	
Manley, Claudine	North Carolina	
Manley, Odell	do	
Manusaki, Antigone	New Jersey	
Marburg, Jean	West Virginia	
Marclay, Elsie	Arkansas	
Mattern, Edith	South Dakota	
Matthews, John B.	Massachusetts	
Mattox, F. Annabella	Alabama	
May, Arthur	Michigan	
Mayo, Sara H.	(Not shown)	
McAllister, Pauline	Florida	
McCandlish, George E.	Washington	
McCann, Grace E.	West Virginia	
McCloskey, Janet	New York	
McDonald, Norma	do	Canada.
McGeachy, Craig	do	
McKeever, Bernard	Pennsylvania	
McMakin, Elythe	Maryland	
Mellet, Jeanne	(Not shown)	
Menshikov, Michail		Russia.
Merryman, Nina	Maryland	
Metropol, Bannia	South Carolina	
Meyer, John L.	Virginia	
Miles, Helen	Iowa	
Miller, Alice	New York	
Moller, Eleanor M.	do	
Montgomery, Katherine	Pennsylvania	
Moore, Marjorie	Minnesota	
Moore, William C.	New Jersey	
Morris, Annie	Washington, D. C.	
Morris, Pearl	(In field, England)	
Morrison, Bessie E.	(Not shown)	
Moy, Thelma	do	China.
Munder, Mabel	Washington, D. C.	
Murphy, Aura Lee	do	
Nadzo, Guido	New York	
Nash, Mary L.	Texas	
Neil, Helen N.	New York	
Netzorg, Elizabeth W.	Michigan	
Newcomb, Annabelle	Massachusetts	
Nickas, Mary	Ohio	
Norell, Benson	Washington, D. C.	
Norris, Corinne	Pennsylvania	
Nugent, Rolf	New York	
Olinger, Lucienne	do	
Osborne, Lithgow	do	
Otto, Elma	(Not shown)	
Owens, Esther	Massachusetts	
Page, Irene	(Not shown)	
Patterson, James	Connecticut	
Peck, Millard	Iowa	
Powell, Annie	Washington, D. C.	

Employees of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration—Con.

Name	American—legal residence	Non-American, national of—
Preston, Gene Isobel	Maine	
Peck, Naida	Kansas	
Pecot, Rebecca	Washington, D. C.	
Penery, Anne H.	California	
Perazich, George	New Jersey	
Perry, Agnes		
Peters, Lenita D.	Maryland	
Peterson, George L.	Minnesota	
Phillips, Bozie C. J.	Georgia	
Phillips, William B.	Illinois	
Pierce, Clarence	New York	
Plimpton, Jane F.	Massachusetts	
Plummer, Alina	Washington, D. C.	
Porter, Doris	Mississippi	
Purvis, Frances M.	Montana	
Racich, Ann	California	
Railley, Battaille	Alabama	
Rathje, Elnora	Nebraska	
Reed, Layle	South Dakota	
Rezak, Nicholas	New York	
Rhatigan, Edward	do	
Richards, Catherine	Massachusetts	
Richards, Gordon S.	do	
Rifkin, Ruth S.	New York	
Roberts, Dorothy F.	Missouri	
Robinson, Horace	Washington, D. C.	
Rodger, Mary		England.
Rogers, Clifton Paul	New York	
Rohrbach, Dorothy	Indiana	
Rooby, George	New York	
Roseman, Alvin	Ohio	
Rosenberg, Samuel	Virginia	
Rosenstein, Abraham	Connecticut	
Rosner, Alice	(Not shown)	
Rubin, Mary	New York	
Rubins, William	Pennsylvania	
Ruda, Frances	New York	
Rusk, Minnie	South Carolina	
Russell, Johnie Mae	do	
Ryshpan, Cicely	New York	
Ryther, Willie	North Carolina	
Sadow, Sue	Massachusetts	
Salter, Arthur (Sir)		Do.
Sayre, Francis B.	Washington, D. C.	
Scaaf, Carl Hart	Virginia	
Schachter, Oscar	do	
Schaefer, Loraine	Montana	
Schenker, Herbert	Pennsylvania	
Schmitter, Lyle L.	Illinois	
Scranton, Laurell	Nebraska	
Semaske, Gertrude	South Carolina	
Semelisky, Ruth	New York	
Sender, Tony	do	
Servison, Gertrude	Washington, D. C.	
Sevareid, Lois	Maryland	
Sexton, Mary Ellen	Tennessee	
Shack, Mildred	New York	
Shafer, Marian	Washington, D. C.	
Shannon, Wilma	New York	
Sheriff, Alice	Maryland	
Shlamanna, Dena	Wyoming	
Shureliff, Alice	Massachusetts	
Sibley, Hiram	New York	
Simmons, Charles	Washington, D. C.	
Singerman, Sylvia	Pennsylvania	
Slagsvold, Peter	Montana	
Sluchan, Miram	New York	
Smith, Jane Horbart	Pennsylvania	
Smith, Leonidas R. Jr.	Washington, D. C.	
Smith, Lorenzo	do	
Smith, Linton	California	
Sorieri, Antonio	New York	
Spillacy, Bettie	do	
Spinks, Francis	California	
Staley, A. Eugene	Massachusetts	
Stanski, Mary	New Jersey	
Steckel, Grace P.	Kansas	
Steel, Herbert	Missouri	
Stillwell, Ray	Texas	
Strogonova, Nadejda		Russia.
Sulzberger, David	New York	
Swisher, Janice	Texas	
Synhorst, Alice	Iowa	
Taris, Frances	New York	
Tellier, Grace W.	Arkansas	
Thompson, Doris	New York	
Thomas, Thalia	Maryland	
Tolley, Grant	California	
Tull, Ray Ashbrook	Colorado	
Tyson, Winifred	New York	
Uhlmann, Martin S.	Michigan	
Underhill, Louise	New York	
Valentine, John	Illinois	
VanGelder, H. P.		Canada.
Vassardaki, Lucile	New York	
Veatch, Ray	Oregon	

Employees of United Nations Relief and
Rehabilitation Administration—Con.

Name	American—legal residence	Non- American, national of—
VonThurn, Elizabeth....	Washington, D. C.	
Wadsworth, Lisa.....	New York	
Warren, George.....	Connecticut	
Washburn, Eleanor....	Washington, D. C.	
Watson, Louise.....	(Not shown)....	
Weber, Milton.....	New York	
Weigel, John.....	Illinois	
Weintraub, David.....	New York	
Welk, William.....	Washington, D. C.	
Whipple, Francis M. (Mrs.)	(Not shown)....	
Whitaker, Margaret....	do.....	
Whitman, Mary.....	do.....	
Wickland, Eleanor....	do.....	
Wilbur, Virginia.....	Pennsylvania	
Williams, Edward.....	(Not shown)....	
Williams, Elizabeth M.	North Carolina	
Williams, Rita.....	(Not shown)....	
Williams, Ruth.....	New York	
Wilson, Theodore.....	Illinois	
Wilson, Wayne.....	do.....	
Wingert, A. Leonella..	(Not shown)....	
Wolff, F. Richard.....	New York	
Wyant, Nina.....	West Virginia	
Xanthaky, George.....	New York	
Yalch, Margaret J.....	Pennsylvania	
Youdin, Richard.....	(In field, Egypt).	
Young, Dora.....	Massachusetts	
Zamoyska, Morag.....		Poland.
Zimmerman, Opal.....	Illinois	
Zorich, Mayre.....	South Dakota..	

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made and include material I used in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, taking up this point that has been discussed in respect to U. N. R. R. A. interfering with educational activities, or attempting to control religious and educational teachings, let me call attention to one or two matters in that connection. A debate was held in another body and one of the participants in that debate is a member of the committee of that body that passed upon the terms of the agreement before that agreement was submitted to the several nations, and he has a very excellent conception of the meaning of that agreement and its objectives. In that debate in the other body, and I use that phrase "the other body" lest somebody may make the point of order that I am referring to the Senate.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman's remarks directed to the other body are out of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York should be cognizant of the rules governing references to the other body.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. And what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In any event, here is a statement from the Secretary of State of the United States, and I think I can mention the title of that office at this time. He wrote to that other body, direct from the State Department, to this effect:

The U. N. R. R. A. has no power whatever to enter into educational, religious, or political activities.

That is the conception of the Government of the United States, as represented by the State Department.

Now, with respect to the omission of this amendment from the conference report, it is admitted that some difficulty was encountered in a special instance, and that difficulty, if resolved, would not in my judgment indicate that U. N. R. R. A. is going to try to run the schools and teach political philosophy or religious concepts. I quote from a memorandum in connection with this particular section B:

The only connection that U. N. R. R. A.'s work may have with education is by virtue of paragraph 4, section II, of resolution 1 of the U. N. R. R. A. Council, which provides that one of the U. N. R. R. A.'s functions may be "assistance in procuring material equipment for the rehabilitation of educational institutions." This provision was inserted at the instance of the Chinese delegation, who referred to the systematic effort of the Japanese armies to destroy Chinese schools and institutions. For your confidential information the following is an excerpt from the résumé of the meeting of the subcommittee of the Council at Atlantic City at which this provision was adopted:

"During the course of the discussion on this amendment, the member for China indicated that under this provision U. N. R. R. A. would not itself procure materials but that it would assist in such procurement. Moreover, the use of the word 'material' would limit the assistance to the procurement of books, laboratory equipment, and other similar items, without requiring the Director General to interfere in anyway with the educational system of the particular liberated area. Under this provision, the Director General might serve as a middleman in obtaining, on the one hand, information as to material available in the countries that have not been occupied, and on the other, information as to the material needed for the rehabilitation of educational institutions within the various liberated areas. In this way the Director General could be of great assistance without placing any large burden on the resources of the U. N. R. R. A."

So, as a matter of fact, the omission of that amendment from this conference report was decided upon because, had it been stated as written, it might have been construed to forbid U. N. R. R. A. to repair broken glass windows in a half-wrecked school, on the ground that that was interfering with educational institutions. I can assure the Members of the House that U. N. R. R. A. has not the slightest intention of controlling education, much less religion. We have been assured of that over and over again, and I think we can dispel that fear from our minds.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts) there were—ayes 68, noes 31.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 287, noes 57, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]

YEAS—287

Abernethy	Gossett	Mruk
Andersen	Graham	Mundt
H. Carl	Granger	Murdock
Anderson, Calif.	Grant, Ala.	Murphy
Anderson	Grant, Ind.	Murray, Tenn.
N. Mex.	Gregory	Murray, Wis.
Andrews, Ala.	Gross	Myers
Andrews, N. Y.	Gwynne	Newsome
Angell	Hagen	Norman
Arends	Hale	Norton
Auchincloss	Hall	O'Brien, Ill.
Barrett	Leonard W.	O'Brien, N. Y.
Barry	Halleck	O'Neal
Bates, Ky.	Hancock	Outland
Beall	Hare	Patman
Beckworth	Harris, Ark.	Patton
Bell	Harris, Va.	Peterson, Fla.
Bender	Hart	Peterson, Ga.
Bennett, Mich.	Hartley	Pfeifer
Bennett, Mo.	Hays	Pittenger
Blackney	Heffernan	Ploeser
Bland	Herter	Plumley
Bloom	Hess	Poage
Boiton	Hill	Poulson
Boykin	Hinshaw	Powers
Bradley, Pa.	Hobbs	Pracht,
Brehm	Hoch	C. Frederick
Brown, Ga.	Hoeven	Priest
Brown, Ohio	Holfield	Ramey
Bryson	Holmes, Mass.	Ramspeck
Burch, Va.	Holmes, Wash.	Randolph
Burchill, N. Y.	Horan	Rankin
Burdick	Howell	Reece, Tenn.
Butler	Hull	Rees, Kans.
Byrne	Jackson	Richards
Cannon, Fla.	Jarman	Rivers
Cannon, Mo.	Jeffrey	Robertson
Capozzoli	Jenkins	Rockwell
Carson, Ohio	Jennings	Rodgers, Pa.
Chapman	Jensen	Rogers, Calif.
Church	Johnson, Ind.	Rohrbough
Clark	Johnson,	Rolph
Clason	J. Leroy	Rowan
Cochran	Johnson,	Rowe
Coffee	Luther A.	Russell
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson,	Sasser
Colmer	Lyndon B.	Sauthoff
Compton	Johnson, Okla.	Schwabe
Cooley	Jonkman	Scott
Cooper	Judd	Sheppard
Costello	Kean	Simpson, Pa.
Courtney	Kearney	Slaughter
Crosser	Keefe	Smith, Va.
Cunningham	Ke'auver	Smith, W. Va.
D'Alesandro	Kennedy	Snyder
Davis	Keogh	Somers, N. Y.
Delaney	Kerr	Sparkman
Dewey	Kilburn	Spence
Dickstein	Kilday	Springer
Dies	King	Stanley
Dilweg	Kinzer	Stevenson
Dingell	Kirwan	Stewart
Dirksen	Kleberg	Sullivan
Domengaux	Kunkel	Sundstrom
Dondero	LaFollette	Taber
Doughton	Landis	Talbot
Douglas	Lanham	Talle
Drewry	Lea	Tarver
Durham	LeCompte	Thomas, Tex.
Eaton	Lesinski	Thomason
Eberharter	Lewis	Tibbott
Elliott	Ludlow	Tolan
Ellison, Md.	Lynch	Torrens
Ellsworth	McConnell	Towe
Elston, Ohio	McCord	Treadway
Engle, Calif.	McCormack	Troutman
Fay	McCowan	Vincent, Ky.
Fellows	McGregor	Voorhis, Calif.
Fenton	McKenzie	Wadsworth
Fish	McMillan	Walter
Fisher	McMurray	Ward
Fitzpatrick	McWilliams	Waselewski
Flannagan	Madden	Weaver
Folger	Magnuson	Weichel, Ohio
Forand	Mahon	Wells
Ford	Maloney	Welch
Fulbright	Mansfield, Tex.	Wene
Gale	Marcantonio	Whitten
Gathings	Martin, Iowa	Whittington
Gavin	Martin, Mass.	Wigglesworth
Gerlach	Michener	Wiley
Gilchrist	Miller, Conn.	Winstead
Gillette	Miller, Mo.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gillie	Miller, Pa.	Wolverton, N. J.
Goodwin	Mills	Woodrum, Va.
Gordon	Monkiewicz	Worley
Gore	Morrison, La.	Wright
Gorski	Mott	Zimmerman

NAYS—57

Allen, La.	Griffiths	Reed, Ill.
Arnold	Harness, Ind.	Reed, N. Y.
Bishop	Heldinger	Rizley
Boren	Hoffman	Robison, Ky.
Bradley, Mich.	Hope	Rogers, Mass.
Brooks	Johnson	Scrivner
Brumbaugh	Anton J.	Shafer
Buffett	Johnson	Simpson, Ill.
Camp	Calvin D.	Smith, Ohio
Carrier	Jones	Smith, Wis.
Case	Lemke	Stefan
Clevenger	Maas	Stockman
Cole, Mo.	Mason	Sumner, Ill.
Cravens	Miller, Nebr.	West
Crawford	Norrell	White
Curtis	O'Brien, Mich.	Wickersham
Day	O'Hara	Wilson
Dworshak	O'Konski	Wolcott
Ellis	Pace	Woodruff, Mich.
Gearhart	Philbin	

NOT VOTING—84

Allen, Ill.	Furlong	Monroney
Andresen	Gallagher	Morrison, N. C.
August H.	Gamble	O'Connor
Baldwin, Md.	Gibson	O'Toole
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gifford	Phillips
Barden	Green	Pratt
Bates, Mass.	Hall	Joseph M.
Bonner	Edwin Arthur	Price
Buckley	Harless, Ariz.	Rabaut
Bulwinkle	Hébert	Robinson, Utah
Burgin	Hendricks	Sabath
Busbey	Izac	Sadowski
Canfield	Johnson, Ward	Satterfield
Carlson, Kans.	Kee	Scanlon
Carter	Kelley	Schiffler
Celler	Klein	Sheridan
Chenoweth	Knutson	Short
Chiperfield	Lambertson	Sikes
Cox	Lane	Smith, Maine
Curley	Larcade	Starnes, Ala.
D'Alesandro	LeFevre	Stearns, N. H.
Dawson	Luce	Summers, Tex.
Disney	McGehee	Taylor
Elmer	McLean	Thomas, N. J.
Engel, Mich.	Manasco	Vinson, Ga.
Feighan	Mansfield	Vorys, Ohio
Fernandez	Mont	Vursell
Fogarty	May	Whelchel, Ga.
Fuller	Merritt	Winter
Fulmer	Morrow	

So the conference report was agreed to.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Satterfield for, with Mr. Short against.
Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Lambertson against.
Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Gibson against.
Mr. Merritt for, with Mr. Vursell against.
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Whelchel of Georgia against.
Mr. O'Toole for, with Mr. Disney against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Kelley with Mr. Carlson of Kansas.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Elmer.
Mr. Morrison of North Carolina with Mr. Fuller.

Mr. Klein with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Monroney with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Joseph M. Pratt.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Ward Johnson.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Knutson.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. LeFevre.
Mr. May with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mrs. Smith of Maine.

Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Morrow.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Taylor.

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF TIME DURING WHICH CERTAIN GRAINS AND OTHER PRODUCTS TO BE USED FOR LIVESTOCK MAY BE IMPORTED FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES FREE OF DUTY

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4410) to extend for an additional 90 days the period during which certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed may be imported from countries free of duty, with Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, after line 15, insert "(3) Oats to be used for purposes of human consumption if the entry or withdrawal is after the date this paragraph takes effect."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House the Speaker may be authorized to sign the enrolled bill, H. R. 4410.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. JACKSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the bill H. R. 3961, and to have them placed following the remarks of the gentleman from California in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURCHILL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of the House an editorial which appeared in the Binghamton Sun, March 18, concerning the St. Patrick's Day speech delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley, chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee, and I ask unanimous consent to include this speech in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BURCHILL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, in one to include a resolution and in the other to include a poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein copy of the Minnesota law on the soldiers' vote.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SCOTT, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the bill, H. R. 3961.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD at that point in the RECORD where I spoke today on H. R. 3961, and to include therein some correspondence between myself and the Corps of Engineers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a certain exhibit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, first, in reference to international currency. I have an estimate on this of \$195 from the Public Printer. I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by B. M. Anderson. On that I have an estimate of \$495. I desire to combine these two in one article and I ask unanimous consent that these articles may be included, notwithstanding the estimate of the Public Printer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL—1945

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4443, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, and pending that

motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate may continue throughout the day and close not later than 3 p. m. on tomorrow, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4443, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the lateness of the hour, I hope as many members of the Committee of the Whole as can do so remain during the attempt on my part to present as briefly as I may the facts about this bill.

The Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations began its hearings on the 7th day of February and since that time has been engaged almost continuously in morning and afternoon sessions in the completion of hearings on the bill which, as you will observe from examining them, are of a rather voluminous character, and in the work of writing up the bill we are anxious to have you understand as clearly as possible the reasons which have actuated us in taking certain actions in connection with the formulation of the bill, especially those which have been taken either in reduction or in the increase of Budget estimates. The bill, in our judgment, will prove a less fruitful source of controversy than has any agricultural appropriation bill presented to this House during the last several years.

The subcommittee is practically in unanimous agreement. Of course, there are some items in the bill concerning which we were not able to reach entire agreement on the part of all members of the subcommittee, but the subcommittee is more nearly in unanimous agreement regarding the provisions of this bill than it has been in regard to any agricultural appropriation bill presented to this House since I have served as a member of the subcommittee.

I desire at this time to express the very deep appreciation which I feel for the fine spirit shown by all members of the subcommittee, including the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who is also a member of this subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WENE], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], who have been so cooperative in connection with the preparation of the bill and for the very large amount of work faithfully per-

formed, which has been necessary on the part of all of them in its preparation.

We have, of course, had the assistance of one of the most able employees of the House Committee on Appropriations who, throughout many years of service, has demonstrated his extraordinary efficiency and who has perhaps had more to do with the preparation of the bill than has any individual member of the subcommittee. I refer, of course, to our genial clerk, Mr. Arthur Orr.

I wish to point out in the beginning of my remarks, as shown by the summary contained on pages 3 and 4 of the committee report, that this bill has been more drastically reduced below the level of the appropriation act for the Department for which it provides for the current fiscal year than has been any supply bill presented so far during this session of the Congress for any of the departments of the Government. That statement was made also last year in comparing the bill for this fiscal year with that for the fiscal year 1943. It was true then, as it is now.

We have here, therefore, a bill which, when all of its provisions are taken into account, carries about 45 percent less in the way of actual money than was carried in the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the current fiscal year 1944. In making that statement I am taking into consideration the appropriations and reappropriations and loan funds authorized for use in the bills for the 2 fiscal years.

If we take into consideration only appropriations and reappropriations, the amount of the reduction below the funds made available for these items for the present fiscal year is approximately 41 percent, but when consideration of the loan provisions is added the amount of the reduction is 45 percent.

The bill as presented to you here is \$93,500,000-plus below budget estimates. It is approximately \$404,000,000 below the amount carried in the bill for the present fiscal year for appropriations and for reappropriations, which amount was approximately \$972,000,000. When, as I have said, you take into account the reduction of loan authorizations carried in the bill, in addition to this tremendous reduction in appropriations and reappropriations, you have a still further reduction in the amount made available of \$82,500,000, which brings the present bill to only 55 percent of the bill for the current fiscal year, involving a reduction of 45 percent.

You may think it strange that I, as one who is deeply interested in agriculture and in contributing to the solution of the problems of agriculture, insofar as it can be done by the appropriation of money for the support of the Department of Agriculture, am thus stressing the fact that by action of the subcommittee on which I serve as chairman there has been such a tremendous reduction in the amount of Federal funds made available for agricultural purposes. I want to assure you that not only myself, but every member of the subcommittee, while we have been interested in bringing about all reasonable economies, have at the same time endeavored to have the bill, insofar as we could under

the limitations under which we labored, provide as fully as possible for the reasonable needs of agriculture insofar as those needs could be supplied through the agricultural appropriation bill.

Perhaps the farmer has been requested, through the submission of this bill in its drastically curtailed form, to assume more than a fair share of the reduction in national expenditures, and to be deprived of services which, in many instances, are of a type which are desirable, if not essential, in the making of proper provision for the needs of agriculture in this time of emergency.

We have not thought, however, to so severely reduce appropriations for the Department of Agriculture as to bring about the reduction or elimination of any absolutely essential activity. We have believed that the farmers of the country generally would approve our efforts to effect all reasonable economies and in that position we have been supported by the evidence of officials of the American Farm Bureau who appeared before our subcommittee, this having been the only farm organization which requested the opportunity to appear and be heard. Of course, there are certain subject matters we could not consider. We have no power to include anything in the bill for the school-lunch program, for which provision was made in the bill for the present fiscal year in the amount of \$50,000,000, which was transferred from section 32 funds intended to be used in facilitating the distribution of surplus agricultural commodities. That provision was legislative. Under the rules of the House we are prohibited from bringing in any provision in this bill which would be subject to a point of order as being legislative in character. The same statement applies to the appropriations and loan authorizations which were proposed by the Budget for the Farm Security Administration, amounting to \$126,000,000.

There are at least some members on the subcommittee, including myself, who would like to have seen adequate provision made for the continuance of the work of the Farm Security Administration. Certainly there must be provision made for conserving the huge investment of Government funds, amounting to over \$400,000,000, which have already been invested in this program. It is absolutely inconceivable that the Congress should fail to make any provision for Farm Security Administration activities and simply leave the matter of the collection and conservation of those funds up in the air, with the Government's interests unattended to. So, I apprehend that before this bill is finally enacted by the Congress some provision will be found in the bill to take care of this situation, certainly for the conservation of these funds, and I trust for the carrying on in a reasonable way of the activities of the Farm Security Administration for another fiscal year.

We are all familiar with the fact that there has been reported from the Committee on Agriculture a bill that seeks to revise this program and to authorize it, and to combine it with the program of

the Emergency Crop Loan and of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. Of course, I do not know what action will be taken by the Congress on that proposed legislation.

If the Congress desires to enact a law under which these activities are taken care of, then I trust that it will do so before this bill is finally enacted, so that an appropriation under the terms of whatever law it may enact may be included in the bill. If it does not enact such a law, then I certainly trust that the Senate in its consideration of the bill, not being bound by the same rules which obtain in the House, will insert adequate provision for the Farm Security Administration activities.

I wish also to point out in connection with the remarks I have made concerning the drastic reduction in the appropriations carried in the bill the fact that \$170,000,000-plus of this reduction is accounted for by the omission from this bill of any provision for parity payments. We carried, of course, in the bill for the current fiscal year a provision for parity payments on the 1942 crops to carry out an obligation which had been assumed by the Congress in connection with the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1943. At this time it appears that all of the major crops to which parity payments would be applicable are selling at or above parity according to parity standards fixed by law, with perhaps one or two exceptions where the prices are almost to parity. Therefore, no provision has been made in this bill for parity payments, and that accounts for a considerable part of the reduction in the over-all appropriations carried in the bill.

There is also the reduction in loan funds for the farm-tenant program of \$15,000,000.

Even with these last-mentioned items, which were included in the Agricultural Appropriations Act for 1944—and have not been included in the present bill—not taken into account, there is still a tremendous reduction in the funds carried in this bill for direct appropriations, reappropriations, and loans as compared with the act for the present fiscal year, amounting to \$152,921,695.

In addition to appropriations, reappropriations, and loan authorizations, there are, of course, available to the Department of Agriculture certain trust funds estimated to amount, for the next fiscal year, to \$10,144,950 and certain funds derived from permanent appropriations, amounting in the aggregate to \$125,309,615, making a total of funds for the Department of Agriculture for the 1945 fiscal year of \$843,759,959, if the recommendations of this subcommittee, as outlined in the pending bill, are approved by the Congress, as against a total of all similar items for the present year of \$1,089,624,558.

I shall not have the time, nor would you have the patience to listen to me for the time that might be necessary, to discuss all of the provisions of this bill. I do ask you to turn with me to the tabular statement which is set out on page 20 of the committee report and the following

pages, and I shall make some brief reference to the outstanding items in regard to which the committee has undertaken to effect some changes, either to increase or to decrease Budget estimates.

SECRETARY'S OFFICE AND OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Certain items for the Office of the Secretary and the Office of the Solicitor were increased by small amounts, in the one case \$29,200 and in the other case \$125,200, largely because of the fact that with the reduction in the working funds of the Department, contemplated by the appropriations made later on in the bill, the work of the Office of the Secretary and of the Solicitor's office ought to be materially decreased. In addition to that, as far as the Office of the Secretary is concerned, there has been set up in the Department, as you know, the Office of the War Food Administrator, which has charge of most of the organizations of the Department, and administrative supervision over them, and that fact should bring about a reduction in the work of the Secretary's office.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

While the committee has approved the Budget estimates for the Office of Information, they represent a reduction of \$284,524 below funds available for the present fiscal year. The services of that Office, its publications, and the information it is able to furnish the farmers of the country are of inestimable value at this time when the American farmer is exerting himself to the utmost to meet the requirements of the food-for-victory program. The committee has reluctantly approved the contemplated economies in this Office but hopes that the funds carried in the bill will enable it to function with reasonable efficiency.

LIBRARY

The bill carries for the library of the Department \$543,233 which is identical with the amount provided in the 1944 act.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

There is some difference of opinion among the members of the subcommittee as to whether it is wise at this time to make further reductions in the funds appropriated for this Bureau. Its economic investigations, if properly conducted, are of vital importance to American agriculture. Speaking for myself alone, I feel that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, while the information it furnishes should, of course, be accurate, is supposed primarily to be working for the benefit of agriculture and of the farmer and that too much of its effort has been devoted to an attempt to prove that the condition of the farmer is satisfactory, and that he is being accorded a fair deal in comparison with other classes of our people in the pending emergency. I do not believe that such findings and contentions accurately or fairly present the farmers' case. While prices of agricultural commodities have increased, their increase has been by no means proportionate to the increases in the values of manufactured goods or in the value of services either in war

industry or in other civilian employment. While labor in war industry is receiving approximately 200 percent of what it received in World War No. 1, the farmers' prices are very substantially less in value than they were during that war and his labor machinery and fertilizer costs are largely in excess of those which then prevailed. Profits in industry, which are so tremendous as to be in large part responsible for a national income exceeding anything of which anyone ever dreamed in our national history, have not been accompanied by anything like proportionate profits in agriculture.

The farmer is, therefore, justified in feeling that he is not receiving the consideration which is the lot of many classes of our citizenry. If this be the fact, and I think it is, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, supposed to be working for the farmer, has not adequately developed it, and I, therefore, feel that it has not been wholeheartedly the servant of agriculture as it should have been. Perhaps the committee would feel justified in increasing rather than decreasing the amount of its appropriation for economic investigations if it were able to feel that in this field the Bureau is accomplishing to the full and with wholehearted sincerity the type of work which it was set up to do.

The appropriation for its crop and livestock estimates has been approved as submitted by the Budget.

OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

The appropriation carried for the activities of this Office is identical with that for the present fiscal year and with the Budget estimate.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

Budget estimates for the Office of the Administrator have been approved without change, including the appropriation of \$1,226,364 for the special research fund.

EXTENSION SERVICE AND OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

We have been carrying, as you know, in every bill for the last several years a lump-sum appropriation for the Extension Service, \$255,000, and for the Office of Experiment Stations, \$63,708, for the purpose of preventing any States from receiving a smaller allotment of funds than they had received prior to the 1940 farm census. These supplemental appropriations have not been authorized by law, and heretofore we could not include them in the bill, under the rules of the House, but this year we are proceeding under a unanimous-consent agreement, reached yesterday, by which the House may consider as in order any items carried in the bill which are proposed for authorization under the Pace bill, which passed the House March 7, 1944, just as if that bill had finally been enacted into law, and the making of these two supplemental appropriations is proposed for authorization by the terms of the Pace bill. Therefore, under the rules and the unanimous-consent agreement under which we are proceeding, these two items are in order, and since the House has on several other occasions

manifested its purpose to continue the appropriation of these funds, the subcommittee has included provision for them in the pending bill. Other estimates for these organizations have been approved without change.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY (A. R. A.)

A very controversial subject matter is involved in the reduction which has been made in the estimates for the Bureau of Animal Industry, and there has been, as I presume all of you know, an organized campaign upon the part of friends of the field service in the Bureau of Animal Industry to have approval given to the proposed reclassification of 2,472 of these field employees, the effect of which would be to bring about a salary increase of an average of \$289 for each of these employees.

I say to you frankly that many arguments which in my judgment have merit were presented to the subcommittee in favor of the proposed increase in salaries, which is what it amounts to, in fact. Except for the circumstances under which the matter came to the attention of the committee, the committee might have felt inclined to have gone along with the suggestion, but we find ourselves confronted with these facts. All Federal employees have had increases in pay under the provisions of the Overtime Pay Act of 1943, amounting for these particular employees to an average of \$452 per employee. We felt that if the Congress should at this time provide for an additional increase through the reclassification method, for all of these field employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry, we would start a movement on the part of many organizations of Federal employees to secure for themselves similar consideration. In fact there was proposed in connection with the legislative appropriation bill passed by the House a few days ago by the subcommittee reporting the bill, an increase of \$330,000 to provide for an increase in the salaries of the law clerks in the district and circuit court judges' offices, and in the full committee that proposed increase was stricken because the committee did not want to embark on an increase in salaries beyond the 21.6 percent carried by the Overtime Pay Act. So this subcommittee handling the present bill, in an effort to be consistent with the action of the committee on the legislative appropriation bill, has eliminated from the estimates here approximately \$996,000, which would have been necessary for the next fiscal year to have paid these increases in salaries, and in addition has found it possible to reappropriate \$343,000 which had been appropriated for the present fiscal year for the work of eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease, and which it had been proposed to use to increase these salaries for the remainder of the present fiscal year.

That money will not be expended during the present fiscal year, unless the Congress should express its approval of this reclassification plan. In the event it should do that, it would be spent, and that would mean an increase in this appropriation of not \$996,000 in all but of

\$966,000 plus \$343,000, which would have to be added to the figures contained in the bill since we would not have that money to reappropriate for the next fiscal year and could not by that process reduce the estimate for the Bureau of Animal Industry.

I trust this may satisfactorily explain the present status of this proposed plan. I apprehend that the matter will be brought to your attention in reading the bill under the 5-minute rule. A motion was made in the whole Committee on Appropriations to restore these cuts that we had made from the Budget estimates for this particular purpose, and that motion was rejected by the full committee by a vote of 19 to 4. It is the hope, at least of a majority of the subcommittee, that the House may approve the action of the subcommittee with regard to this item.

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY (A. R. A.)

The estimates for this Bureau which are identical with the appropriations for the present fiscal year have been approved without change.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY, SOILS, AND AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING (A. R. A.)

The estimates for this Bureau, with its manifold activities, including agricultural engineering investigations, cereal crops and diseases, cotton and other fiber crops and diseases, dry-land agriculture, forage crops and diseases, forest pathology, fruit and vegetable crops and diseases, irrigation agriculture, plant exploration, soil and fertilizer investigations, the plant industry experiment farm, soil surveys, sugar-plant investigation, and tobacco investigations, represent in almost every instance small reductions below the amounts carried in the act for the present fiscal year.

We have approved the Budget estimates with two exceptions, having made a small additional appropriation of \$3,110 in connection with the investigation of fruit and vegetable crops and diseases, and a reduction of soil-survey item of \$12,000, feeling that additional soil surveys at this time are unlikely to prove beneficial in the war effort and especially that these should not be undertaken until it is possible to make available for the use of farmers the information which has already been collected by previous surveys, a great deal of which has not yet been published.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE (A. R. A.)

The estimates for this very important Bureau include provisions for research in fruit insects, Japanese beetle control, sweetpotato weevil control, Mexican fruitfly control, citrus canker eradication, gypsy and brown-tailed moth control, Dutch elm disease eradication, phony peach and peach mosaic eradication, forest insects, truck crop and garden insects, cereal and forage insects, barberry eradication, cotton insects, pink bollworm and thurberia control, bee culture, insects affecting man and animals, insect pest survey and identification, and foreign parasites.

Numerous budgetary reductions in this multitude of items have been approved,

although we feel that sufficient funds are now carried in the bill for these worthy purposes to insure the efficient continuance of proper research and investigation. In only one instance have we exceeded Budget estimate. We have restored a proposed budgetary cut of \$6,950 in the item for bee culture.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY (A. R. A.)

The committee examined with a great deal of care witnesses having knowledge of the types of investigations being carried on by this Bureau and were particularly interested in the work of the four regional research laboratories. Many substantial accomplishments were reported in connection with that work and the attention of interested Members is respectfully invited to the hearings regarding these subject matters.

In the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry there has been an increase of \$18,536 for the purpose of carrying on some very essential work at Winter Haven laboratory in Florida in connection with the experimentation on processes for the preservation of citrus fruit juices so as to aid in shipment abroad for the use of our armed forces and our allies without damage in shipment. We were given advice as to considerable losses which have been sustained by reason of the spoilage of such products in shipment heretofore. The laboratory at Winter Haven has been doing some very important, and to some extent at least, successful work in undertaking to solve these particular problems.

BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS

I am sure all the Members of the House are deeply interested in the work of the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, which heretofore has been known as the Bureau of Home Economics. It is the women's organization of the Department of Agriculture. Frequently we have letters from women throughout the country complaining that whereas we appropriate \$17,000,000 or \$18,000,000 for the Bureau of Animal Industry, yet for this organization which has to do with the problems of the American home and homemaking we appropriate what seems to them to be a miserly sum, estimated by the Budget for the next fiscal year at \$606,000. I hope you will find time to read the hearings on this bill, and particularly the evidence of the outstanding women from all over the United States who came before our committee to testify in behalf of increases in the Budget estimates for this Bureau. They asked for \$675,000 more, which would have more than doubled the amount of the appropriation. The committee was very sympathetic with their request, but felt that under the present conditions we were not justified in granting it to the full extent that was desired. But we have provided here in this bill for an increase in appropriations for this Bureau above the estimates for the next fiscal year of \$200,000 for certain very desirable types of research activities which you will find outlined in the committee report and in the hearings.

BELTSVILLE RESEARCH CENTER (A. R. A.)

The Budget estimate for administrative expenses of the Beltsville Research Center has been approved without change. Most of the moneys expended at Beltsville, as Members of the Congress know, are appropriated to the several bureaus of the Department doing work there, and the comparatively small item of \$130,760 carried in the bill represents only over-all administrative expenses.

WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL

The Budget estimate for this very important work has been approved as submitted in the amount of \$2,264,026.

FOREST SERVICE

Despite the fact that two small increases were made in items of appropriations for the Forest Service above Budget estimates, the bill represents a reduction of \$2,422,324 below Budget estimates for this Service. This is occasioned by the fact that estimates for forest fire cooperation were in the amount of \$5,000,000, whereas the limit of authorization of existing law is \$2,500,000, to which we have added \$29,062 authorized under the Overtime Pay Act of 1943. This action does not represent the viewpoint of the committee as to what funds should be appropriated for this purpose, but represents the limit of our authority under the law, and the committee leaves open the question of further consideration should the additional amount of the Budget estimate be added to the bill by Senate amendment. We have made an addition under the item for Forest Management of \$45,000 which includes \$35,000 for use in investigation of Naval Stores Production at the Olustee, Fla., laboratory, and \$10,000 for studies looking to the control of the spruce budworm.

The bill includes no money for the acquisition of lands for national forests excepting small amount to carry out existing obligations of the Government under contracts heretofore executed. The available funds for farm and other private forestry cooperation is continued, \$781,466, as estimated for by the Budget.

The Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., has been provided for in the amount of the Budget estimate plus \$15,000 for investigations at the Southern Forest Experimental Station at New Orleans, La., in connection with the utilization of southern hardwoods.

EMERGENCY RUBBER PROJECT

We have provided in the bill for the liquidation of the emergency rubber project. That, I know, is a subject matter which is bound to arouse considerable discussion and considerable controversy. Before the Members of the House reach the conclusion that the committee has improvidently made provision for the liquidation of this project, I respectfully request that they read the hearings had before the committee with reference to the matter. The Government has expended so far approximately \$45,000,000 in connection with this emergency rubber project, most of it in experimentations in guayule, in which so far there have resulted approximately 400 tons of rubber

produced from stock which had matured prior to the purchase of the lands comprising the original project by the Government. The golden rod and Russian dandelion and cryptostegia investigations have produced some findings which appear to be of interest, but at the same time there has not been developed from them or from the guayule experimentations any hope that as the result of the carrying on of this project any material relief will be secured in our rubber situation during the period of this emergency unless it should last much longer than most of us hope will be the case.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

According to the evidence of some of the witnesses who have appeared in past hearings in connection with this emergency rubber project, the cost of the production of this guayule rubber would run about \$3 a pound, whereas some of the more recent evidence and that delivered in connection with our hearing this year, would indicate the possibility of its production at 52 cents per pound, or even, according to the most optimistic estimates, at lower prices than that. However that may be, the evidence is undisputed that in 1933 and 1934 natural rubber imported into this country from the East Indies was selling at 3 cents per pound. Of course, that was the lowest price ever reached. But there is no hope in the minds of anyone so far as I have been able to ascertain, that is, anyone who is in position to know or to express an intelligent opinion regarding this subject matter, that we will be able to develop in this country an industry for the production of natural rubber, either from guayule, golden rod, Russian dandelion, or cryptostegia, which will be able to compete with the importation of natural rubber from foreign sources after this war is over and since it is very apparent that the carrying on of this emergency rubber project during the period of the war will not contribute substantially to the solution of our rubber problem, and since it involves and has involved such a tremendous sum of money, the committee has thought proper to provide for its liquidation. However, an ample sum amounting to \$3,900,000-plus has been provided in the bill for the purpose of liquidation which would include money for the processing of whatever guayule or other plants they may have which are available for processing during the next fiscal year and the reclamation of whatever rubber can be secured by this processing, which they estimate will be, however, only about 325 tons.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman know of any expenditure for any other agricultural program such as hemp? I do not believe it has been included in the agricultural appropriation, but has there been a wartime experiment on the production of such fibers?

Mr. TARVER. There has been, of course, such a program, but it is not provided for in this bill, and I have not given the study to that particular subject matter that would be required in order to intelligently advise the gentleman concerning it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I note in the table under "Farm tenancy, title I," that there is provided \$750,000 for personnel.

Mr. TARVER. I am going to discuss that later. Would the gentleman wait until I reach that?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes. I would like to have that cleared up.

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TARVER. The Budget estimates for the War Food Administration contemplate a substantial increase, amounting to more than \$3,000,000 above amounts available for the present fiscal year. It has been pointed out, however, by officials of the War Food Administration that many of its activities began long after the beginning of this fiscal year, such as the promulgation and enforcement of food distribution orders, and that more money will be required to carry them on for an entire fiscal year than was sufficient for only a portion of a year. It has been felt, however, by a majority of the subcommittee that the \$800,000 projected for expenditure in the wage-stabilization project of War Food Administration should not be expended and that this project should be abandoned. It is believed it should be abandoned now rather than to await the beginning of the next fiscal year, when, if this bill is approved, its funds will not be available for that purpose.

The committee has inserted a proviso which would prevent the expenditure of administrative funds to promulgate or enforce any food-distribution order which undertakes to assess the cost of administering such orders against the handlers, distributors, or producers of the product with which they deal. In the cases of dairymen the War Food Administration has begun a practice of making a small assessment of 1½ cents per hundred pounds of milk against handlers or distributors of dairy products for administrative expenses in carrying out these food-distribution orders, which assessment is eventually borne by the producer, whether he is a producer only or a producer-distributor. While the assessment is small we believe it is distinctly unfair that any part of administrative expense of the War Food Administration should be assessed against the agricultural producers with whose products it has occasion to deal. We were advised by administrative officials that a considerable additional amount of administrative money should be appropriated for the use of War Food Administration if these assessments are made impossible. Estimates as to the exact

amount of increase thought necessary were in the nature of guesswork and varied from \$1,000,000 to \$1,500,000. We believe that the increased funds made available for War Food Administration for the next fiscal year, if this bill is approved, should be amply sufficient to take care of any additional costs which may be incurred in this connection.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A reduction of \$302,000 is proposed in the committee bill in the amount of money appropriated from Corporation funds for administrative purposes. This represents the judgment of a majority of the subcommittee as to economies that it should be possible to effect in the administration of the affairs of the Corporation. It cannot be said that the subcommittee has been in unanimous agreement on this proposed reduction. Further, I as one member of the subcommittee believe that an appropriation should be made by Congress to restore the capital stock of the Corporation as contemplated by law. According to the information we have, the capital stock of \$100,000,000 has now suffered almost 100 percent impairment. A Budget estimate for approximately \$39,000,000, intended to replace a portion of this impairment, was recently disapproved by the Deficiency Subcommittee and the House passed the deficiency bill which might have contained the appropriation without amendment in this particular. There was no Budget estimate before our subcommittee for this purpose, and we did not feel justified in including in this bill any provision with relation to this subject matter. The proviso carried in the Agricultural Appropriation Act of the present year prohibiting the sale of Government-owned or controlled agricultural commodities at less than parity prices is carried in the pending bill in substantially the same form in which it appears in the present law and with the same exceptions.

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

The bill carries provision for the direct appropriation of \$290,000,000 as contemplated in the Budget estimates, although the Budget estimates provided for the use of \$40,000,000 of this amount from section 32 funds. For this use, however, we were unable to provide since it is not authorized by law. We, therefore, appropriate in the bill the \$40,000,000 directly, or a total of \$290,000,000, which, added to funds which will be available from previous appropriations, will make a total of \$300,000,000 available for the program for the present calendar year, which is the amount of the limitation contained in the 1944 Agricultural Appropriation Act. The money is provided entirely for soil-conservation and water-conservation practices. Language in the Budget which would have required that the 1944 appropriation suffice for the program until June 30, 1944, instead of the calendar year 1943 as appropriated has been deleted by the deficiency committee in its submission of the deficiency bill considered a few days ago and similar

language proposed by the Budget for the pending bill with regard to extending the availability of the appropriation carried in this bill for a program to end June 30, 1945, instead of for a program to end December 31, 1944, has been disapproved by this committee since we feel that the effect of these proposed changes would be to reduce the appropriation for soil- and water-conservation practices by having the same funds suffice for the needs of the program for a 6-month period after the expiration of the period for which they were pledged.

PARITY PAYMENTS

As previously pointed out, no provision is carried in the bill for parity payments.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE

Despite the action of the Congress last year in directing the liquidation of the Federal crop insurance program, the Budget has sent over an estimate in the amount of \$5,997,433 for the reinstallation of this program and carrying it on for another fiscal year. Of course, there has been no insurance on wheat or on cotton, the only two agricultural products involved for the present crop year. The committee is of the opinion that the Congress considered very carefully all of the facts, both for and against this program, in taking the action it did last year and does not believe that it contemplates now reversing its position, and immediately after directing the liquidation of the program, providing for its reinstatement.

I might say to you that the evidence regarding last year's program, what was done after the hearings last year, shows a more unsatisfactory condition with reference to the Federal crop insurance program even than was shown at last year's hearings. The losses on wheat have been \$6,000,000 as compared with \$3,000,000 the year before. The losses in cotton, while not so considerable, yet have been substantial, and the entire losses for the 5-year period of operation of the Corporation aggregate in excess of \$63,000,000. They are divided about half in the amount of indemnities paid by the Government over and above the amount of premiums paid by the farmers, and about half in administrative expenses. I think there is no member of the committee but who is sympathetically interested in the objective sought by the establishment of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. I think all of them without exception would have been delighted if that experiment had been successful.

But 5 years' operation with huge losses to the Government seems to have demonstrated conclusively that the plan, as devised by Congress, will not work out, and the farmers themselves are not participating in it to the extent which had been anticipated. Last year only one-fourth of the wheat farmers participated, whereas one-third had participated the year before. The same is true of cotton, where 10 percent or less have participated. So under those circumstances we thought it would be unwise to provide, and we did not think that Congress would be willing to provide, for

the reinstallation of the program for the next fiscal year. For that reason we omitted this Budget estimate, but have provided for an appropriation of \$100,000 from the unexpended balance heretofore appropriated for this Corporation, to be used in the final and complete liquidation of the Corporation during the early part of the next fiscal year. We feel that that amount of money should be amply sufficient for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I cannot understand why the Budget would make that recommendation after the action of the Congress.

Mr. TARVER. I am not able to inform the gentleman on that point.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

The Soil Conservation Service, in my judgment, is performing a more useful service for agriculture than any other organization of the Department of Agriculture.

I have had the opportunity to examine its work in connection with soil conservation districts set up in my own State, to which, as to other districts throughout the country, it furnishes technical assistance and assistance in the making of farm plans and otherwise. The result of its work, to one who will take the trouble to examine it, is astounding. It has contributed not only to the restoration of the soil where it has been depleted, but it has contributed, in substantial ways, to the material prosperity of the farmers who have undertaken to cooperate with the Soil Conservation Service in this work, and I feel amply justified in the statement I made a few moments ago to the effect that the Soil Conservation Service is performing a work of more benefit to agriculture than is any other organization in the Department of Agriculture.

Since I feel that way about it, you may wonder why I am in accord with the action of the committee in reducing the appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service as estimated for by the Budget, by \$2,935,000. \$2,900,000 of that was intended for use in connection with the proposed taking over of certain drainage and irrigation districts set up by State laws, in which cases the draining or irrigating in the districts in question, as the case might be, was assessable against the land in those districts. Those districts have proven unsuccessful ventures. Now it is proposed by the Soil Conservation Service to take over these unsuccessful districts and spend several hundred thousand dollars for heavy machinery and equipment, to proceed at Government expense, with some undetermined amount of cooperation on the part of the local owners, to endeavor to carry out the programs which were originally undertaken and with regard to which there was failure.

We thought that suggestion unwise. Despite our love for the Conservation Service, we provided for the elimination of this portion of its estimates.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. In regard to that \$3,000,000 for drainage in connection with the Soil Conservation Service, was there any evidence presented to the committee that might justify, not the projects but the effort that might be made on individual farms, to do the drainage work in connection with increasing food production?

Mr. TARVER. Yes. There was evidence submitted to the committee that some of this land lying on the Mississippi River, I think part of it in Illinois, and in some of the Middle Western States would, if reclaimed, be extremely valuable land, perhaps worth two or three hundred dollars an acre. In the opinion of the officials of the Soil Conservation Service there is a need for the development of additional land for agricultural production at this time. The committee was of the opinion, however, that the trouble about agricultural production today is not that we have insufficient land upon which adequate production might be obtained, but that we do not have the necessary farm machinery and labor and other facilities which would bring about adequate production. We thought that instead of using several hundred thousand dollars—I think it approximates a million dollars for heavy machinery and equipment, and with other funds it would amount to \$2,900,000, in trying to reclaim this land which other authorities had tried to reclaim without success, we ought to husband our resources for use in trying to do what we could to aid in the agricultural program on lands already available, and which should be sufficient for our purposes if properly handled, and with proper equipment and labor.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. What the gentleman says may be true of particular lands that may be along the river, but I am sure the gentleman from Georgia would not want to say that applied to all the land. There is no contemplation of using money to buy equipment. As I understand, practically all of these funds are used for personnel.

Mr. TARVER. Oh, no. The gentleman is mistaken. If he will examine the justifications he will find that a tremendous amount of the reduction made here was estimated for, for the purpose of purchasing heavy equipment.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. For the drainage part.

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. But practically all of their appropriation goes to personnel, does it not?

Mr. TARVER. No; I would say that the major portion of it goes to personnel, but this particular item has included in it a tremendous amount of money, well over half a million dollars, for heavy equipment.

Now, may I pass on briefly.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I find nothing in here that would provide money for the control of chinch bugs and grasshoppers unless it be in this paragraph for the control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases. Does that cover it?

Mr. TARVER. Yes; I intend to discuss that further on, but I may as well dispose of it now.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Would the gentleman tell us whether corn borers would be included, too?

Mr. TARVER. Yes; they are included, too; all destructive pests. We have not carried in this bill heretofore the pest-control provision. It has been provided for in the deficiency bill, but \$2,700,000 is carried for it in this bill with the understanding that, if there develops need for more money, the money will be supplied through a deficiency appropriation. This was not intended to be the limit of what is to be available for the purpose of combating these outbreaks, if they occur, of pests of these types.

The school-lunch program: I have already referred to this. I am one of those who feel that the school-lunch program in some form ought to be continued. I regret very much that the committee has been unable to make provisions for funds in this bill to provide for the continuance of this program, but we are without authority to do so, for the program is not authorized by law. Had we inserted such provision in the bill, it would have been stricken on a point of order in the House. Further than that, the House on March 7 voted down an amendment to the Pace bill which would have authorized the program, and as I recall, the vote was about 3 to 1. So, the committee being the servant of the House, and feeling on this occasion that the action on the Pace bill was indicative of its opinion regarding the program, its composite opinion, and also because the program is not authorized by law, could not insert the provision in the bill.

EMERGENCY EROSION CONTROL, EVERGLADES REGION, FLORIDA

The budget of \$72,248 for this project, which is to be matched by State and local funds, has been approved.

LAND UTILIZATION AND RETIREMENT OF SUBMARGINAL LAND

The Budget estimate of \$1,250,000, representing a decrease of \$58,875 below the current appropriation, has been approved. It does not involve the purchase of any additional land but only the caretaking, maintenance, and operation for demonstration purposes of lands already owned by the Government.

SUGAR ACT

The Budget estimate for administration of the Sugar Act has been approved without change.

MARKETING SERVICE

No change has been effected in estimates for the Marketing Service except by the addition of \$25,915 intended to restore marketing-news service for Cleveland, Detroit, and Seattle. Small items of increase proposed by the Budget for the various branches of this service are almost in their entirety related to increased cost brought about by the Overtime Pay Act of 1943 and this statement is also true with regard to other increases of a similar character appearing at other points in the bill.

LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

These estimates, as I have already stated, have been disapproved since appropriation is not authorized by law. They amount to \$126,000,000. When the pending Cooley bill to provide for the consolidation of this activity with the Emergency Crop Production Loan activity and that of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations comes before the House we will be able to ascertain the legislative will as to the type of program of this sort which it is desired to maintain and under what limitations. It is to be hoped that that legislation will have been enacted prior to the final disposition of the pending bill so that provision can then be made in this bill for such appropriations as Congress may see fit to authorize.

FARM TENANT LAND PURCHASE PROGRAM

The Budget estimate for loans for this program in the amount of \$15,000,000 has been approved. The program, in my judgment, has amply justified itself and should be expanded after the war. At the present time its activities have necessarily diminished owing to high land values and the apparent unwisdom of permitting tenants to assume long-term obligations to pay for farms at high prices, which obligations they would probably be unable to discharge under post-war conditions. The appropriation of \$750,000, or half the Budget estimate, for the administration of this program is, in my judgment, manifestly insufficient, and yet we are prohibited by law from appropriating more than 5 percent of the amount of funds made available, the law having apparently failed to take into account the tremendous amount of money the Government has invested in the loans made in previous years and which must be serviced and collected. I sincerely hope that the Senate may, under its rules, which are more liberal than those of the House, make provision for the additional administrative funds necessary.

LIQUIDATION AND MANAGEMENT OF RESETTLEMENT PROJECTS

No appropriation was proposed by the Budget and none has been made for this purpose. It is proposed that necessary liquidation expenses in 1945 for these projects shall be financed from trust funds received for such purposes from

such projects. Their complete liquidation and that of all other cooperative or collective farming activities has been twice directed by Congress, and we are still hopeful that it may be eventually achieved.

WATER FACILITIES—ARID AND SEMIARID AREAS

This appropriation was estimated for by the Budget in connection with the estimate for loans, grants, and rehabilitation which has heretofore been discussed.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

The Budget estimates for the Rural Electrification Administration have been approved without change. The work of this organization during the present fiscal year has substantially improved and with the relaxation of restrictions upon the use of materials in line construction greater steps have been made toward completing the job of rural electrification than were possible in the 1943 fiscal year. It is believed, however, that the amount of funds estimated for by the budget will be amply sufficient for the needs of R. E. A. for fiscal 1945.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Except for \$626,321 directly appropriated, which represents a reduction of \$62,938 below the appropriation for the present fiscal year, no funds are directly appropriated to the Farm Credit Administration for administrative expenses. The larger portion of these expenses is paid by amounts chargeable against activities administered by it and by transfer from farmers' crop production and harvesting loan funds. Adequate provision for this last-mentioned activity is made through reappropriation of unexpended balances.

FEDERAL FARM MORTGAGE CORPORATION

Provision is made in the bill for the use of corporation funds for its administrative expenses in the amount of Budget estimates.

The record of the Farm Credit Administration in its several branches and of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation is one which must bring gratification to all of those who are interested in the development of a more stable agriculture and the removal as time goes on of the heavy debt burden with which our farmers generally have been afflicted. An examination of the hearings will disclose the repayment of these loans has exceeded all previous records and, while the loan activities of the Federal land banks and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation are being materially reduced, that circumstance in itself very greatly adds to our feeling of satisfaction with the success of these activities.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, I have substantially covered the major items in the bill. The hour is growing late, and unless some Member desires to ask me a question I shall relinquish the floor.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I have some curiosity to know whether a worm is an insect.

Mr. TARVER. Oh, undoubtedly it is. An insect is not necessarily a worm, but a worm, of course, is an insect.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I spoke about corn borers. That would be covered by the provision at the bottom of page 40 and the top of page 41 of the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. GILCHRIST. One further inquiry, if the gentleman will permit, about farm loans upon grain that is stored upon the farms. That is taken care of by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. TARVER. If it is taken care of at all it is taken care of there. I want to say this to the gentleman with regard to the Commodity Credit Corporation: I think it was a mistake when the House in the deficiency bill made no provision for a restoration of the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation which has now been depleted by at least 95 percent of the original \$100,000,000. Whether the Commodity Credit Corporation will continue to be able to make as extensive loans during the coming fiscal year as it has in the past is very questionable because of this depletion in its working capital. Certainly I think the Congress ought to provide sufficient funds, but all we can do in this bill is to make an appropriation for its administrative expenses from corporate funds.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I think there has been nothing so satisfactory as the right to the farmer to store his grain on his own farm and borrow money on it. It has been universally approved. I think it ought to be covered in the bill.

Mr. TARVER. There is nothing we can do here except to appropriate funds from the corporate funds for its administrative expenses. The Budget estimate providing for restoration of the capital stock of the Corporation was referred to the deficiency subcommittee, not our subcommittee.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to congratulate the chairman in regard to several items here, especially in regard to farm homes and with regard to forest management. Can the gentleman give me a little more assurance about taking proper care of the great Government investment in the Farm Security Administration so that what we have there will be protected?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I will take another minute.

Let me say to the gentleman that it is beyond the power of this committee to include provisions in this bill for taking care of the investments or for carrying on in any degree the activities of the Farm Security Administration. It has never been authorized by law, but certainly I cannot conceive that Congress will fail to make some provision for the protection of the Government's interest

in Farm Security Administration loans before the end of the present fiscal year, either through this bill or through some other legislative action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, not long ago I introduced a resolution, House Resolution 418, which provided for the reaffirmance of the action of the Sixty-seventh Congress in 1922, when it placed itself on record as favoring the establishment of a national home in Palestine for the Jews. This original action was in substantiation of the Balfour Declaration, wherein Britain committed itself to the identical policy, and the later mandate of the League of Nations, signed by 72 nations, which entrusted Britain with the encouragement of Jewish immigration into Palestine, their close settlement of its lands, and the establishment there of a Jewish national home. Implicit in the Balfour Declaration and the mandate was the plan that the Jews should eventually form in Palestine a nation or commonwealth. The resolution which I presented provided expressly for a Jewish commonwealth. This policy was at that time likewise agreeable to the Arabs in their first gratitude at being themselves freed from Turkish rule. The resolution of the Sixty-seventh Congress was later fortified by a convention or treaty between the United States and Britain wherein the United States agreed to the mandate, and Britain pledged itself not to change its terms without our consent.

In 1939 the white paper was published by Britain without the consent of the League or of our country, the effect of which was the cutting off of immigration into Palestine and the prohibition of the further purchase by the Jews of Palestine lands. This action was assailed in Britain by many of its most prominent leaders, and was condemned by the mandates commission of the League of Nations. In the meantime, the persecutions of Hitler had grown steadily more brutal and murderous, both in Germany and the conquered countries, until it is doubtful today whether any considerable number of European Jews will survive. It became imperative that a haven be found for those who can now escape, the hope be afforded the others of a post-war asylum. This Palestine resolution sought to fill this desperate need.

We are impelled to the salvation of the Jews by many motives. The first, of course, is common humanity. We cannot be so callous as to be indifferent to the suffering of these unfortunate people. The second is that our treaty rights be respected, and that the judgment of the civilized world at the expiration of the last war be now affirmed. The third is our concern for the world's stability and peace. For centuries the Jewish minority has been mistreated by Christian

Europe. Anti-Semitism has been repeatedly used as a weapon by ambitious and demagogic tyrants. Palestine is the answer to these grave, recurring problems of the world.

Our President has stated but recently that America has never agreed to the white paper, but favors immigration of Jews into Palestine. He pledged eventual justice to the downtrodden Jews of the world.

At a meeting of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House last week a letter from Secretary of War Stimson was received, stating that further action on the Palestine resolution at the present time would be prejudicial to the successful prosecution of the war. A representative of the War Department stated in the committee's executive session matters of a military nature which concerned themselves with the possible unfortunate results of the present passage of the resolution.

Mr. Chairman, we are not soldiers but civilians. We are not military strategists. We must in the absence of superior knowledge respect our selected military chiefs in their decisions on military matters. The progress of the war and its successful conclusion is never absent from our minds. Our thoughts are grave when they turn upon the safety of our own American boys in the armed services. We cannot lightly disregard the warning we have received.

On the other hand, we have not abandoned this fight. We have agreed in committee, and have so stated, that we will postpone action on this resolution. We have not tabled it nor buried it. The Jews are entitled by all considerations of humanity and right to their home. We must press for action whenever the military situation is alleviated.

It is my intention so to do as quickly as I have reason to believe that I am not endangering our soldiers nor hampering our military in so doing.

This is my pledge to the House and to the millions who cling to this hope of Palestine as the last chance of salvation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I assent generally to the statements made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on which it is my privilege to have served some time.

Mr. Chairman, the agricultural interests of this country are more fortunate than they perhaps know or appreciate to have as the chairman of this subcommittee so energetic, so able, so fair an advocate, or such a man as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]. He is a hard man to "lick" when he has made up his mind he is right; but overwhelmed as he is sometimes by the votes of those whom he still thinks are wrong, he is the best sport in the world. He will report the committee's action and defend it—and I would not do it as such, but he will, and he will reserve the right to express his own opinion on the floor. That is what I call sportsmanship, and I hand

it to him. If we "lick" him then and there I will say we are good. It is a pleasure and a great honor to serve with him and with the other members of the committee, none of whom are less distinguished or able than he.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not in the brief period of time that has been allotted to me undertake to cover all the ramifications of the activities of or appropriations for this great Department. I take it for granted that my colleagues on the committee will, if they have not already done so, tell you in detail of the status of the many vast programs that have been launched through the Department of Agriculture at some time during the past 10 or 12 years—such programs as the emergency rubber project, the work of the War Food Administration, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the prosecution of the agricultural program under which vast benefits ranging from \$300,000,000 to \$500,000,000 have been paid annually to the American farmer, and other programs and activities of the like nature.

FOOD WILL WIN THE WAR

These are subjects of primary importance, of course, and it is proper that the House and the country should be advised of them. However, it shall be my pleasure to devote the few remarks which I intend to make on this bill to the subject of agricultural research, that activity to which the Department of Agriculture was born almost 100 years ago and to which it has been dedicated in the act often referred to as the basic act establishing the Department and dedicating it to the acquisition and dissemination of information useful to agriculture in the broadest sense of that term.

That was the work which the Department had been carrying on for almost three-quarters of a century when these great, modern programs involving the control of agricultural production, the payment of benefits to agriculture, and so forth, first appeared on the scene. In fact, it was upon the foundation of knowledge that agricultural research had laid that these programs were established and have been carried on.

I do not hope to be able to cover the entire field of agricultural research in my remarks today. That is a subject upon which one could dwell with profit for many hours. It is a subject shot through and through with romance—the story of the plodding work of thousands upon thousands of scientific men, each working in his little cubicle and in his own generation and each contributing to the sum total of the vast store of scientific knowledge on agricultural subjects which is now the precious heritage of this generation.

There are three men of whose work I know in particular and whom I have come to esteem for their admirable qualities, their ability in research, and for the great contributions which they are making to this great store of knowledge. In naming them I do not wish to detract from the similarly admirable qualities

which I know are possessed by the other bureau chiefs, but whom it has not been my good fortune to know as intimately or to observe their work as in the case of these three men.

I am referring to Dr. E. C. Auchter, formerly the Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry but now the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Administration; to Dr. O. E. Reed, Chief of the Bureau of Dairy Industry; and to Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, Chief of the Soil Conservation Service.

In praising them let it be understood that I include, as they would insist, within that praise all of the worthy individuals who labor with them and under their supervision. Also let it be understood that the work which they are doing and to which I am calling special attention merely exemplifies the splendid work being performed by all the scientific men in this great Department under the guidance of their great bureau chiefs.

The war has placed a man killing and most solemn responsibility upon the shoulders of Dr. Auchter, the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Administration. It has been his duty to redirect and coordinate the research of the several bureaus under his administration with a view to rendering maximum support to the war effort. Dr. Auchter reports that a thorough review of all research projects has resulted in placing about 90 percent of them in the category of being directed toward the solution of problems pertinent to war food, feed, fiber, medicinal, and other requirements. The remaining projects, he tells us, are on a curtailed basis, directed principally to the maintenance of valuable breeding stocks, experimental orchards, groves, and certain physical facilities the complete abandonment of which would entail a loss too great to be justified even by the war.

Let me cite just a few of the recent accomplishments by the men working under Dr. Auchter's supervision:

They have developed methods for preparing and utilizing crude adhesive materials from natural sources for meeting emergency camouflage needs where base supplies are unavailable. The results of these studies have been incorporated into instructions issued by the military services.

They have developed soybean varieties of high yield and high content of oil and of improved drying quality especially valuable for industrial war uses.

Through the application of breeding methods in the improvement of sheep on the western ranges, they have made definite progress in increasing the length of staple and amount of clean wool. During the past 3 years the staple length of the fleeces in the breeding line under the project has increased from 2.17 inches to 2.41 inches, or a little better than 10 percent.

They have discovered that the lack of honeybees and other pollinating insects in Utah is partly responsible for the steady decline in alfalfa seed production. Since the practice of devoting lands to

the growing of alfalfa as a part of crop rotation is regarded as of major importance in the soil-conservation program, the value of this discovery becomes obvious.

Experiments on a laboratory scale in the application of certain chemicals to turpentine woods have demonstrated the possibility of stimulating and increasing the flow of rosin-bearing saps by this means, and the present bill contains an increase of \$35,000 for the purpose of enlarging these experiments to the pilot-plant scale with a view to the early introduction of this process into the industry and with a view to its availability to increase the production of vitally needed naval stores in connection with the war.

These constitute but a few examples of what has been recently accomplished. They could be multiplied many hundred times.

I wish now to speak briefly of the interesting and important work being done by the Bureau of Dairy Industry under the immediate supervision of Dr. Reed, the Chief of that Bureau. Here again the improvements are too numerous to be enumerated in their entirety.

Recent accomplishments have been along the line of producing a dehydrated form of cheese which not only enhances the keeping quality of the product but which greatly reduces the bulk and therefore the amount of shipping space required to transport this product which is of such great importance to our allies as well as to our soldiers overseas.

In compiling a roster of the great shipbuilders of this period, the names of Dr. Reed and his associates should not be omitted, for when one has devised a process by which products which once required two ships to carry may now be carried in one, has he not, in effect, constructed a ship?

One of the most interesting pieces of work performed by the Bureau of Dairy Industry has been the direction of the work of the herd-improvement associations. These associations had, in 1927, 327,000 cows only 15 percent of which produced more than 375 pounds of butterfat per cow per year, while in 1942, with 816,000 cows on test, 34 percent produced over 375 pounds, and the average last year of all cows in these associations was 339 pounds of fat as compared to an average of 188 pounds for the entire dairy-cow population.

Here indeed is a foundation upon which a dairy industry can be erected in this country far greater than man has ever dreamed of.

The work of Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, is known far and wide not only in this country but throughout the entire world. The Soil Conservation Service had its very humble start in the form of a very small appropriation for soil-erosion investigation reported out in this very bill some 15 years ago through the initiative of the Honorable James P. Buchanan, of Texas, then a minority member of the committee but who later became its chairman. This appropriation was continued from year to year with some increases in amount as time went on, and

the movement finally blossomed forth in the establishment of a great bureau in this great Department of the Government.

Under the guidance of Dr. Bennett and his inspirational leadership, soil conservation demonstration projects to the number of approximately 150 were established throughout the length and breadth of this great land. Wherever a region had problems common to the great number of farm areas within its boundaries there would be set up a great farm demonstration project of sometimes as many as 25,000 acres. Every farmer in this project agreed to conduct his farm operations under the direction of the Soil Conservation scientists assigned to the project. Crops that had formerly been planted in rows up and down hill, as a result of which heavy rains would wash away great quantities of topsoil, were now planted in rows which followed the contour of the land. The contour rows, instead of facilitating rapid run-off of the rains, tended to hold the precipitation until it sank into the ground where it was stored up for the use of the crops in drier seasons and whereby the precious topsoil was not washed away to the streams and to the rivers and down into the sea where it was beyond recovery.

Farmers for miles around would visit these demonstration projects and would learn of the improved methods and of the increased production resulting from the application of the principles of soil conservation which had been worked out by the men under Dr. Bennett's supervision.

Long after this generation has passed from the scene of action, long after the programs of control of agricultural production have been supplanted by a more satisfactory and a more intelligent regime, the work of the vast army of scientific men who generation after generation have labored upon the problems confronting agriculture and have made of agriculture the greatest and noblest of all the sciences, will go on and each succeeding generation will reap dividend at compound interest on the labors and the efforts which they have so patiently put forth throughout the years.

Recognizing the almost incalculable value of the research work that has been done and is being done this very moment in the fields offered by the sulfa drugs and penicillin, your committee, while reducing the appropriation sought in some respects, has been concerned not to cripple nor to retard unduly the work of those who are giving their lives and effort to the advancement of science for the safety, security, rehabilitation, and prosperity of us all.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

CONGRESS MUST ASSUME THE RESPONSIBILITY IF THEY CONTINUE THESE EXPENDITURES

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, when the New Deal was verbally buried its follies were not interred with its bones. I am including in my remarks the official table showing the payees that received in 1942 up to \$185,000 as Government payments.

Before discussing the import of this information at this time, I wish to bring out certain facts and my own personal observations. First of all, we should consider that when this subsidy program was adopted and up until 1940, farm prices were low, and these Government payments could be accepted and construed as part of the market price rightly belonging to the producer.

Second, from remarks made when this same subject was under consideration in previous years, I wish to emphatically state that I am not necessarily opposing big farms, nor have I any personal feelings against any insurance company or any large land owner or owners. I will say I do not believe in a system that subsidizes one man \$20 and another \$100,000. I oppose these payments because it does not appear to me to be a desirable expenditure of public funds.

Third, I say right here and now that no Member of Congress who supports the present method of distributing these funds can fairly criticize the A. A. A. I have discussed this question of Government payments with many township, county, and State A. A. A. committeemen. They all have had constructive suggestions as to how to improve the A. A. A. The leadership and plans may or may not have been right when the A. A. A. was inaugurated, but that is no excuse for continuously following the methods of distribution that were then put into effect.

In other words, let us not blame the administration of the A. A. A. for something that is a provision of law that we each year sanction by legislation. The agency has had little criticism for not following the mandates of Congress, so I say frankly that Congress must accept the responsibility if it does not change the legislation.

The A. A. A. has gradually changed its program as much, no doubt, as was permissible under the provisions of the law.

With the foregoing statements I hereby include the table showing the 1942 payments of over \$1,000 each by States. It is as follows:

Payments to payees who received \$1,000 or more under the 1942 agricultural conservation and parity payment programs—United States

State	Number of payees	Payments			
		Agricultural conservation program	Parity	Naval stores	Total
Alabama.....	138	\$190,525.53	-----	\$57,201.07	\$247,726.60
Arizona.....	390	883,947.59	\$34,575.12	-----	918,522.71
Arkansas.....	763	1,574,831.29	2,625.72	-----	1,577,457.01
California.....	1,315	2,652,323.53	699,561.93	-----	3,351,885.46
Colorado.....	418	523,019.36	212,505.10	-----	735,524.46

Payments to payees who received \$1,000 or more under the 1942 agricultural conservation and parity payment programs—United States—Continued

State	Number of payees	Payments			
		Agricultural conservation program	Parity	Naval stores	Total
Connecticut.....	19	\$46,054.87	\$150,478.30		\$196,533.17
Delaware.....	25	22,626.80	13,528.67		36,155.47
Florida.....	251	801,073.41		\$259,060.83	560,134.24
Georgia.....	370	303,501.72	5,518.63	428,755.98	737,776.33
Idaho.....	656	624,266.42	567,661.74		1,192,558.16
Illinois.....	4,479	2,847,854.34	4,162,901.75		7,010,846.09
Indiana.....	1,040	705,122.22	971,091.78		1,676,214.00
Iowa.....	3,892	1,793,915.26	2,804,142.40		4,601,057.66
Kansas.....	3,225	2,942,989.49	2,436,484.78		5,379,474.27
Kentucky.....	95	109,188.78	52,243.49		161,432.27
Louisiana.....	207	412,700.52		2,703.68	415,404.20
Maine.....	141	82,071.00			82,071.00
Maryland.....	79	65,500.05	58,087.80		123,587.85
Massachusetts.....	8	17,543.05	84,859.68		102,402.73
Michigan.....	26	19,789.17	18,134.95		37,924.12
Minnesota.....	532	423,940.22	494,656.12		923,596.34
Mississippi.....	992	2,147,970.97		20,041.26	2,168,012.23
Missouri.....	894	839,370.29	716,896.35		1,556,266.64
Montana.....	1,579	1,505,686.55	1,029,186.63		2,534,873.18
Nebraska.....	1,552	1,211,134.94	1,361,629.23		2,572,764.17
Nevada.....	16	30,014.25	3,614.88		33,629.13
New Hampshire.....					
New Jersey.....	15	45,182.04	300,066.90		345,188.94
New Mexico.....	340	572,126.19	99,802.82		671,929.01
New York.....	18	37,961.74	265,472.95		303,434.69
North Carolina.....	79	154,454.66	4,508.02		158,962.68
North Dakota.....	1,121	977,907.28	768,475.55		1,746,382.83
Ohio.....	688	485,607.89	731,606.72		1,217,214.61
Oklahoma.....	485	405,378.25	297,490.21		702,868.46
Oregon.....	926	1,009,210.54	997,657.32		2,006,867.86
Pennsylvania.....	71	88,454.68	78,937.72		167,392.40
Rhode Island.....	1	1,074.13			1,074.13
South Carolina.....	249	387,603.53	6,606.57	12,510.68	406,720.78
South Dakota.....	658	654,343.66	341,947.50		996,291.16
Tennessee.....	64	122,385.36	3,975.06		126,360.42
Texas.....	3,302	4,941,269.45	1,336,846.16		6,278,115.61
Utah.....	132	148,894.44	96,118.59		245,013.03
Vermont.....	2	10,494.47	23,656.55		34,151.02
Virginia.....	21	39,720.41	3,328.37		43,048.78
Washington.....	1,768	1,570,470.74	1,919,967.36		3,490,438.10
West Virginia.....	4	4,306.00	366.86		4,672.86
Wisconsin.....	57	59,224.61	83,581.96		142,806.57
Wyoming.....	200	299,852.09	49,971.09		349,823.18
Alaska.....					
Hawaii.....	18	82,989.23			82,989.23
Puerto Rico.....	3	4,353.45	918.10		5,271.55
Total.....	33,324	34,358,986.58	23,291,717.03	780,273.60	58,430,977.11

You will note that one State—Texas—has 10 percent of these large payments and over 10 percent of the total funds. This same year—1942—the Texas cotton farmer on the black waxy land of that State received 19 cents per hour labor return and received 2 cents per hour as Government payment. In 1939, in Dr. Goodsell's study in the United States Department of Agriculture, we find the cotton farmer on this black land received 10 cents per hour labor return and 5 cents, or half of this hourly income, came to him in the form of Government payments. In 1942 there were 178,000 Texas farmers that received less than \$20 per farm, or about three millions for soil conservation, while in 1942 there were 3,300 large operations in that State that received \$4,941,000 or over \$1,400 each for soil conservation alone.

The complete list of these large payments is on file in the office of the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable HAMPTON D. FULMER, chairman of the Agricultural Committee, and includes all payments above \$1,000, filed according to law by the Secretary of Agriculture with the Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN. A partial list of the larger payments is as follows:

Alabama:	
E. D. Fennel, Leighton.....	\$10,000
Stallworth Pine Co., Stapleton.....	6,496
Leonard Premit, Leighton.....	4,784

Arizona:

Arizona Land Co., Waddell.....	\$9,690
Arizona Farm Products, Casa Grande.....	6,381
Bartlett, Heard Land & Cattle Co., 303 Phoenix Building, Phoenix.....	5,830
Allen Belluzzi, Avondale.....	5,238
V. D. Brown, Sanders.....	4,727
Casa Grande Valley, Casa Grande.....	6,176
Cataract Livestock Co., Flagstaff.....	4,956
Chandler Implement Co., Chandler.....	5,227
Chinle district, Chinle.....	8,632
Dougherty, M. J., 516 Heard Building, Phoenix.....	6,204
Fort Defiance district, Fort Defiance.....	9,165
Peter Ethrington & Sons, Casa Grande.....	9,531
Green Gold Ranchos, Tucson.....	9,130
A. G. King, Buckeye.....	8,247
Klag-E-Toh District, Klagstoh.....	9,190
Leupp District, Leupp.....	9,190
Lukachukai District, Lukachukai.....	8,919
Maricopa Reservoir & Power Co., Phoenix.....	9,690
S. Carl Miller, Buckeye.....	5,248
T. G. Rhodes, Avondale.....	7,165

Arkansas:

Twist Leasing Cooperative Association, Twist.....	8,415
Wilson Lee Co., Wilson.....	7,350
Tillar Mercantile Co., Tiller.....	9,760
R. A. Pickens & Son Co., Pickens.....	7,566
Miller Lumber Co., Marianna.....	9,742
W. P. McGeorge, Pine Bluff.....	7,538

Arkansas—Continued.

Lowrance Bros., Driver.....	\$9,810
Lesser-Goldman Co., Walnut Ridge.....	8,293
Mary K. Kuhn, Marion.....	11,717
Howe Lumber Co., Wabash.....	8,481
Cromer Bros., Osceola.....	7,599
Chapman & Dewey Farms Co., Marked Tree.....	8,253
J. O. E. Buck, Jr., Hughes.....	7,686

California:

J. G. Boswell, Corcoran.....	11,309
J. G. Boswell Co., Corcoran.....	11,970
Capital Co., San Francisco.....	11,320
Frank C. Driver, Riverdale.....	10,308
Russell Giffin Co., Mendota.....	11,409
Ralph and Margaret Gilkey, Corcoran.....	13,797
A. W. Goodfellow, Fresno.....	14,408
Grayson-Owen Co., Oakland.....	15,417
J. W. Gulberson Co., Corcoran.....	10,798
Heck Bros., Stratford.....	11,119
Hotchkiss Estate Co., Firebaugh.....	14,080
C. E. Hanchin, Bakersfield.....	12,200
James Irvine, San Francisco.....	12,788
Kern County Land Co., Bakersfield.....	11,666
Natomas Co., Sacramento.....	14,831
J. E. O'Neill, Fresno.....	11,009
J. C. Phillips, Paso Robles.....	11,319
F. E. Redfern, Dos Palos.....	10,950
Forest Ripley, Corcoran.....	11,639
Sutter Basin Corporation, Ltd., Robbins.....	15,960
Elmer C. Von Glahn, Corcoran.....	24,916

Colorado:

Western Boca County Soil Erosion District, Springfield.....	3,101
C. E. Tupps, Watkins.....	4,159
Ira J. Taylor, Pasoli.....	4,074
Soil Erosion District, Walsh.....	4,181
Reicholt & Beal, Julesburg.....	4,201
R. R. Rutherford, Vilas.....	6,911
San Luis Valley Land & Cattle Co., Crestone.....	7,200
Carl Nielson, Ruggin.....	5,094
A. S. Miller, Watkins.....	4,157
T. P. Klausner, Roggen.....	6,800
Alvin Hobbs, Milliken.....	5,060
Hatchett Cattle Co., Pueblo.....	9,178
B. V. Hanna, Springfield.....	5,712
Frank L. Forristall, Hugo.....	4,322
James A. and Lyle Cocksey, Roggen.....	4,477
Arnold-Harriman Co., Inc., Fowler.....	3,465
Arkansas Valley Sugar Beet & Irrigated Land Co., Holly.....	3,619
American Crystal Sugar Co., Denver.....	4,513

Connecticut:

Aetna Life Insurance Co., Hartford.....	52,092
Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford.....	25,046
Phoenix Mutual Life Insurance Co., Hartford.....	23,172
Travelers Insurance Co., Hartford.....	59,298
Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Co., Hartford.....	6,888

Delaware:

25 payees—only one over \$2,500.	
Lillian Price, Middletown.....	2,506
John S. Isaacs, Ellendale.....	2,346
Julius N. Kirk, Middletown.....	2,088
Townsend Inc., Millsboro.....	1,909

Florida:

American Sumatra Tobacco Corporation, Quincy.....	6,814
Avon Florida Citrus Corporation, Avon Park.....	6,549
Aycock-Lindsey Corporation, Shamrock.....	9,400
Dixie Cattlemen's Association, Okeechobee.....	5,674
Hugh Turpentine Co., Maxville.....	5,451

Florida—Continued.

Ideal Holding Co., Perrine.....	\$4,277
A. B. & D. B. Kibler, Inc., Lakeland.....	8,376
Lykes Bros., Inc., Tampa.....	9,740
Mayo Rosin Co., Shamrock.....	7,296
Palm and Pine Land Co., New York, N. Y.....	6,216
Seminole Cattle Co., Inc., Orlando.....	8,986
Southern Resin & Chemical Co., Mary.....	7,702
Swainsboro Rosin Corporation, Jacksonville.....	6,144
Welles' Fruit and Livestock Co., Arcadia.....	4,296

Georgia:

Bateman Fruit Farm, Inc., Macon.....	7,052
Brunswick Peninsula Corporation, Brunswick.....	9,400
Butler Naval Stores, Inc., Butler.....	5,179
J. B. Davis & Co., Camilla.....	7,176
W. M. Jackson, Est., Donovan.....	6,980
Langdale & Bennett, Nashville.....	6,514
Meadows Turpentine Co., Vidalia.....	5,325
Mitchell Naval Stores, Homer-ville.....	6,008
The Newton Co., Cogdell.....	8,664
Onyx Turpentine Co., Cordele.....	6,554
Tarver Turpentine Co., Valdosta.....	9,400

Idaho:

J. W. Harp, Idaho Falls.....	11,951
Kootenai Valley Farms, Inc., Bonners Ferry.....	11,241
D. H. Linderman, Tetonla.....	7,716
McIntosh & Grover, Lewiston.....	7,560
Joe Rosenkranz, Reubens.....	8,217
Wagner & Co., Clarkston, Wash.....	6,197
W. T. Wagner, Clarkston, Wash.....	6,556
Herndon & Harris, Lapwai.....	5,397
Leslie Herndon, Culesac.....	5,296
Joe Lux, Nez Perce.....	5,929
McDonald Bros., Fenn.....	4,467
F. S. Parkinson, Rexburg.....	5,456
Carl Rudeen, Pocatello.....	6,404
Thomas Bros., Downey.....	4,231
Turner Bros., partnership, Nez Perce.....	4,515

Illinois:

Robert Allerton, Monticello.....	13,382
Babson Farms, Inc., DeKalb.....	12,813
Cook Valley Farms, Eldred.....	9,075
M. L. Evans, Sr., Emerson.....	12,988
First Trust Joint Stock Land Bank of Chicago, Chicago.....	54,781
Franklin Life Insurance Co., Springfield.....	14,588
Illinois Bankers Life Assurance Co., Monmouth.....	10,509
Rebecca Lowrie, Galesburg.....	13,801
Mutual Trust Life Insurance Co., Chicago.....	11,439
John C. Proctor, endowment, Peoria.....	11,354
Valley Farms Co., Carrollton.....	11,321

Indiana:

Robert Graham, Washington.....	11,655
Mitchell Partnership, Windfall.....	8,071
New Harmony Realty Corporation, New Harmony.....	8,685
Princeton Farms, Princeton.....	10,273
L. A. Waugh, Brookston.....	8,850
John Brevoort, Vincennes.....	7,130
Deshes Farms, Inc., Vincennes.....	6,127
Fair Oaks Farms, Inc., Chicago.....	9,130
Earl Goodwine, West Lebanon.....	7,423
Frances M. Hanson, Connersville.....	6,879

Iowa:

Adams Bros. & Co., Odebolt.....	18,758
Amana Society, Amana.....	23,716
American Mutual Life Insurance Co., Des Moines.....	10,753
Bankers Life Co., Des Moines.....	24,954

Iowa—Continued.

Brenton Bros., Inc., Dallas Center.....	\$14,002
Central Life Assurance Society (mutual), Des Moines.....	12,047
The Equitable Life Insurance Co. of Iowa, Des Moines.....	55,269
Litchfield Realty Co., Des Moines.....	11,151
W. G. Lodwick, Sedan.....	10,301
Martha P. Cresap, Hamburg.....	9,983
Iowa State College, Ames.....	5,672
George Kellogg, Missouri Valley.....	8,786
G. H. Moorhead, Moorhead.....	5,965
National Life Co. (Home Office), Des Moines.....	6,638
Henry K. and Raymond G. Peterson, Council Bluffs.....	8,702

Kansas:

Herbert J. Barr, Leoti.....	9,920
J. W. Baughman, Liberal.....	13,321
R. B. Christy, Scott City.....	12,845
Collingwood Grain and Land Co., Johnson.....	19,957
G. K. Kriss and John Farms, Colby.....	13,225
George E. Gano, Hutchinson.....	12,638
Federal Land Bank, Wichita.....	31,558
Prudential Investment Co., Topeka.....	10,344
Ed. Richardson, Plains.....	10,871
Sledd Farm Corporation, Lyons.....	11,267
Victory Life Insurance Co., Topeka.....	17,362

Kentucky:

Beaumont Farm, Lexington.....	2,486
Bower Bros., a partnership, Evansville, Ind.....	4,950
Henry P. Barrett, Henderson.....	5,075
James C. Ellis, Owensboro.....	3,789
S. R. Ewing Est., Owensboro.....	2,777
A. G. & S. B. Pritchett, a partnership, Corydon.....	2,493
Charles B. Smith, Reed.....	3,667
Helen Tyler, Hickman.....	3,472
Brent and Co., Inc., Paris.....	2,793
Clarence LeBus and Co., Lexington.....	4,668
Well Land and Livestock Co., Lexington.....	2,880

Louisiana:

John H. Baker, Delhi.....	7,850
Beene Planting Corporation, Bossier.....	5,890
Burnside and McDonald, Newell-ton.....	6,688
Canal Bank and Trust Co., New Orleans.....	4,207
T. B. Gilbert and Co., Inc., Wis-ner.....	5,743
J. W. Lyon, Gilliam.....	5,640
W. H. North, Dixie.....	6,320
W. H. Robinson, Shreveport.....	5,859
A. B. Learned, Natchez, Miss.....	4,067
A. F. McDade, Sr., McDade.....	4,524
R. R. Rhymes, Rayville.....	4,978

Maine:

W. R. Christie, Presque Isle.....	4,196
Kroemer Farm, Inc., Lagrange.....	3,969
Ben Marks Co., Inc., Presque Isle.....	3,991
Reed Bros., Fort Fairfield.....	5,157
Woodman Potato Co., Presque Isle.....	6,930

Maryland:

J. H. and W. G. Baker, partner-ship, Buckeystown.....	5,096
Frank S. Dudley, Baltimore.....	4,221
Thomas W. Eliason, Chestertown.....	2,448
Edison Groh, Lime Kiln.....	2,337
Charles Jarrell, estate, Hillsboro.....	3,733
John McKinney, Millington.....	2,259
Oldfields Farm, Galena.....	2,182
Harry H. Rieck, Preston.....	2,642
B. F. Shriver Co., Westminster.....	3,902
A. Lee Towson, Jr., Chestertown.....	3,346
Nathaniel J. Williams, Middle-town.....	2,513

Massachusetts:

Columbian National Life Insur-ance Co., Boston.....	4,143
---	-------

Massachusetts—Continued.

John Hancock Mutual Life In-surance Co., Boston.....	\$90,031
--	----------

Michigan:	
G. Elwood Bonine, Vandalia.....	2,589
L. E. Casey and Edward Brooks, Marshall.....	2,697
A. B. Chapman & Sons, South Rockwood.....	2,238
William H. Mathews, Niles.....	2,731
Upjohn, W. E. U. T. C., Richland.....	2,464

Minnesota:	
Agricultural Credit Corpora-tion, Minneapolis.....	4,297
Ruth T. Cathcart, Windom.....	5,221
Concordia College Corporation, Farmers & Merchants Savings Bank, Minneapolis.....	5,931
Federal Land Bank, St. Paul.....	55,882
First Minneapolis Co., Minne-apolis.....	4,559
N. J. Florence, Hallock.....	7,409
A. J. Kaufman, Appleton.....	6,524
Frank Klene, Kennedy.....	9,791
Maple Island Farms Co., Hollan-dale.....	6,790
E. G. Melo, Stephen.....	5,973
Northern Pacific Railway Co., St. Paul.....	5,544
Northwestern Improvement Co., St. Paul.....	4,031
Northwestern National Life In-surance Co., Minneapolis.....	9,022
The Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, Minneapolis.....	9,409
St. Olaf College, Northfield.....	4,392
Southern Minnesota Joint Stock Land Bank, Minneapolis.....	23,239
James S. Thompson, Windom.....	7,976
Tilney Farm Co., St. James.....	6,828
A. R. Voss, St. James.....	5,006
Winona National & Savings Bank, Winona.....	5,110

Mississippi:	
Abbey & Leatherman, Robinson-ville.....	7,266
C. B. Box Estate, Midnight.....	9,184
W. P. Brown, Drew.....	8,610
J. P. Cole, Highlandale.....	7,331
Dixie Farms, Vance.....	9,069
J. R. Dockery, Cleveland.....	9,249
J. T. Fargason & Son, Lyon.....	8,808
J. L. Gaddis, Bolton.....	8,113
B. F. Herbert & Co., Robinson-ville.....	7,006
Hopson Planting Co., Clarks-dale.....	8,069
King & Anderson, Clarksdale.....	9,910
McKee Bros., Friars Point.....	9,910
Mississippi State Penitentiary, Parchman.....	9,950
Newton Naval Stores, Inc., Wig-gins.....	9,400
R. W. Owen & Son, Evansville.....	9,212
Panther Burn Co., Leland.....	7,549
Robertshaw Co., Heathman.....	7,981
Lamont Rowlands, Picayune.....	10,000

Missouri:	
Acom, O. H.; Smith, Emerson; Peterson, Glenn, Wardell.....	11,729
American Union Life Insurance Co., St. Joseph.....	7,062
E. P. Coleman, Jr., Sikeston.....	12,170
Columbia Hog & Cattle Powder Co., Kansas City.....	6,417
Federal Land Bank of St. Louis, St. Louis.....	6,598
General American Life Insur-ance Co., St. Louis.....	11,556
Kansas City Life Insurance Co., Kansas City.....	16,759
Gabe Rendleman, Mesler.....	7,502
W. T. Riley, New Madrid.....	7,190

Montana:	
Antler Livestock Co., Wyola.....	7,922
Campbell Farming Corporation, Hardin.....	12,174
Cort Livestock Co., Big Timber.....	6,757

Montana—Continued.

R. E. Davis, Willow Creek.....	\$7,012
Ed. Kopac, Hardin.....	7,515
A. J. Rasmussen, Harlem.....	8,009
Scheffels Bros., Great Falls.....	12,836
Schmittlyer Corporation, Froid.....	10,941
Wismeyer & Shawhan, Billings.....	6,653

Nebraska:

Bankers Life Insurance Co. of Nebraska, Omaha.....	40,912
Brown Land Co., Omaha.....	18,101
Conservative Savings & Loan Association, Omaha.....	4,926
D. W. Evans, Watson.....	9,702
Federal Land Bank of Omaha, Omaha.....	62,483
Fremont Joint-Stock Land Bank, Lincoln.....	11,528
Grinnell College, Omaha.....	5,901
Hamilton County Farms Co., Aurora.....	4,626
Kilpatrick Bros. Co., Beatrice.....	11,441
Lincoln Joint-Stock Land Bank of Lincoln, Nebr., Lincoln.....	24,471

Nevada:

Lester C. Munk, Lovelock.....	3,153
C. A. Sewell, Elko.....	3,317
Utah Construction Co., Montello.....	4,448

New Hampshire: None over \$1,000.

New Jersey:

The Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co., Newark.....	185,869
The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark.....	132,248
Seabrook and Baftinger, Bridgeton.....	8,245

New Mexico:

Hal Bogle, Dexter.....	6,597
Del Cerro Co-op Association, Las Cruces.....	8,370
The Diamond A Cattle Co., Roswell.....	6,059
John Garrett, Jr., Clovis.....	9,141
Bun Lewis, Grady.....	6,658
Cecil Porter, Clovis.....	6,730
H. F. Prewitt, Coolidge.....	9,000
D. F. and Joyce H. Stahmann, Las Cruces.....	8,370
J. P. White Co., Roswell.....	9,078

New York:

Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, New York City.....	115,031
Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., New York City.....	148,691
New York Life Insurance Co., New York City.....	14,332
Security Mutual Life Insurance Co., Binghamton.....	2,810

North Carolina:

M. C. Braswell Farms, Battleboro	4,977
Caledonia State Prison Farm, Halifax.....	6,223
Duke Power Co., Charlotte.....	7,213
McNair Investment Co., Laurinburg.....	6,178
John F. McNair, Inc., Laurinburg.....	4,335
Z. V. Pate, Inc., Laurinburg.....	7,446

North Dakota:

John J. Deschenes and Henry M. Baldwin, Cando.....	9,886
Equitable Reserve Association, Neenah.....	5,424
E. J. Lander Co., Grand Forks.....	4,316
McCanna Farming Co., McCanna.....	5,620
McKensie County, Watford City.....	4,197
Murphy & Murray, Grand Forks.....	4,661
State of North Dakota, Bismarck.....	49,682
Olaf Pierson, York.....	8,531
J. Scott, Gilby.....	6,299

Ohio:

Agricultural Lands, Inc., London.....	12,611
Brady Bros., Payne.....	22,155
Ohio National Life Insurance Co., Cincinnati.....	10,076
Orieon Farms, London.....	14,137

Ohio—Continued.

Union Central Life Insurance Co., Cincinnati.....	\$73,432
---	----------

Oklahoma:

Jacob Q. Bacon, Elkhart.....	4,356
Big V Ranch, Ponca City.....	6,288
O. J. Gales, Tonkawa.....	3,101
R. C. Drummond, Hominy.....	3,757
G. E. Irvin, Gage.....	3,384
Sid Jones, Duncan.....	3,457
Rolla Lathrop, Keyes.....	3,014
Emery L. Metcalf, Helena.....	3,924
E. C. Mullendore, Hulah.....	9,640
Prothro Perkins Co., Wichita Falls, Tex.....	3,545
Owen W. and W. H. Temple, Bufalo.....	3,863

(All others under \$3,000.)

Oregon:

F. H. Banfield, Portland.....	8,134
Cunningham Sheep Co., Pendleton.....	12,107
Dixon & McQuiston, Klamath.....	9,103
Eastern Oregon Land Co., Ontario.....	10,023
John H. Hales, Adams.....	12,910
James K. Hill, Pendleton.....	9,660
H. A. Miller, Bond.....	9,066
Pendleton Ranches, Inc., Pendleton.....	14,640
M. E. Weatherford, Arlington.....	8,767

Pennsylvania:

Fidelity Mutual Life Insurance Co., Philadelphia.....	6,478
Penn. Mutual Life Insurance Co., Philadelphia.....	18,208
Provident Mutual Life Insurance Co., Philadelphia.....	30,750
Trexler Farms, Allentown.....	6,550
Lauxmont Farms, Wrightsville.....	4,534

(All others under \$4,000.)

Rhode Island (only one): Harold B. Tarbox, Slocum.....

1,074	
South Carolina:	
Coker's Pedigreed Seed Co., Hartsville.....	6,563
J. A. Fletcher, McColl.....	4,020
R. J. Moyes, Jr., Mayesville.....	5,292
D. K. McColl, Bennettsville.....	6,729
Jerry Richardson, Barnwell.....	4,223
C. W. Stone, Clinton.....	4,516
P. A. Wallace, Bennettsville.....	5,044

(All others under \$4,000.)

South Dakota:

Wm. J. Asmussen, Agar.....	4,620
R. P. England, Stamford.....	4,872
The Grand Lodge of the Ancient Order of United Workmen of North Dakota, Aberdeen, S. Dak.....	4,734
H. F. Hansmeier, Bristol.....	4,503
Rural Credit Board of South Dakota, Pierre.....	6,283
T. R. Walker Estate, Vermillion.....	5,549

(All others under \$4,500.)

Tennessee:

Dillard & Coffin Co., Memphis.....	5,302
John C. Jackson, Jr., Tiptonville.....	5,463
G. F. Parker, Tiptonville.....	4,014
Tennessee Farm Corporation, Clarksville.....	5,302
J. E. Vaughn, Tiptonville.....	4,107

(Balance under \$4,000.)

Texas:

Mrs. C. Adair Estate, Floyd Bennett Field, Long Island, N. Y.....	9,948
Ollie P. Anderson, Pecos.....	9,900
O. V. Beck, Amarillo.....	9,405
Grover C. Brillhart, Spearman.....	11,687
Richard C. Buckles, Stratford.....	11,938
S. B. Burnett Estate, Fort Worth.....	9,684
Geo. F. Buzzard, Spearman.....	9,454
Callaghan Land & Pastoral Co., Encinal.....	9,900
Capitol Freehold Land & Trust, Farwell.....	17,582
J. R. Durrett, Amarillo.....	11,074
Fred S. Fegel, Amarillo.....	10,273

Texas—Continued.

A. S. Gage Ranches, Marathon.....	\$9,800
Haden B. Hart, Gruver.....	10,311
Hueco Cattle Co., El Paso.....	9,900
Chas. L. Killgore, Amarillo.....	16,194
H. L. Kokernot & Son, Alpine.....	9,800
Martin & Zimmerman, Floydada.....	10,359
Matador Land & Cattle Co., Ltd., Denver, Colo.....	9,863
Clyd. Merryman, Plainview.....	10,541
L. M. Price Co., Stratford.....	9,455
Malcolm J. Shelton, Amarillo.....	9,340
Malcolm Stewart, Dalhart.....	9,967
The Sugarland Industries, Sugarland.....	9,800
Texas Land & Development Co., Plainview.....	12,011
W. T. Waggoner Estate, Vernon.....	10,160
Asa Willis, Hatley.....	10,104

(Too many to enumerate.)

Utah:

John Adams, Brigham City.....	4,864
Perry Land & Livestock Co., Salt Lake City.....	4,200

(Balance under \$4,000.)

Vermont (only 2):

Burlington Savings Bank, Burlington.....	1,677
National Life Insurance Co., Montpelier.....	32,473

Virginia:

Eastern Shore Canning Co., Machipongo.....	8,625
Stuart Land and Cattle Co., Cedar Bluff.....	3,965
G. L. Webster Co., Inc., Cheriton.....	9,510

(Balance under \$3,000.)

Washington:

C. J. Broughton, Dayton.....	20,170
Don Damon, Cunningham.....	10,788
Win C. Estes, Prescott.....	11,221
Fred W. Hair, Prescott.....	10,549
Hugh Huntley, Colfax.....	7,262
Fred Lasater, Prescott.....	8,227
W. A. Longmeier, Lind.....	9,022
McGregor Land & Livestock Co., Hooper.....	16,071
Sheffels Bros., Govan.....	9,299
Ed Tucker, Walla Walla.....	10,409
Nettie E. Woodward, Walla Walla.....	10,866

West Virginia: (Only 4 loans, all under \$2,000.)

Wisconsin:

Better Farms, Inc., Fond du Lac.....	6,197
George W. Borg, Delavan.....	3,365
H. W. Burmeister, Gratiot.....	2,046
Larsen Canning Co., Green Bay.....	1,227
Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., Milwaukee.....	51,651
Old Line Life Insurance Co. of America, Milwaukee.....	9,538

Wyoming:

Cow Creek Sheep and Pioneer Sheep Co., Rawlins.....	4,330
Lee Sheep Co., Rawlins.....	4,034
Miller Land & Livestock Co., Parkman.....	12,025
Leroy Moore, Ross.....	4,019
Mortons, Inc., Douglas.....	6,071

(Balance under \$4,000.)

Alaska: None.

Hawaii:

Hawaiian Pineapple Co., Ltd., Honolulu.....	10,000
Hutchinson Sugar Plantation Co., Naalehu Kau.....	2,956
Annie T. K. Parker (trust), Honolulu.....	4,057
Ulupalakua Ranch, Ltd., Waialua, Maui.....	6,360

Puerto Rico (only 3):

Luis Rivera, Comerio.....	2,284
Adolfo San Feliz, Comerio.....	1,772
Rafael Aponte Sanchez, San Lorenzo.....	1,214

Mr. Chairman, now let us review some of these payments. Let us review them in the light of the fact that we are now engaged in a world-wide war; in the light of the fact of a national debt of \$300,000,000,000; in the light of the fact that we have a tax bill that reaches down to the low-income brackets; in the light of legislation for the few at the expense of the many; in the light of the fact that in past years some Members have justified these large subsidies to insurance companies and large operators on the basis that it was necessary to have the large operators cooperate in order to control and reduce food and fiber production; in the light of the fact that this argument is worthless now as no one would contend, you need to make these enormous payments for reducing production at this time; in the light of the fact that no appropriation whatever has been included in the agricultural bill for the use of the farmers in the low-income brackets that are serviced by the Farm Security Administration; and lastly in the light of the fact that most of us have assured our constituents that we would oppose all nonwar expenditures.

Who can say that the reduction of these payments to \$200 would decrease food production?

Let us ask ourselves a few questions.

First. The school-lunch program was defeated on the grounds of the purchasing power of the people and on the grounds of economy. Do you feel that if this abolition of school lunches which was to cost \$50,000,000 was advisable, that we should provide 33,000 large land owners—whether insurance companies or individuals—a gratuity of \$53,000,000 for doing something they should be doing anyway for their own welfare?

Second. Take a look at the Arizona list of checks for from \$5,000 to \$9,000 to big cattle ranches.

Third. Look at the California list receiving \$10,000 to \$24,000. Do you suppose they are subsidizing labor from other countries for these same big operators?

Fourth. In Colorado they send one sugar company \$3,600 and another \$4,500.

Fifth. You will note that \$166,000 of the \$196,000 that went in large checks to Connecticut went to five life-insurance companies. Do you really believe that the \$166,000 is needed to make their policies good?

Sixth. Florida is interesting. One sumatra tobacco company received over \$6,000. Some types of tobacco are 200 to 300 percent of parity. Does this make sense?

Seventh. Do you realize that according to Dr. Goodsell's studies the two-mule Georgia cotton farmers received in 1942 but 22 cents labor income per hour, and that of this 22 cents per hour labor income only 2 cents per hour was from Government payment. However, in Georgia in 1942, 370 large operators received on the average over \$2,000 each. This subsidy would be a down payment on quite a farm in that State. If all the farmers in the United States had the

same subsidy 370 large operators received, it would take an appropriation of \$1,200,000,000. This indicates how futile this approach is in solving the farm soil or price problem.

Eighth. To look at the Illinois list one would never realize the great areas of rich produce fertile land within the confines of that State, would one? The first trust joint stock land banks of Chicago receive a \$54,000 subsidy.

Ninth. Kansas has had recipients receiving subsidies of from \$10,000 to \$31,000.

Tenth. In the Kentucky blue-grass area only one received a \$5,000 subsidy.

Eleventh. In Maine one potato company, the Woodman Co., received \$6,900. Floor or support prices are supplemented with a large additional subsidy.

Twelfth. Maryland—close to the best markets in America—had several subsidies but mostly under \$5,000. Do you suppose the same ones get the \$14-per-ton hay subsidy, too?

Thirteenth. Massachusetts has one life-insurance company that received \$90,000 out of the total of \$102,000 that went for the large checks in that State.

Fourteenth. Fifty-five thousand dollars was paid to the Federal land bank in Minnesota.

Fifteenth. Big operations in Mississippi did pretty well. The State penitentiary is much below former years and before the \$10,000 State limit was put into effect.

Sixteenth. Montana. The Campbell Farming Corporation is down to \$12,000. This is much reduced.

Seventeenth. New Jersey is worth the time to examine. Two insurance companies received \$318,000 of our grandchildren's money.

Eighteenth. New Mexico can surely obtain many large subsidies for the amount of the Nation's food it produces.

Nineteenth. Two insurance companies in New York received \$263,000. Does this make sense to you? According to Dr. Goodsell's studies the dairymen in central New York received less than 1 cent per hour as Government payments in 1942.

Twentieth. Three thousand three hundred big operators in Texas receive over \$6,000,000. In Dr. Goodsell's official report farmers on family sized selected farms on the black waxy land in Texas the same year received 19 cents per hour. Three cents per hour was in Government payments. Is it any wonder that Texas has exhibited the attitude it has?

Our distinguished colleague, the Honorable EDWARD REES of Kansas, assisted by the Honorable AUGUST H. ANDRESEN of Minnesota, have led the fight to reduce these payments to \$1,000 and also to \$500. Last year the House fixed the maximum payment at \$500, but it was removed in the other body.

In the letter of transmittal which is furnished according to law by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Speaker of the House, there is one paragraph that should be of interest to every Member of the House.

The letter of transmittal is from Mr. Grover Hill. This paragraph is:

The great majority of farmers participating in the 1942 program earned payments of less than \$200. Approximately 95 percent were in this classification.

If 95 percent of the farmers participating in the program received less than \$200 each, do you not agree that a \$200 maximum would be fair for all the participants?

Congress, and every Member of both bodies must answer for taxation or the method of taking money from the people for public needs. Is not here an opportunity to more fairly distribute public funds, and would not a wider distribution be used for an increased food supply? I feel that if the Members would obtain the long list of farmers that receive a \$20 check, they would not hesitate to put a \$200 ceiling on these subsidy payments. This should be ample for any family sized farm and why subsidize more generously the above family sized farms?

The importance of this rural financing is and should most assuredly be of interest to every Member since Dr. A. G. Black, Governor of the Farm Credit Administration writes me on March 11, 1944, as follows:

We believe that 4 percent per annum is a fair and reasonable rate on long-term mortgage loans of the type made by the Federal land banks through national farm loan associations and with their endorsement. Similarly we believe that a 5-percent interest rate is reasonable for the type of first- and second-mortgage loan made by the Land Bank Commissioner, which carries no endorsement liability, and which, in general, is a more hazardous credit risk than the land-bank loan.

Our Government would receive— $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 4 percent— $\frac{1}{2}$ percent more interest on Federal land bank and— $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 5 percent— $1\frac{1}{2}$ percent more interest on the Land Bank Commissioner loans. On January 1, 1944, there were 482,779 Federal land-bank loans with a total of \$1,357,937,417. An increase in interest rate would provide \$6,789,687 in additional revenue.

On January 1, 1944, there were 318,282 Land Bank Commissioner loans with a total indebtedness of \$406,190,206. The increased interest rate from $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 5 percent would provide \$6,092,853 in additional revenue.

In the United States this would extract \$12,882,540 in additional interest directly from the rural people of America. This increase in interest will be reflected in higher interest rates by private loaning agencies that make farm loans.

In Wisconsin alone this increase in interest rate will amount to \$274,436 from Federal land-bank loans, and \$367,702 from Land Bank Commissioner loans, or a total of \$642,138 for the State. There were 18,723 Federal land-bank loans, and 15,312 Commissioner loans in Wisconsin on January 1, 1944.

If we are forced to accept Dr. Black's position and increase the interest rate to obtain \$12,000,000, and take it from the producers that owe money, do you

feel we are justified at this time in doling out \$58,000,000 to 3,300 big land owners and insurance companies? You and I have the responsibility of making this decision. I have made mine as a result of careful study. Are you ready to make yours? This might be an appropriate time to have one of those "stand up and be counted" procedures we have been hearing about.

In conclusion, I wish to say that the more I see of the illogical, indefensible waste of public funds the more I feel like paraphrasing Scott and saying: "Breathes there a man with soul so dead, who never to himself hath said 'This is the bunk.'"

Mr. RIZLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly agree with the gentleman that we should not criticize the A. A. A. for something and then by appropriation or otherwise insist on them doing certain things. So far as the gentleman knows, is there anything in the A. A. A. program, or that we gave to the A. A. A., to set itself up as a board to determine who is entitled to deferment by reason of being an essential agriculturist, or has the Congress ever authorized the A. A. A. to act as a board or an agency to determine who is entitled to farm machinery, or has the Congress ever authorized the A. A. A. to determine under the A. A. A. program which farmers are entitled to gasoline to be used not in their tractors but on the highways? If the gentleman can answer those questions and say that those of us who have criticized the A. A. A. for sending out information to farmers now that these things I have just mentioned will be used in considering whether they are going to permit a farmer to have machinery or whether they are going to permit him to be deferred, that is another thing entirely. I have criticized the A. A. A. for that and I still criticize it. I do not know where the Congress has ever authorized them to do anything of that kind.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I may say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that he has not asked one question, but several questions. If I were to answer the questions from the knowledge I have at this moment, I would say: I presume what the gentleman refers to are the activities of the War Food Administration which do not necessarily come under the A. A. A. In most, if not all the States, the Chairman of the A. A. A. happens to be the head of the War Food Board. I presume that those things that the gentleman complains of are done under the War Food Boards rather than by the A. A. A. set-up. That would be my understanding of the organization at the present time. In most cases they are the same individuals. If there is any law it comes under the powers that have been delegated to the War Food Administrator by Executive order and is not part of any law passed by the Congress.

Mr. RIZLEY. Does the gentleman say that by Executive order the War

Food Administration has now been given authority to determine who is entitled to a draft deferment as an essential farmer?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would say it may have been so construed. There is a rather broader interpreting of many laws and orders.

Mr. RIZLEY. Does the gentleman say further that the War Food Administration, by Executive decree, has been authorized to determine who shall be entitled to a quota of farm machinery?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will look up the law under which this power has been delegated, I am sure he will find it is quite broad, and he will find that the interpretation of it is very, very broad. It will include most anything, as I found out last summer when a certain employee of the War Meat Board was telling all the farmer butchers in my particular district that, if they did not have a new slaughterhouse within 10 days, he would cancel their permit to slaughter. That is what I ran into last summer. I later found the writer of the letter did not have permission to write the letter from any superior officeholder. I did find out that he must have been a political appointee, as his service record showed no experience whatsoever in regard to meats, or much of anything else. I did, however, find that I could not get the War Food Administrator, my friend, Mr. Marvin Jones, to write me that the employee had exceeded his legal authority. One of Mr. Jones' underemployees wrote me quoting the provisions of the Executive order, where this authority was supposed to come from. This is where these small people in big places can harm any program. They should be replaced by people who have the right attitude in regard to the public. I imagine that is part of the directive under which these other things you complain about operate, though I do not want to be too sure on that point.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. What will the situation be in 1944 in regard to the farmers being able to get more machinery?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It is going to be the same problem as to whether the farmer will get more overalls or not. There is plenty of steel for farm machinery. It is simply a matter of manpower. As far as the overalls are concerned, there is plenty of cotton, because we are pretty nearly giving it away to make insulating material. It is a matter of manpower and getting it into the cheaper garments. Those are problems we have to meet.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4443, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1945, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at the conclusion of the debate on the rivers and harbors bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] be permitted to revise and extend the remarks he made today and include therein a letter from Mr. Leo Crowley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 1 hour.

THE KEYNES-MORGENTHAU SCHEME

A FURTHER STUDY OF THE BRITISH SCHEME TO SECURE CONTROL OF UNITED STATES GOLD, COMMONLY REFERRED TO AS THE KEYNES-MORGENTHAU PROPOSAL FOR AN INTERNATIONAL STABILIZATION FUND

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the present study should be considered in connection with a paper I presented on this subject to the House November 1, 1943. In that paper I established what I believe to be conclusive proof that there are not two plans, a British plan for an international clearing union and an American plan for a united and associated nations stabilization fund, but that there is in reality only one plan; namely the British plan. Benjamin M. Anderson has asserted as much.

[Anderson, Benjamin M., Post-War Stabilization of Foreign Exchange; the Keynes-Morgenthau Plan Condemned; Outline of a Fundamental Solution, in the Economic Bulletin, Capital Research Co., Los Angeles, Calif., May 11, 1943. For many years economic adviser to the Chase National Bank in New York, Dr. Anderson is now professor of economics, University of California at Los Angeles.]

Dr. Melchior Palyi states that the two plans "deal practically only with the problem of Great Britain."

[Palyi, Dr. Melchior, *Some Implications of the Keynes-Morgenthau International Clearing Pool*, an address delivered at Union League Club, Chicago, April 28, 1943, and reprinted from the *Great Lakes Banker*, July 1943.]

Indeed, I think the proof is clear in that paper that the officials of the administration who are responsible for having drawn up the draft for a "United and Associated Nations Stabilization Fund" did practically nothing but copy from and reword and rephrase the text of the British proposal for an international clearing union as outlined in the British white paper.

Several other points contained in the November 1 paper should be kept in mind in considering the present study. The scheme would involve the complete abandonment of the international gold standard as this term has been used and understood since gold has been used in international trade and commerce down to the present time—all protests by the promoters of the scheme to the contrary notwithstanding. It would substitute for the gold standard a fictitious international monetary unit called "unitas" which would not be gold but whose value would be fixed by politicians in terms of gold, but not unalterably. The currency of each country belonging to the scheme would in turn be arbitrarily fixed by politicians in terms of unitas, but also not unalterably. The main characteristic of this device would be its high degree of political variability which would give it the desired political manipulability aimed at by Lord Keynes and his coworkers. Along with the destruction of the international gold standard, this artifice would, of course, also destroy the supremacy which the United States dollar now holds in international trade, which is no doubt one of the objectives of the scheme.

The scheme would also involve the assumption by the United States of perhaps \$5,000,000,000 or more of British debts which Britain owes South American countries, Belgium, Scandinavian countries, and her colonies and dominions. This would be accomplished substantially with United States gold. Although the United States would furnish the vast bulk of the capital in the form of gold, yet our country would be hopelessly in the minority in respect to control. The present study will show this picture to be even more unfavorable to the United States than was shown in my previous paper.

The control of our money, which is vested in Congress by the Constitution, would be given over to an international monetary authority which would also have far-reaching and dictatorial powers over our domestic economy. Great Britain would be the dominating power in the scheme.

The computations in the November 1 paper relating to contributions were based on a total capitalization of \$5,000,000,000. Since then, as stated in a

letter to me by the Treasury, the administration has changed this figure to \$8,000,000,000. Accordingly the computations will in the present study be based on the latter figure.

It will be noted in referring to column 2 in the table which is to follow that the aggregate of contributions listed does not come to \$8,000,000,000 but only \$6,560,000,000. The aggregate of the contributions of the countries not shown on the table would apparently not be sufficient to make up this difference. However, Treasury officials inform me that the percentage figures given me for computing contributions are tentative and subject to change. Further, that "before computing individual quotas there shall be reserved an amount equal to 10 percent of aggregate quotas to be used as a special allotment for equitable adjustment of quotas," as provided in II-4 of the administration's revised draft. The irreconcilability of these figures would seem to be of no particular importance to the results of this study.

In my November 1 paper I raised the question of the availability of free or unpledged gold in the countries that would belong to the scheme for their allegedly assigned contributions to the fund. By free or unpledged gold is meant gold in excess of that pledged as cover for demand liabilities. The primary purpose of the present study is to show which countries have and which countries do not have free gold to meet their proposed gold quotas.

The accompanying table (see p. 1669) shows the pertinent data relating to this problem for 31 of the 43 so-called United and Associated Nations which we are told would become members of the scheme.

Data relating to the amount of circulating notes and "other demand liabilities" and gold holdings were furnished me by the Federal Reserve. Data relating to contributions to the scheme were furnished me by the Treasury.

Four sources showing the legal requirements for gold reserves against demand liabilities have been made available to me, namely, the Federal Reserve Bulletin for July 1936; Treasury data for about 13 Latin-American countries; the Law Library of the Library of Congress; and Moody's Manual of Investments for 1943.

A footnote will be appended to the name of each country on the table showing the legal reserve requirements as furnished me by one or more of the above-mentioned sources. As will be noted the data for some countries are incomplete, uncertain, and apparently conflicting. Where doubt or uncertainty exists I have sought to use the data which provide the least amount of reserves and to apply the statute of the most recent date.

I have quoted the several sources showing legal reserve requirements for the purpose of presenting the apparent uncertainties, lack of uniformity and generally unsatisfactory conditions in this part of the monetary field. However, I have done this more expressly to indicate something of the progressive deterioration of the standard unit of value and

the gravity of the monetary pathology that now afflicts nearly if not all of the countries we are to believe would become participants in the scheme.

The 31 countries represented on the table are divided into 3 categories, namely, (a) those countries having no free gold, which number 14; (b) those countries having free gold, which number 16; (c) the United States.

With respect to the remaining countries that would become members of the scheme, I have been unable to obtain any data that are of value to this study. Those countries are Iceland, the Philippines, Panama, Luxembourg, Iraq, Honduras, Haiti, Ethiopia, Dominican Republic, Paraguay, Nicaragua, and Iran. According to Federal Reserve and Treasury data, though sometimes conflicting with each other, Panama, Iraq, Ethiopia, and Dominican Republic make no reports of their gold holdings, while in the case of some of the others no figures respecting gold holdings are at present available. Paraguay and Nicaragua require no gold reserves against their demand liabilities. From such data as are "available" to me it would appear that all of these countries together must possess such a very small amount of gold that leaving them out of consideration could not possibly make any material difference in the results of this study.

In further explanation of the figure (2) which precedes the percentage figures in column 2, it should be stated that gold exchange, as defined on page 541 in the July 1936 Federal Reserve Bulletin, means exchange convertible into gold.

The percentage figure shown in column 2 does not always correspond with the figure actually used in computing reserve requirements because of certain qualifying factors. This apparent discrepancy is clarified in the footnote relating to the country concerned.

Observe that although both the circulating notes and other demand liabilities are shown for each country in columns 4 and 5 that the percentage figure in column 2 has not always been applied to both of the above two figures. Some countries require gold reserves against circulating notes only and others against both circulating notes and other demand liabilities. Furthermore, the requirement for notes may be different than the one for other demand liabilities. The footnote for each country will clarify these points.

It should be understood that the computations showing the amount of gold reserve requirements against demand liabilities as well as the amount of free or unpledged gold or lack of same are of necessity quite inexact. This is true because in most cases up-to-date data and in many complete figures are unavailable. Figures showing gold holdings and circulating notes and other demand liabilities are frequently of different dates. Numerous other qualifying factors are involved. In several cases I could not be certain as to the correct percentage figure to be applied for computing the amount of required gold reserves and accordingly some errors are likely to be

found in those computations. The best I have been able to do with the material at hand is to give a rough approximation of the true picture. But whatever inexactness and error may be involved in the figures which would show conditions to be worse than they really are, this would be more than offset by the fact that they are now much worse than the table shows and are continually growing worse at an accelerated rate of speed.

Neither in this nor my paper of last November has the administration's formula for determining gold quotas for member countries been strictly adhered to. Section II-3 of the administration's revised draft of the Keynes scheme provides in most cases that the amount of free foreign exchange held by a country is to be given a certain amount of weight in determining the gold quotas. Both the Treasury and Federal Reserve informed me that they had no data relating to this item. This, however, could not materially affect the results of the study.

With respect to several countries, because of incomplete and unsatisfactory data, principally in Latin America, no attempt has been made to compute the amount of required gold reserves.

By referring to columns 4 and 5 on the table it will be seen that the grand total of circulating notes and other demand liabilities of the 13 non-free gold holding countries [China not included] is \$28,000,000,000. By referring to column 6 it will be noted that the amount of gold reserves required against their total demand liabilities [omitting gold reserves required by United Kingdom] would be \$7,300,000,000. By now referring to column 8 it will be seen that the total amount of gold holdings of those 13 non-free gold holding countries is only \$3,800,000,000. Thus it will be seen that those 13 non-free gold holding countries have a shortage of \$3,500,000,000 for meeting their statutory reserve requirements.

Looking now at column 13 we see that the total amount of gold contributions of the 13 non-free gold holding countries would come to roundly \$894,000,000. Since, however, those countries are deficient in gold to the amount of \$3,500,000,000 for their demand liability coverage as shown in column 9 [taking into consideration that no figure for China is possible for this column] those countries would, of course, have no available gold for international use in the form of such contributions.

Let us now look at column 14 and compare the amount of gold the United States would be called on to contribute with that which the other 30 non-free and free gold holding countries combined would have available to meet their gold quotas, leaving out of consideration for the moment the paper portion of the contributions that would be made by the United States as well as that of all the other countries.

The United States would contribute in gold \$1,172,000,000. The 30 other countries would have available for international use only approximately \$420,000,-

000 in gold to meet their quotas. On this basis the United States would contribute 73-plus percent of the gold capital of the scheme while all the other countries combined would contribute only 26-plus percent. Yet the United States would be given a voting strength of only 20 percent while the other countries would have 80 percent! But this by no means shows the picture to be as bad as it really is.

In my paper of last November, before I had completed the present study, I stated:

The gold liability of the United States would be nearly four times that of the whole British Empire, yet the United States would have only 20 percent of the votes while the Empire would have 19 percent.

I now find the United States would be in a much more unfavorable position than was indicated at that time. The Union of South Africa is the only component of the entire British Empire which possesses any free gold. She is given a gold quota of \$72,000,000. The gold quota of the United States would be \$1,172,000,000. Thus it is seen that, on the basis of available free gold the United States would contribute more than 16 times as much gold as the entire British Empire, yet the United States would be given only approximately the same percentage of basic votes as the Empire, 20 and 19 percent, respectively!

Since United States paper dollars from an international standpoint are convertible into gold on demand, the United States would actually contribute in gold \$2,344,000,000. Her total gold liability would be the same as her total contribution. The non-free gold holding countries, numbering 14, would have no gold liability whatever. We stated the total gold that would be available for contributions by the 16 free gold holding countries would be \$420,000,000. Now what would be the total gold liability of the 16 free gold-holding countries? Would it be any more than the aggregate of their gold contributions? Conceivably it might be more. But here we run into some questions which show this whole proposal to be positively preposterous.

Let us consider the case of Russia. Her paper and gold contributions are set at \$432,000,000 and \$184,000,000, respectively. The Treasury informed me that Russia makes no reports of her gold holdings. November 22, 1943, the Federal Reserve gave me the figure of \$839,000,000 as the amount of gold Russia held September 1935.

The Soviet Union is an absolutist state. It is conceivable that she might pool a portion of her gold on paper, or even by delivering it into the physical possession of some other country. That would depend on the benefits she could see accruing to her by doing so. Lend-lease and United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation gifts and "loans" for reconstruction and development, which latter might be available to her in case the proposed international bank should be created, would no doubt be deciding factors. But it is unthinkable that the Soviet Union would consent to giving over to an international

body any power whatsoever over her money, or any other part of her economy.

The basis of the whole Soviet economy is the political ownership and control of her gold and paper currency, just as this is the basis of all dictatorship. Lewis Haney, professor of economics, New York University, in an article in the Washington Times-Herald December 11, 1943, in commenting on a certain press dispatch from Moscow relating to "world banks and such things" gives the impression that Russian participation in the Keynes scheme is impossible. "Russia Balks" is the caption of an article by Ralph Hendershot in the New York World-Telegram December 7, 1943, of which he is financial editor. He then goes on to say of Russia:

And, she wants nothing to do with schemes for an international bank, preferring to do business on a gold basis. The chances are this will put a crimp in Britain's plans to stabilize international currencies by placing various and varied assets into an international bank and issuing a new currency against these assets, to be used in the settlement of trade balances between participating nations. And it may very well give our Treasury officials reason to stop, look and listen before throwing in with the British idea.

Furthermore, it would seem another complication may have arisen in connection with Russian participation in this British scheme. I refer to the announcement that recently came from Russia to the effect that the Russian state is to be divided up into 16 "republics," each of which is to have power to separately enter into "direct relations with foreign states and conclude agreements with them."

[See full text of Molotov Plan Enlarging Autonomy of 16 of the Soviet Republics, New York Times, February 2, 1944.]

What the purpose of this new arrangement may be is as yet not clear but it could be used to somehow match the control of other nations, particularly that of Great Britain and the United States, in order to secure greater advantage to herself in any international financial arrangements that might be created. But whatever may be the object of this move, it is safe to say the Soviet Union could not in any event give her consent to any proposal which would involve outside interference with the price at which she might be willing to buy or sell gold outside of her borders, or with her domestic currency or any part of her internal economy. Since the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme would definitely involve control by an international body over all of those things in Russia, we can safely conclude that she would not become a full-fledged participant in it. Hence the gold contribution assigned to her becomes more of a fiction than a reality.

Having eliminated Russia as anything but a possible limited partner in the plan, let us look for a moment at the other countries in the free gold holding category with a view of determining the extent to which they could be expected to actually make their gold available to the scheme. The extent to which this could be expected would of course, as in the

case of Russia, depend upon the amount of concrete benefits they could see in it for themselves. We may be sure that the other countries that would join this proposed scheme would be realistic, that they would do so understandingly and with their eyes glued to their material interests. The United States seems to be the only country in the world that not only has lost much of its mechanism for protecting its own material interests against foreign exploitation, but whose trusted government officials willfully assist foreign interests to insinuate themselves into our economy and government and intrude themselves upon our rights as a sovereign power.

Section V-8 of the administration's revised draft holds out a promise of considerable benefit to at least some of the free gold holding countries. This is particularly true with respect to those Latin-American countries which have large sterling balances in London. The assumption by the scheme of the British debts which comprise those sterling balances would place those Latin-American countries in a position of being able to collect them from the United States.

Like Russia, lend-lease, Export-Import Bank loans, and loans which might be made available to them through the creation of an international bank for reconstruction and development would undoubtedly be further inducements to the Latin-American countries to contribute some of their gold to the scheme. The extent to which the United States would indirectly, through these means, furnish to the Latin-American countries the very assets they would contribute to the scheme could not help but be substantial. If we can believe certain news items, the Treasury is even now giving away gold to certain countries which would be used in making up their gold quotas to the scheme. [See Reader's Digest, February 1944, pp. 12-14.]

In my November 1, 1943, paper, I also raised the question of whether the scheme would actually have physical possession of all of the gold assets contributed to it, or whether each country would keep its gold quota in its central bank and government vaults, and the whole operation of the plan, except the gold contributed by the United States, be one of bookkeeping.

It is important to know the answer to this question, for unless the international body would actually have in its physical possession the gold contributions of the so-called member countries, it is difficult to see how they could serve either as a true credit base or be of any value in maintaining the liquidity of its assets. The soundness—that is, the liquidity—of the plan would always be dependent upon the availability to it of its gold assets. There is no such thing as absentee liquidity any more than there is liquidity in futurity.

The paper contributions that would be made to the scheme constitute in reality nothing but overdrafts, except those made by the United States and other countries whose currencies are internationally convertible into gold. Lord

Keynes, in expounding his scheme to the House of Lords, touched upon this point, but apparently was very careful to refrain from distinguishing between the paper which would be contributed by countries whose position is such as to make it fully redeemable in gold at all times and those countries whose gold position is not such as to make their paper fully redeemable in gold at all times. He said:

The American plan requires the member States to provide so-called security against their overdrafts, a requirement which could certainly be met if it is thought useful; but the security in question only to a very small extent consists in an outside security in the shape of gold. It consists mainly of an I O U engraved on superior notepaper, better than would be the case, perhaps, under our own scheme. I have said that, if that is thought useful and worth while, it does not involve any particular problem. [P. 81, Parliamentary Debates on an International Clearing Union, British Information services.]

The paper portion that would be contributed by the United States would not "consist mainly of an I O U engraved on superior notepaper" but would be a bond underwritten by the Government of the United States for the delivery of gold on demand, backed by the actual possession of said gold. But the paper portion that would be contributed by the United Kingdom would not be possessed of this liquid quality. It would be a political I O U in the truest sense, with no gold back of it to assure its redemption, and without recourse to any other means or source of payment.

To what extent would the gold "contributions" made by countries other than the United States actually be made available to the scheme? Would any gold except that supplied by the United States be made available for use in the operation of the scheme in the sense in which the term "use" is applied to the capital of a bank or any other financial institution? The capital and assets of any financial institution must either be in its actual physical possession or in some manner subject to physical possession by it. This proposition holds with respect to international financial institutions as well as domestic ones. If the scheme does not comprehend actual physical possession of all its capital assets, if the shares of some are represented by paid-in gold and of others by political promissory notes only then it becomes a sham and a fraud of the worst sort.

On November 10, 1943, I addressed the following letter to Mr. Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury:

Some days ago Mr. E. M. Bernstein, in company with Mr. Brenner [Mr. Edward M. Bernstein is an assistant director, Division of Monetary Research, Treasury Department; Mr. Richard B. Brenner is an attorney in the Treasury Department], in my office gave me to understand, in answer to a direct question, that the operation of the United and Associated Nations Stabilization Fund would be only a matter of bookkeeping, that the assets of the fund would remain in the central banks and government institutions of the member countries.

Wishing to have this statement confirmed in writing by the Secretary of the

Treasury, I wrote him in that letter as follows:

I desire from you, the Secretary of the Treasury, a direct answer to the following:

Does the "Preliminary Draft Outline of a Proposal for a United and Associated Nations Stabilization Fund, United States Treasury Department, Revised Draft, July 10, 1943," provide for the physical delivery of the gold assets of the fund at some central point within the geographic boundary of one of the United and Associated Nations? Or, is it contemplated that the gold assets of the fund will remain in the physical possession of the member countries of the fund within their territorial boundaries?

On November 13, 1943, Mr. Morgenthau replied to the above as follows:

It is my understanding that the discussions among the technical experts of other countries did not touch on the point of the manner in which the gold contributed by a member country would be physically delivered to the fund. I presume, however, it is likely, with respect to the larger countries at least, that their respective gold contributions would be kept available on earmark for the fund at the central banks of those countries.

This is of course an attempt to evade answering my question. In the first place how could there be any question about the "manner" in which the gold should be physically delivered to the scheme? Is there any other way this could be done except by the simple act of shipping? Surely it would not require the services of any "technical experts" to figure that out.

If we are to infer from Mr. Morgenthau's answer that these technical experts have not discussed with the other countries the question of whether they would be willing to ship their gold quotas to one or possibly even several of the other member countries, it should be interesting to know what they have discussed. Do administration officials who are lending their support in the promotion of this scheme believe we are either so naive as to simply take it for granted that the member countries would be willing to ship their gold to some central depository, or so completely uninformed and unconcerned about the matter as to ask no questions?

One thing certain, however, does emerge from Mr. Morgenthau's answer, namely, that each one of the "larger countries" would retain physical possession of its gold contribution. Furthermore, the phrase "with respect to the larger countries at least," would certainly imply that the smaller countries might be given the choice to do likewise.

It should be interesting to have Mr. Morgenthau's formula which he used to classify the United and Associated Nations in two categories, the larger countries on the one hand and the smaller ones on the other, but it would be more interesting still to know how and why he arrived at determining that the larger nations would keep their gold contributions at home in their own vaults, yet seemed undecided or unwilling to say whether or not the smaller countries would be permitted to keep their gold contributions at home, too.

We wonder also which countries have been selected as the elect. The United States, Great Britain, China, and Russia have been officially designated as the "big four" powers so it is reasonable to suppose none of these countries would be called on to let loose of its "gold contribution" to be shipped off to any of the other member countries, though neither Great Britain nor China has any gold to let loose of.

If it is proposed that the smaller countries should hand their gold contributions over to the scheme, to which of the self-chosen few would they be expected to deliver them, to one or more of them, and, if so, which one or ones? Since the Soviet Union would be no more than a limited partner in the scheme, it is hardly likely that country would be selected as the gold depository for the smaller nations. China being so far away from the financial and industrial center of the world and for obvious various and sundry other reasons would hardly do as a depository of the gold assets of the smaller countries. That would leave only England and the United States to be considered as suitable places for holding and guarding those gold assets. To which of these two would the gold contributions from the smaller countries be made to flow, or would they be made to gravitate toward both?

These would not be idle questions if the scheme really contemplated that the proposed gold subscriptions of the smaller countries would actually have to be delivered at some central point within the geographic boundary of one of the so-called member countries. Indeed, these questions would then become vital as they would go to the very root of the matter.

These questions, of course, answer themselves, and they are not asked so much for the purpose of determining whether or not the smaller countries would actually deliver their gold quotas to some central depository within one of the member countries, but are asked more particularly to show both the deception and bizarreness of this scheme. With respect to the countries having no free or unpledged gold, the scheme would have nothing more than a second mortgage on any gold contributions that might be promised and with no recourse at that. Is it not likely that the free gold holding countries, nearly all of which come within the category of smaller countries, would prefer to keep their gold quotas in their own pockets when the nonfree gold holding countries had nothing more to offer than a second mortgage on their gold quotas without recourse, and when the so-called larger countries preferred to retain their gold contributions at their homes in their own vaults? Is it possible to draw any other conclusion than that the operation of the scheme would be one of bookkeeping, and the allegedly assigned gold contributions for both the nonfree and free gold holding countries, except with respect to the United States, would consist almost, if not entirely, of political promises, not to even pay in any part of such gold con-

tributions, but simply to agree to earmark them in their own countries for the account of the scheme?

Up to the present we have considered only the initial amount of gold liability the scheme would impose upon the United States. In the paper heretofore referred to of last November, I mentioned that the initial subscription of gold by the United States would likely be no more than a starter, that once the program were put in operation we should expect to be called upon to pour additional amounts into it. In that paper I said of the scheme:

We are to believe it is something that could be started and stopped like a watch; tried out and if found ineffective abandoned to its own fate. But it just would not work that way. Once the scheme were in operation it would quickly generate forces that would make for self-perpetuation and expansion, as is the nature of all political machinery * * *. A whole congeries of "vested" international interests would quickly spring up and concurrently the protective mechanisms for maintaining them.

In this connection we should read some of the provisions of the administration's draft under section V, Powers and Operations, wherein are provided the following powers:

To buy, sell, and hold gold, currencies, and government securities of member countries; to earmark and transfer gold; to issue its own obligations, and to offer them for discount or sale in member countries.

To buy from the governments of member countries, blocked foreign balances held in other member countries.

To sell member country obligations owned by the fund.

To use its holdings to obtain rediscounts or advances from the central bank of any country whose currency the fund needs.

With the approval of the representative of the government of the country concerned, sell its own securities, or securities it holds, directly to the public or to institutions of member countries.

With these far-reaching powers the scheme could be greatly expanded beyond its initial functions and organization. J. H. Riddle, economic adviser to the Bankers Trust Co. in New York, says of the administration's draft of the scheme that:

It could lend and borrow money, and deal in securities. The fact that it could borrow money and issue its own obligations might bring the fund's activities nearer the scope of the Keynes Union.

Of the Keynes Union he says:

Under the Keynes plan foreign countries could in theory accumulate debts of nearly \$26,000,000,000. That is a theoretical limit based on the assumption that the United States would be the only creditor country and all others would be debtor countries, and further than none of the safeguards provided for worked. That would not occur, of course, but it might be possible after a period of years for debit balances to reach half that figure, or even more, if creditor countries should continue to supply the funds without making any use of their credit balances.

That is, the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme could in time involve the United States in a liability to the extent of up-

ward of perhaps \$15,000,000,000. Many conditions must be taken into consideration in determining the probable extent to which the scheme would be expanded. It would be in control of the debtor countries who would determine its operations and formulate its lending policies. Keynesian monetary and financial thinking, with its fiat credit and currency, its pyramiding of credits, its unlimited government deficit financing, its totalitarian approach, and, in this instance at least, its lack of integrity, would give direction to all of its procedures.

Then we must keep in mind that this proposed plan is only a part of a larger and more grandiose scheme that is envisioned by its promoters. Indeed, this is frankly stated by its prime mover and spearhead, Lord Keynes, when he says:

It is possible that taken together—

1. The mechanism of currency and exchange.

2. The framework of a commercial policy regulating conditions for exchange of goods, tariffs, preferences, subsidies, import regulations, and the like.

3. Orderly conduct of production, distribution, and price of primary products * * *.

4. Investment aid, both medium and long term, for countries whose economic development needs assistance from outside.

* * * may help the world to control the ebb and flow of the tides of economic activity which have, in the past, destroyed security of livelihood and endangered international peace.

Lord Keynes looks upon his international stabilization scheme as the nucleus for the construction of a universal and all-pervasive centralized international power to regulate the economies, governments, and individual lives of the people of the whole earth. To the foregoing he adds that it "might become the instrument and the support of international policies in addition to those which it is its primary purpose to promote," that it "might become the pivot of the future economic government of the world," that "without it, other more desirable developments will find themselves impeded and unsupported," that "with it, they will fall into their place as parts of an ordered scheme," that it "might set up a clearing account in favour of international bodies charged with post-war relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction," which segment of his scheme is already in operation in the form of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Further, that his stabilization scheme "might set up an account in favour of any supernational policing body which may be charged with the duty of preserving the peace and maintaining international order," that "this would provide an excellent machinery for enforcing a financial blockade," that it "might set up an account in favour of international bodies charged with the management of a commodity control, and might finance stocks of commodities held by such bodies, allowing them overdraft facilities on their accounts up to an agreed maximum."

Also that it "might be linked up with a board for international investment," that

"there are various methods by which the clearing union could use its influence and its powers to maintain stability of prices and to control the trade cycle," that "if an international economic board is established this board and the clearing union might be expected to work in close collaboration to their mutual advantage," that "if an international investment or development corporation is also set up together with a scheme of commodity controls for the control of stocks of the staple primary products, we might come to possess in these three institutions a powerful means of combating the evils of the trade cycle, by exercising contractionist or expansionist influence on the system as a whole or on particular sections," and, finally, "the facility of applying the clearing union plan"—that is, the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme which we are here considering—"to these several purposes arises out of a fundamental characteristic which is worth pointing out, since it distinguishes the plan from those proposals which try to develop the same basic principle along bilateral lines and is one of the grounds on which the plan can claim superior merit," which he clinches with this sophistry: "This might be described as its 'anonymous' or 'impersonal' quality."

What else could it possibly be that is envisioned here but a "supernatural brain trust with authority," as Benjamin M. Anderson has designated it?

As just mentioned, one of the parts of this all-embracing scheme has already been perfected, namely, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, which, according to resolutions adopted at the Atlantic City conference, is to undertake everything from the furnishing of soup kitchens to the construction of railroads in all the war-stricken areas of the world; further, still another part of this global program, an "international bank for reconstruction and development" with an initial capitalization of \$10,000,000,000, is now in the process of concoction by the Administration.

Then there is a vast assemblage of related forces and conditions which are giving impetus or allowing freedom to this movement, though perhaps not so directly or manifestly connected with it, such as the totalitarian planning cult which in conjunction with the Federal bureaucracy all but completely dominates our economy and government, the disordered and corrupt currency and the long way our Nation has already gone in substituting a society of status for that of contract.

There is one more point which is of great importance to the consideration of the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme and which is very pertinent to this study. Seldom if ever are the expectations or promises of legislators in setting up political agencies fulfilled. It is an almost unbroken law that such bodies are, when once established and put in operation, never limited to their original size and functions, but tend always to enlarge and expand the scope of their activities.

This is so universally true and so self-evident that it should require no sub-

stantiating proof, though a thousand illustrations are ready at hand to support this contention, if that should be deemed necessary. But look at the growth of bureaucracy that has taken place in the Federal Government in recent years.

Who in 1887 would have thought that the Interstate Commerce Commission, which was created at that time, would develop to its present size, complexity, and power, and that the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution would be construed by the Supreme Court so as to make the growing of wheat interstate commerce and empower a Federal bureau to dictate to the farmer how much wheat he can grow?

The Congress devotes nine-tenths of its time trying to restrain the political machinery which it has created and to confine its functions within the bounds of the laws it has itself written. Now especially, it scolds the O. P. A., C. C. C., A. A. A., and the other political alphabetical agencies for using their powers to change the economy, for taking on functions that were not intended and for disobeying the laws which brought them into existence.

The Keynes-Morgenthau scheme would be no exception to the law of endogenous growth of political machinery. That it would go the way of all bureaucracy, take on new functions and expand in directions not now thought of or intended, most likely even by Lord Keynes and some of his coworkers, should be a foregone conclusion. Indeed, the nature of this scheme is such as to make it particularly liable to anarchic growth.

It is plainly seen that the meat of the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme, stripped of its pretense and window dressing, is, perhaps along with other highly important objectives, an attempt to inveigle the United States into handing over to Great Britain the control and use of the United States stock pile of gold; to finance \$5,000,000,000 or more of debts Britain owes to a large number of countries; to restore London as the world's banker and financial center; to finance her world trade and pay for her Beveridge plan.

The scheme seeks to accomplish these objectives by destroying the dollar as the leading international standard unit of value and settler of accounts and what is left of the orthodox international gold standard by substituting therefor a fictitious and political paper unit of account called *unitas*, in terms of which international pecuniary contracts would have to be made. It is sheer nonsense for Lord Keynes to say:

The existence of the clearing union does not deprive a member state of any of the facilities which it now possesses for receiving payment for its exports. In the absence of the clearing union, a creditor country can employ the proceeds of its exports to buy goods or to buy investments, or to make temporary advances and to hold temporary overseas balances, or to buy gold in the market. All these facilities will remain at its disposal. [Proposals for an international clearing union, British Information Services, April 8, 1943, p. 11.]

And for the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, to chime in with Lord Keynes by saying:

The fund would deal only with treasuries and central banks. It would not compete with private banks or existing agencies. Its operations would be maintained only to supplement the efforts made by each member government to maintain monetary stability. The established channels of international trade and international banking would be retained in full for all international transactions. [Statement of Secretary Morgenthau before the Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Banking and Currency and the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, April 5, 1943, p. 3.]

If these gentlemen mean that gold could still be used in the settlement of international trade balances in the orthodox way. That view postulates the impossible, namely, the existence simultaneously of two kinds of international units of value and media for settling trade balances, a definable weight of gold on the one hand and an indefinable paper "*unitas*" of account on the other. Would not Gresham's law operate the same in the international field as it always has in domestic economies? Would not the bad *unitas* money drive out the good gold money? What earthly chance would gold have to remain in circulation internationally and compete with the cheap money, the politically manipulable paper *unitas*? None, of course.

It is of the utmost importance to a full comprehension of the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme to grasp the fact that it would involve not merely the amount of gold the United States would contribute to it but our entire stock pile of gold. It envisions the complete demonetization of our total gold reserves for international use just as they have been demonetized for domestic use within our own economy and the economies of other countries. It would do exactly what Lord Keynes formally denies it would do when he says:

Nor is it reasonable to ask the United States to demonetize the stock of gold which is the basis of its impregnable liquidity.

This would in one single stroke destroy in large measure if not entirely the superb international gold position the United States now holds, in international trade and commerce. It would at the same time yield to the debtor countries and, of course, to Great Britain in particular an unearned, precious, and vital national resource.

The alleged capital formation of the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme is a fraud. The dishonesty and deception which underlie it condemn it utterly. This is not a proposal for international cooperation if the word "cooperation" still means what the dictionary up to now has always said it meant—"collective action in the pursuit of common well-being." On the contrary, this is a proposal by Great Britain, supported by other countries and aided by our present administration, not only to bleed the United States white but to destroy her very blood-making organs.

Table showing the countries which would have no free or unpledged gold and the countries which would have free or unpledged gold for gold contributions to the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme, and other pertinent data relating thereto

POSITION OF 14 COUNTRIES HAVING NO FREE GOLD

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Country	Percent of gold (1) or gold and gold exchange (2) legally required against circulating notes or circulating notes and other demand liabilities in central banks	Date of circulating notes and other demand liabilities in central banks as shown in columns 4 and 5	Amount of circulating notes (in dollars, 000 omitted)	Amount of other demand liabilities in central banks (in dollars, 000 omitted)	Amount of gold, or gold and gold exchange required against circulating notes, or circulating notes and other demand liabilities in central banks (in dollars, 000 omitted)	Date of gold holding as shown in column 8	Amount of gold holding (in dollars, 000 omitted)	Amount of free gold (+) or gold deficiency (-) for circulating notes, or circulating notes and other demand liabilities in central banks (in dollars, 000 omitted)	Alleged percent of aggregate contribution (\$8,000,000,000 gold and paper) assigned by scheme	Alleged share of aggregate contribution (\$8,000,000,000 gold and paper) allotted by scheme (in dollars, 000 omitted)	Alleged percent of gold contribution of total contribution of each country allotted by scheme	Alleged amount of gold contribution allotted by scheme (in dollars, 000 omitted)	Free gold (+) or deficiency of free gold (-) for gold contribution to fund (in dollars, 000 omitted)
Australia.....	(2) 25	Sept. 27, 1943	484,239	557,266	121,029	April 1940.....	5,000	-116,059	1.5	120,000	1.2	1,500	-1,500
Belgium.....	(2) 40	Aug. 26, 1943	2,512,595	372,111	865,411	August 1943.....	734,000	-131,411	2.4	192,000	37.5	72,000	-72,000
Bolivia.....	(2) 45	Sept. 30, 1943	24,204	19,211	13,024	September 1943.....	13,000	-24	1	8,000	40.0	3,200	-3,200
Canada.....	(1) 25	Oct. 30, 1943	760,552	403,354	200,976	October 1943.....	5,000	-285,976	2.8	224,000	40.0	89,600	-89,600
China.....						March 1939.....	21,000		4.0	320,000	22.5	72,000	-72,000
Czechoslovakia.....	(1) 25	Aug. 31, 1943	863,446	142,798	251,561	August 1943.....	61,000	-190,561	1.2	96,000	14.0	13,725	-13,725
Egypt.....	(1) 50	do.....	356,294	484,840	178,147	do.....	52,000	-126,147	.6	48,000	32.0	15,600	-15,600
France.....	(1) 35	Oct. 28, 1943	9,517,353	1,022,606	3,688,985	April 1940.....	2,000,000	-1,688,985	5.5	440,000	37.5	165,000	-165,000
Greece.....	(2) 40	Mar. 31, 1941	129,789	140,085	107,709	Mar. 1941.....	28,000	-79,709	.4	32,000	22.5	7,200	-7,200
India.....	(2) 40	Aug. 27, 1943	2,272,964	315,690	909,185	August 1943.....	274,000	-635,185	3.2	256,000	32.0	82,200	-82,200
Netherlands.....	(1) 40	Aug. 30, 1943	1,542,053	422,047	616,821	August 1943.....	522,000	-94,821	2.1	168,000	30.0	50,400	-50,400
New Zealand.....	(2) 25	Sept. 27, 1943	109,122	130,241	62,090	July 1943.....	23,000	-39,090	.5	40,000	17.0	6,900	-6,900
United Kingdom.....	(1) 100	Oct. 27, 1943	4,028,794	1,003,827		August 1943.....	1,000		12.8	1,024,000	30.0	307,200	-307,200
Yugoslavia.....	(1) 20	July --, 1943	713,840	91,340	201,295	February 1941.....	83,000	-118,295	.3	24,000	30.0	7,200	-7,200
Total.....			23,315,245	5,114,416	7,306,263		3,801,000	-3,506,263		2,992,000		893,725	-893,725

POSITION OF 16 COUNTRIES HAVING FREE GOLD

Brazil.....		Apr. 30, 1943	510,643	473,209		September 1943.....	223,000		1.2	96,000	40.0	38,400	+38,400
Chile.....	(2) 50	Aug. 31, 1943	107,229	30,306	60,579	August 1943.....	54,000	+6,579	.4	32,000	40.0	12,800	+12,800
Colombia.....		Oct. 30, 1943	63,748	65,915		September 1943.....	55,000		.3	24,000	40.0	9,600	+9,600
Costa Rica.....		July 31, 1943	12,005	7,219		do.....	6,000		.04	3,200	50.0	1,600	+1,600
Cuba.....						July 1943.....	31,000		.4	32,000	28.0	9,300	+9,300
Ecuador.....	(2) 30	July 29, 1943	14,459	13,697	6,757	April 1943.....	10,000	+3,243	.05	4,000	40.0	1,600	+1,600
El Salvador.....	(1) 25	Aug. 31, 1943	12,972	8,819		September 1943.....	11,000		.05	4,000	50.0	2,000	+2,000
Guatemala.....		May 31, 1942	12,436	13,415		December 1942.....	19,000		.07	5,600	50.0	2,800	+2,800
Mexico.....		Aug. 31, 1943	205,620	128,505		October 1943.....	200,000		.8	64,000	50.0	32,000	+32,000
Norway.....	(1) 100	Mar. 30, 1940	136,088	25,468	39,528	February 1940.....	84,000	+44,471	.7	56,000	30.0	16,800	+16,800
Peru.....		July 31, 1943	49,585	21,681		October 1943.....	26,000		.2	16,000	30.0	4,800	+4,800
Poland.....	(1) 40	Aug. 20, 1939	385,705	17,934	65,456	July 1939.....	84,000	+18,544	1.1	88,000	21.0	18,800	+18,800
South Africa.....	(1) 30	Aug. 27, 1943	181,002	494,061	202,788	August 1943.....	628,000	+425,212	1.8	144,000	50.0	72,000	+72,000
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.....						September 1935.....	839,000		7.7	616,000	30.0	184,800	+184,800
Uruguay.....	(1) 100	June 30, 1943	78,808	102,534	31,410	June 1943.....	101,000	+69,590	.2	16,000	50.0	8,000	+8,000
Venezuela.....	(2) 50	Oct. 31, 1943	75,233	23,966	44,639	October 1943.....	84,000	+39,361	.3	24,000	50.0	12,000	+12,000
Total.....			1,862,433	1,424,729			2,455,000			1,224,800		427,400	+420,823

GOLD POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES

United States.....	140-35	Oct. --, 1943	15,550,000	14,193,804	11,187,000	October 27, 1943.....	219,851,000	+8,514,000	29.3	2,344,000	50.0	1,172,000	+1,172,000
--------------------	--------	---------------	------------	------------	------------	-----------------------	-------------	------------	------	-----------	------	-----------	------------

¹ The United States statute provides that: Every Federal Reserve bank shall maintain reserves in gold certificates or lawful money of not less than 35 per centum against its deposits and reserves in gold certificates of not less than 40 per centum against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation.

² Represents gold certificates held by the Federal Reserve banks. They are truly representative of gold only to the extent to which they are actually convertible into gold, that is, to the extent to which gold may be exported.

FOOTNOTE ANALYSIS OF COLUMN 2 IN PRECEDING TABLE

AUSTRALIA

Requires a 25-percent gold and gold exchange reserve against notes.

Exchange included limited to English sterling. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 542.]

The bank is obligated by law to maintain a 25-percent gold reserve against notes in circulation. By the Commonwealth Bank Act of 1932 [assented to May 21, 1932], it was provided that the reserve may be held in gold coin or in English sterling or partly in gold and partly in English sterling. [Moody's Manual of Investments, 1943, p. 1652.]

The maintenance of reserves in the Commonwealth of Australia, provided for in the Commonwealth Bank Act, 1911-32, is as follows:

"Sec. 60K. (1) The Board shall hold in gold or in English sterling or partly in gold and partly in English sterling a reserve of an amount not less than 15 percent of the

amount of Australian notes on issue during the 2 years ending on the 30th day of June 1933, not less than 18 percent of such notes on issue during the year ending on the 30th day of June 1934; not less than 21½ percent of such notes on issue during the year ending on the 30th day of June 1935; and not less than 25 percent of such notes on issue after the 30th day of June 1935." [Library of Congress, Law Library, November 15, 1943.]

Only gold held by Australia can be considered as reserve against notes since English sterling exchange owned by Australia cannot be considered as gold exchange.

BELGIUM

Thirty percent gold or 40 percent of gold and gold exchange against demand liabilities. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 193, p. 542.]

Prior to the occupation of the country by the German Army in May 1940, the National Bank of Belgium had the sole right to issue bank notes; its reserves, in gold or gold foreign exchange had to equal 40 percent of its sight engagements and 75 percent of the reserve had to be in gold. [Moody's Manual of Investments, 1943, p. 1682.]

Moody's Manual of Investments data used for computing amount of gold reserve required.

BOLIVIA

Requires a 50 percent of gold and gold exchange reserve against notes and deposits.

May legally include silver. Silver included limited to one-fifth of required reserve. Exchange included limited to deposits payable in gold on demand or on 3 days' notice in

New York or London, except that since September 6, 1932, domestic and foreign prime commercial bills may, with the consent of the superintendent of banks, be included up to one-tenth of required reserve. Bank includes drafts payable, dividends, and other obligations with deposits against which reserves are required. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 542.]

Decree of June 21, 1941, requires 45 percent reserve in gold or foreign exchange against notes and deposits, all foreign exchange may be counted, but gold itself must equal 30 percent of notes and deposits. [Computation of required reserves in chart based on this 30-percent requirement.] The bank however, follows its organic law of July 20, 1928, and counts only gold, dollars and sterling [plus a small amount of silver]. [Treasury data as of June 30, 1943.]

CANADA

Canada requires 25 percent gold reserve against notes and deposits.

Government at bank's request may suspend reserve requirement for maximum period of 1 year. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 542.]

In connection with the Exchange Fund order of May 1, 1940, the bank's gold reserves were sold to the Foreign Exchange Control Board, and at the same time the bank's minimum gold reserve requirement was temporarily discontinued. [Moody's Manual of Investments, 1943, p. 1512.]

Excludes gold held by Foreign Exchange Control Board which on May 1, 1940, took over all the gold reserves of the Bank of Canada, amounting to \$206,000,000. [Federal Reserve data.]

CHINA

According to information supplied me by the Federal Reserve Board, China held in March 1939, only \$21,000,000 in gold. Yet, according to data furnished me by the Treasury, China's gold contribution is set at \$72,000,000.

No attempt has been made to show the gold reserve requirements of China. The Law Library of Congress furnished me with almost seven pages of single-spaced typewritten data relating to this subject, which shows it to be impossible to determine much of value in respect to her reserve requirements.

China has no gold to contribute to the scheme. In this connection should be read the agreement made by the Treasury Department with China relating to the \$500,000,000 of financial aid extended to China. Under that agreement the United States has assumed a potential gold liability to the full amount of \$500,000,000. It is also necessary here to keep in mind the great inflation which is now raging in China. She needs all the gold she can possibly acquire to meet that situation, and for that reason alone would have none to spare for the Keynes scheme.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

A 25-percent gold reserve is required against demand liabilities.

Reserve may be permitted to fall below stated reserve requirements subject * * * to the payment of a tax. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 543.]

When Czechoslovakia became divided into a protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia and the state of Slovakia, a separate Slovakian bank—Slovenska Narodna Banka—was established. [Library of Congress, Law Library, November 16, 1943.]

The demand liabilities of Slovakia were included with those of Bohemia and Moravia, but they amount to only about 10 percent of those of the latter, and would, for the purpose of this study, not materially affect any of the figures shown for Czechoslovakia.

EGYPT

Requires a 50-percent gold and gold-exchange reserve against notes.

Gold included must be held at home. Exchange included limited to British Treasury bills. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 542.]

The statutes of the National Bank of Egypt, approved by the decree of June 25, 1898, were amended several times, the last amendments being dated May 29, 1920, June 20, 1927, and August 10, 1940. This last decree was promulgated August 12, 1940 [Journal Officiel, p. 108]. Section 4 of the statute grants the National Bank of Egypt the privilege of issuing bank notes. Section 5 states that the issue of bank notes is a separate service distinct from the other operations of the bank. It states further:

"The amount of bank notes in circulation payable either to bearer or on sight must be always represented by (1) at least one-half in gold; (2) one-half in such securities owned by the bank and calculated at a rate not exceeding the daily quotations but with maximum at par, the choice of which is by law reserved to the government alone without any responsibility whatsoever on the part of the government. In default, either complete or partial, of such securities the reserve in gold held by the special issue service of the bank notes, must be increased proportionately in such a way that the amount of the bank notes in circulation shall always be covered completely."

This text is quoted from Pace, Repertoire Permanent de Legislation Egyptienne, which is a loose-leaf service of Egyptian legislation in force brought up to date to August 1940. [Library of Congress, Law Library, November 18, 1943.]

Required gold reserve computed in accordance with Library of Congress, Law Library, November 18, 1943, data. English exchange being not gold exchange, the result would be the same if Federal Reserve data had been used.

FRANCE

Requires a 35-percent gold reserve against demand liabilities. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 542.]

This 35-percent gold reserve requirement was suspended under the emergency decree of September 2, 1939. [Moody's Manual of Investments, 1943, p. 1777.]

The amount of gold holding shown does not include the gold transferred to the Exchange Stabilization Fund—about \$700,000,000. [See p. 1003, September 1940 Federal Reserve Bulletin.]

GREECE

A 40-percent gold and gold-exchange reserve is required against "demand liabilities, minus holdings of national silver coin up to 150,000,000 drachmas."

Reserve net, i. e., minus gold exchange liabilities. Reserve may include certain gold bonds of the Greek state up to 650,000,000 drachmas. Reserve requirements suspended since April 26, 1932. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 542.]

Under section 61 of the Statute of the Bank of Greece of 1927, the bank had to maintain

"a reserve of not less than 40 percent of the notes in circulation and other demand liabilities." The reserve may have consisted not only of gold bullion and coin, but also of "net foreign gold exchange." However, section 61, above quoted, was expressly suspended by section 1 of the law, No. 5422 of April 26, 1932 [Ephemeris, 1932, p. 917]. This law seems to be still in force down to 1939 as it is stated in the monograph, Tsamis, L'Evolution Monetaire en Grece, 1928-38, a Doctor's dissertation presented at the University of Nancy on October 19, 1939. The same work gives the following tabulation of the amount of coverage actually held by the bank [p. 96]. [Library of Congress, Law Library, November 17, 1943.]

No consideration was given to the silver allowed as reserve by Greece because of the very small amount permitted to be used, nor to her foreign exchange which might be used by her as reserve because of the comparatively small amount held—\$103,000, March 31, 1941, Federal Reserve figure.

INDIA

A gold and gold-exchange reserve of 40 percent is required against notes.

Reserves may be permitted to fall below stated reserve requirements subject * * * to the payment of a tax. Government consent is necessary in * * * India. Gold must not be less than 400,000,000 rupees; at least 85 percent of gold included must be held at home. Exchange included limited to deposits at Bank of England, sterling bills, or British Government securities maturing within 5 years. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 542.]

India held on August 27, 1943, \$2,155,071,000 of English sterling. [Federal Reserve data.]

Since English sterling exchange cannot be considered as gold exchange in the true sense, India's English sterling cannot be applied as reserve against her notes.

NETHERLANDS

A 40-percent gold reserve is required against demand liabilities.

May legally include silver. Eighty percent of required reserve must be held at home. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 543.]

The Netherlands Bank is required to maintain against outstanding notes and other demand liabilities a revenue of 40 percent in gold and silver coin and bullion, and other legal tender coin. The law does not specify a fixed proportion of gold or silver. Foreign exchange is not permitted as reserve. [Moody's Manual of Investments, 1943, p. 1851.]

The latest comprehensive regulation concerning the bank is contained in the law of February 2, 1937 [Staatsblad, 1937, No. 400], and the royal decree of March 1, 1937 [Staatsblad, 1937, No. 401], by which the provision for issuing bank notes was prolonged for 5 years, beginning with March 31, 1937—that is, up to March 31, 1942. The last-named law also contained the following provision:

"Sec. 23. The proportion of bank notes, bank drafts, and balances of accounts current which must be covered by coin or bullion shall be established by royal decree and passed on recommendation of the management of the bank. This decree shall be promulgated in Staatsblad and changed as necessary from time to time."

The only royal decree disclosed in this respect is that of January 4, 1939 [Staatsblad, 1929, No. 3], which set the minimum proportion of the gold reserve in bullion and coin at

40 percent. Staatsblad, from 1929 to 1940, inclusive, does not contain any laws changing these provisions, so it seems that it was still in force by the end of 1940. [Library of Congress, Law Library, November 17, 1943.]

The amount of silver held in the Netherlands Bank in June 1943 was \$4,000,000. [Federal Reserve Bulletin for October 1943, p. 1040.]

NEW ZEALAND

A 25-percent gold and gold exchange reserve is required against demand liabilities.

Exchange may include sterling; liabilities in exchange must be deducted from gold exchange. Government at bank's request may suspend reserve requirements. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 543.]

The Reserve Bank of New Zealand is the sole bank-note issuing authority. In October 1939 it was announced that the minimum reserve of 25 percent of the Reserve bank's note circulation and other demand liabilities may be varied or suspended, and authority was given to revalue the gold reserve up to market value. As of September 1, 1942, no action had been taken in either respect. [Moody's Manual of Investments, 1943, p. 1664.]

As of February 1943, New Zealand owned English sterling exchange to the amount of £31,000,000. [London Economist, April 7, 1943, p. 180.] But English sterling exchange cannot be considered as gold exchange, since it is not convertible into gold.

UNITED KINGDOM

A 100-percent gold reserve is required against notes in excess of fiduciary issue of £260,000,000.

At bank's request treasury may decrease fiduciary issue or may, for a period up to 2 years, increase fiduciary issue. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 543.]

The principle of formula controlling the Bank of England's reserve is to be found in the Currency and Bank Note Act, 1928 (18 and 19 George V, ch. 13), section 2 (1):

"Sec. 2 (1). Subject to the provisions of this act the bank shall issue bank notes up to the amount representing the gold coin and gold bullion for the time being in the issue department, and shall in addition issue bank notes to the amount of £260,000,000 in excess of the amount first mentioned in this section, and the issue of notes which the bank is by or under this act required or authorized to make in excess of the said first-mentioned amount is in this act referred to as 'the fiduciary note issue.'"

"(2) The treasury may at any time on being requested by the bank, direct that the amount of the fiduciary note issue shall for such period as may be determined by the treasury, after consultation with the bank, be reduced by such amount as may be so determined."

Section 3 (1) provides for the covering of the fiduciary note issue by securities as follows:

"Sec. 3 (1). In addition to the gold coin and bullion for the time being in the issue department, the bank shall from time to time appropriate to and hold in the issue department securities of an amount in value sufficient to cover the fiduciary note issue for the time being."

"(2) The securities to be held as aforesaid may include silver coin to an amount not exceeding five and one-half million pounds."

"(3) The bank shall from time to time give to the treasury such information as the

treasury may require with respect to the securities held in the issue department, but shall not be required to include any of the said securities in the account to be taken pursuant to section 5 of the Bank of England Act, 1819." [Library of Congress, Law Library, No. 15, 1943.]

Gold held by England excludes gold held by exchange equalization account which on September 1, 1941, the last date reported, amounted to \$151,000,000. [Federal Reserve data.]

The figure of 100 in column 2 showing the percentage of gold reserves required by the United Kingdom against her circulating notes was taken from the July 1936, Federal Reserve Bulletin, page 543. It should be noted, however, that this figure was not applied to the circulating notes, as will be seen in column 6 for the reason that the data here are too uncertain to be of any value.

Unless it could be shown that England considers that she no longer requires any gold in the exchange equalization account as well as any gold backing for her notes, she would have no free gold to contribute to the fund. It has been suggested by one of the leading English financial journals that England might sell goods for gold to meet her gold contribution, but that such action would be objectionable. [See London Economist, August 28, 1943, pp. 261-262.]

YUGOSLAVIA

Requires a 25-percent gold reserve, or 35 percent of gold and gold-exchange reserve against demand liabilities.

Gold included must be held at home. Provisionally since January 21, 1935, reserve requirements are reduced from 25 and 35 percent to 20 and 25 percent, respectively, and bank is authorized, in computing these ratios, to value reserves at 28.5 percent above legal rate. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 543.]

The monetary law of May 11, 1931, provided with regard to the reserve as follows:

"Sec. 5. The bank must maintain a reserve in gold or foreign values legally or actually convertible into freely exportable gold. The amount of the reserve to be not less than 35 percent of the bank's sight obligations of which at least 25 percent must be covered by gold in the vaults of the bank."

By section 63 of the financial law [Budget] for 1934-35 [Sluzhbene Novine, 1934, item 168, p. 330] the Council of Ministers was granted the power to issue decrees with the force of law for the regulation of economic situation in the country. On the basis of this authority, the Council of Ministers issued on January 15, 1935, a decree which being printed in No. 15 Sluzhbene Novine of January 21, 1935, took effect on that date.

The decree reads:

"Decree concerning liquidation of the revolving credit of the national bank."

"Section 1. The National Bank of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, may provisionally, in defiance of section 5 of the law on currency of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and for the purpose of a complete liquidation of its revolving credits abroad, maintain reserve in gold and foreign exchange which was accounted at the legal rate plus a 'prim' of 28.5 percent, so that the total reserve must cover 25 percent of the sight liabilities and at least 20 percent of sight liabilities of the bank must be covered in gold in the vaults of the bank."

No further change of this provision was disclosed by perusal of the Collection of Yugoslavian Laws [Sluzhbene Novine] down to the 2d of April 1941, the date of the last

number of Sluzhbene Novine. [Library of Congress, Law Library, November 18, 1943.]

Computation of required gold reserves made on the basis that at least 20 percent of sight liabilities of the bank must be covered with gold in the vaults of the bank. [Library of Congress, Law Library, data used for computing reserve requirements.]

BRAZIL

A 25-percent reserve of Government funds in gold or foreign exchange is required against cruzero notes. No gold or foreign exchange reserve is required against deposits. [Treasury data, as of June 30, 1943.]

The above being the only data available to me respecting the reserve requirements of Brazil, no effort has been made to supply all of the figures here. For the purpose of this study we shall assume that Brazil would have enough free gold to meet her gold contribution to the fund.

CHILE

A 50-percent gold and gold exchange reserve is required against notes and deposits.

Reserve may be permitted to fall below stated reserve requirements subject * * * to the payment of a tax. Exchange net; limited to demand deposits payable in gold in New York or London. Exchange purchased under laws of April 19, 1932 (No. 5107) and February 13, 1935 (No. 5594), regarding official exchange control, and an equivalent amount of notes and deposits are excluded in computing ratio. While bank holds Treasury notes issued under law of January 7, 1932 (No. 5028) and later consolidated in a long-term Government debt, reserve requirements are reduced to 25 percent. Bank includes cashiers' checks and dividends payable with deposits against which reserves are required. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 542.]

Article 83: The Central Bank of Chile must maintain a gold reserve equal to 50 percent of the total of its notes in circulation and of its deposits. This may be in gold bars or coins deposited in the safes of the bank, or gold [bars or coins] deposited in the custody of first-class foreign banks; or in deposits payable on demand, and in gold in first-class banks in London and New York. The 50 percent guarantees also Treasury notes and bonds in circulation which the bank is obliged to exchange, cancel, or withdraw in accordance with law. [Library of Congress, Law Library, Nov. 15, 1943.]

Reserve requirements are "in suspense." [Treasury data as of June 30, 1943.]

Chile employs a system of multiple exchange rates in its current trade, but at present the prevailing rate is P/31-\$1. P/317,400,357 of the outstanding notes are technically not subject to reserve requirements. [Treasury data, as of June 30, 1943.]

These factors were taken into consideration in determining the reserves required. Chile owned on August 31, 1943, \$18,331,000 of foreign exchange [Federal Reserve data] which was added to her gold holding in computing the amount of reserve required against her notes and deposits. However, no data are available to show the distribution of Chile's foreign exchange holdings according to the currency involved. To the extent Chile's foreign exchange holdings may not consist of gold exchange the amount of free gold shown in column 14 would be reduced.

COLOMBIA

A gold and gold exchange reserve of 40 percent is required against notes.

Reserve may be permitted to fall below stated reserve requirements subject . . . to the payment of a tax. Exchange limited to demand deposits but not to gold exchange. During present emergency reserve requirements are reduced to 30 percent or, so long as gold content of peso is not reduced, to 25 percent. An additional reserve of 25 percent of deposits plus outstanding Treasury notes is required in gold or other cash [silver not to exceed one-half]. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 542.]

In January 1942 the minimum legal gold reserve of the Bank of the Republic was fixed at 30 percent [reduced from 40 percent] of its bills in circulation. [Moody's Manual of Investments, 1943, p. 1741.]

A 25 percent reserve is required against deposits. No more than one-half may be in silver. A 50 percent reserve in gold or foreign exchange is required against notes. [Treasury data, as of June 30, 1943.]

No attempt has been made to determine the amount of gold reserve that is required against notes or notes and deposits. It is assumed Colombia would have sufficient free gold to meet her gold contribution.

COSTA RICA

No specific gold or exchange requirements. [Treasury data, as of June 30, 1943.]

CUBA

Since May 2, 1942, 98 percent gold or dollar reserve has been required against new note issues. Earlier issued backed 1 to 1 by silver pesos. United States currency circulates freely. [Treasury data, as of June 30, 1943.]

Decree of August 2, 1938 [Norma de reserva metálica en los Bancos]: Article 1 provides that all banking institutions operating within the territory of the Republic shall have in metallic currency of national coinage a reserve of at least 75 percent of the amount to which article 180 of the Commercial Code refers [infra]. Article 180 of the Commercial Code [as amended through 1941] provides that banks shall conserve in metal at least one-fourth of the total of their deposits, current accounts in currency and of their bills in circulation. [Library of Congress, Law Library, November 15, 1943.]

ECUADOR

Requires a 40-percent gold and gold-exchange reserve against notes and deposits.

Exchange included limited to deposits payable in gold. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 542.]

A 30-percent reserve is required against notes and sight obligations. This reserve may consist of gold and [up to 20 percent of the required reserve] of foreign exchange. [Treasury data, as of June 30, 1943.]

A minimum reserve of 30 percent [reduced from 40 percent effective Jan. 1, 1938] in gold against notes in circulation and sight deposits is required. [Moody's Manual of Investments, 1943, p. 1765.]

Treasury data used in computing amount of required gold reserve.

EL SALVADOR

A gold reserve of 25 percent is required against demand liabilities.

After definitive stabilization of currency, net exchange may count as reserve. Such exchange is not limited to gold exchange, but must be held in central banks. If reserve falls below 30 percent on 3 of the 24 report dates a year, no dividend shall be paid to

shareholding banks. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 542.]

Twenty-five percent reserve in gold or foreign exchange is required against notes and other sight liabilities. If, however, the reserve ratio falls below 30 percent, no dividends can be paid. [Treasury data, as of June 30, 1943.]

Amount of reserve not computed. Assumed El Salvador would have sufficient free gold to meet her gold quota.

GUATEMALA

Thirteen and one-third percent gold is required against notes. A gold reserve of $8\frac{1}{3}$ percent is required against deposits, due in 30 days or less, including unutilized credits.

Gold in required reserves must be in bank's vaults. Silver may replace gold up to one-tenth of requirement shown in gold column. Reserve against deposits payable in a foreign currency may be held entirely in that currency. Note issue may not exceed five times bank's paid-up capital and surplus or 12,500,000 quetzals, whichever is larger. Deposits due in 30 days or less may not exceed five times bank's capital and surplus. May legally include silver in each category. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 542.]

The bank must maintain a reserve in gold and silver in its vaults or in sight deposits abroad payable in gold equivalent at least to 40 percent of its notes in circulation. Not less than one-third of the 40 percent reserve must be kept in its own vaults, but this may include Guatemalan silver coins in an amount not exceeding 3.33 percent of the reserve. [Moody's Manual of Investments, 1943, p. 1817.]

Forty percent reserve required against notes; 25 percent against other sight liabilities. Reserves may consist of gold, deposits abroad, United States currency, and silver in a limited amount. [Treasury data, as of June 30, 1943.]

Amount of required gold reserve not calculated. Assumed Guatemala would have sufficient gold to meet her gold quota.

MEXICO

On December 23, 1938, the Chamber of Deputies approved a new law providing for the revaluation of the bank's gold, and foreign exchange reserves at market value. In addition, the law removed the limitation on the amount of paper currency which the bank may issue. Under the original organic law, the bank was required to back its note issue with at least 50 percent of metallic reserves. Early in 1938, however, that restriction was removed by decree, and a bill passed authorizing the treasury to issue interest-bearing treasury certificates which are acceptable for tax payments. [Moody's Manual of Investments, 1943, p. 1845.]

Ley organica del Banco de Mexico y Estatutos—as amended February 21, 1939:

"Article 99: The bank shall maintain at all times a reserve to uphold the value of the peso. The total of this reserve . . . shall not in any instance be lower than 100,000 pesos, nor less than 25 percent of the total of notes issued on the bank and its obligations to pay on sight in national currency.

"Article 100: The reserve to which the article above refers will consist of gold and silver, coined or in bars, of shares of foreign exchange, etc." [Library of Congress, Law Library, November 15, 1943.]

Twenty-five percent reserve required against both notes and deposits, of which at least 80 percent must be in gold or foreign exchange. As much as 20 percent may be in silver. [Treasury data, as of June 30, 1943.]

No attempt has been made from the above data to calculate the amount of required gold reserves. It is assumed Mexico would have sufficient free gold to meet her gold quota.

NORWAY

Requires a 100-percent gold reserve against notes in excess of fiduciary issue of 250,000,000 kroner. Gold included must be held at home. Fiduciary issue may be increased, subject to a tax, by authority of King and Storting. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 543.]

A legal minimum reserve of 100 percent gold against notes in excess of a fiduciary issue of 425,000,000 kroner must be maintained. This issue may be increased, subject to tax, by authority of the King and Storting. [Moody's Manual of Investments, 1943, p. 1860.]

Gold reserve requirements computed from Moody's Manual of Investments, that is, on the basis of 100 percent against notes in excess of 425,000,000 kroner, which qualifies the percentage figure as shown in column 2 accordingly.

PERU

A gold and gold exchange reserve of 50 percent is required against notes, deposits, and net foreign items in process of collection.

May legally include silver. Silver included must not exceed one-fifth. Exchange included may consist only of deposits payable on demand in gold, or its equivalent, in New York or London, and up to one-half of reserve, bankers' acceptances payable in gold currencies. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, January 1936, p. 543.]

The original statutes of the bank [Banco Central de Reserva del Peru] provided for a tax on the note circulation whenever the reserve ratio fell below 50 percent, but this provision was suspended by Law 7760 of June 9, 1933. [Moody's Manual of Investments, 1943, p. 1869.]

A 50-percent reserve is required against notes and deposits. Reserve may consist of gold or exchange, bank acceptances or silver coins [up to one-fifth]. [Treasury data, as of June 30, 1943.]

No attempt has been made from the above data to determine the amount of gold reserve that is required for cover of demand liabilities. It is assumed Peru would have sufficient free gold to meet her gold quota.

POLAND

Requires 30 percent gold reserve against demand liabilities in excess of 100,000,000 zlotys. Reserve may be permitted to fall below the stated reserve requirements subject to the payment of a tax. Gold net, after deduction of pledged gold and of liabilities in exchange. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 543.]

The law of March 24, 1939, introduced some amendments to the charter of the Bank Polski of 1936. In particular, the law changed section 52 of the charter dealing with the gold reserve [Dziennik Ustaw, 1939, item 142, p. 417]. Then the charter with all the amendments was re-promulgated in toto by the proclamation of the Minister of Finance of May 2, 1939 [Dziennik Ustaw, 1939, item 296], and the amended text to section 52 is given there as follows:

"Sec. 52. The bank must possess a gold reserve to the amount equivalent to 40 percent of the sum by which the total of the

banknotes in circulation plus sight liabilities exceeds the sum of 800,000,000 zlotys.

"Depending upon the situation on the gold market, the council of the bank may, with the consent of the Minister of Finance, raise the limit of 800,000,000 zlotys established in the first paragraph of this section to a sum not exceeding 1,200,000,000 zlotys however.

"The liabilities based upon loans secured by gold of the bank are deducted from the gold reserve" [Dziennik Ustaw, 1939, p. 585].

These are the latest available provisions for the period before the German occupation. [Library of Congress, Law Library, November 19, 1943.]

Gold-reserve requirement computed from data supplied by Law Library of Congress, second paragraph, under section 52.

If the figure 800,000,000 zlotys were taken as representing the amount of notes and sight liabilities to be exempted from reserve requirements, as provided in the first paragraph of section 52 above, instead of the figure 1,200,000,000 zlotys—the figure used in the chart—there would be a deficiency of gold to the amount of \$13,455,000 for note and sight liability coverage.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

Requires a gold reserve of 30 percent against notes, deposits, and bills payable. May legally include silver.

Reserve may be permitted to fall below stated reserve requirements subject, except in South Africa * * * to the payment of a tax. Government consent is necessary in * * * South Africa. One-half of gold included must be held at home. Silver included limited to 6 percent of deposits and bills payable [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 543].

U. S. S. R.

She makes no report of her gold holdings. [Treasury data.] There are indications that Russia does not intend to bind herself to the United and Associated Nations' stabilization fund scheme.

[See New York World-Telegram, December 7, 1943; Lewis W. Haney in the Washington Times-Herald, December 11, 1943; Russia's Intentions About Gold, in the January 1944 Economic Conditions, Government Finance, United States Securities, p. 6.]

URUGUAY

Requires 45% percent of gold reserve against major notes of 10 pesos or more issued in excess of (a) bank's paid-up capital, less fiduciary issue of minor notes, and (b) rediscounted bank documents up to 10,000,000 pesos.

Fiduciary issue of minor notes is permitted in place of major notes, against paid-up capital. Against minor notes in excess of fiduciary issue minimum reserve requirement is 45.6 percent in silver. Minor notes are limited to 20,000,000 pesos. Bank must hold notes equivalent to 20 percent of deposits. Gold coin may be held abroad only if 55,000,000 pesos of gold coin is held in Uruguay, unless specifically authorized otherwise. [Federal Reserve Bulletin, July 1936, p. 543.]

Notes of the issue department of the Banco de la Republica in excess of 60,000,000 pesos may be backed by silver up to 12,000,000 pesos [actually 9,000,000 pesos are so backed]; additional notes require a backing of 100 percent in gold. [Treasury data, as of June 30, 1943.]

Ley No. 9496, August 14, 1935. Article 11.—The Bank of the Republic of Uruguay shall always maintain a reserve of bank notes equal to 20 percent of the total of its deposits, no

matter of what type. [Library of Congress, Law Library, November 15, 1943.]

Treasury data used for computing gold reserve requirements. The percentage figure shown in column 2 must therefore be qualified accordingly.

Sixty million pesos, plus 12,000,000 pesos subtracted from 119,715,000 pesos. [Federal Reserve figure as of June 30, 1943, of outstanding peso notes] times 65.83 cents to peso [same source and data as above] equals \$31,410,000.

VENEZUELA

A 50-percent reserve is required against note and deposit liabilities. No more than 10 percent of the reserve may be in the form of foreign exchange, and at least 60 percent must be gold on hand. [Treasury data, as of June 30, 1943.]

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the international stabilization fund project which we have heard criticized so sharply is not by any stretch of the imagination far enough along to warrant such detailed discussion. Moreover, the criticism is based chiefly upon a preliminary draft, which, I understand, has been worked over and changed materially by the technical people of thirty-odd countries since its publication 4 months ago.

It seems to me, however, there is a far larger issue at stake than whether or not a stabilization plan which might conceivably be adopted by this or any other government looks good or bad at this highly premature point.

The issue is whether or not the Government of this country should attempt to be forehanded about problems which are certain to arise in the future; whether or not Government departments should make preliminary investigations and studies with the full knowledge and consent of Congress, leading to possible solutions for unavoidable difficulties which lie ahead. I think they should, and I believe that we in Congress should cooperate, not carp.

The alternative, of course, is to have the Government operate as it did in late Republican years, and spend its time running around locking barn doors after horses are stolen. My Republican colleague from Ohio may prefer this.

Now, before we go any farther, let us set the record straight on some of the more obvious accusations:

The gentleman from Ohio says that the monetary proposal, drafted by American technicians, is nothing but a rewording of the text of the British proposal. Nothing could be further from the truth. In the first place the proposal of the American technicians was drawn up in the winter of 1941 fully 15 months before the British plan, and was pre-

sented in principle to the Rio Conference of foreign ministers in January 1942. Anyone with the slightest understanding of international exchange and monetary questions would say that the plans have only one thing in common and that is they both attempt to deal with the international monetary problems. The two proposals are completely different in their approach and suggested solution.

The gentleman from Ohio says that the draft proposal seeks to replace gold with a fictitious standard. The fact is that the proposal of the American technicians provides for defining the currencies of all member countries in terms of gold and tying their currencies to gold. Instead of weakening the possibility of a return to the gold standard, it would do the very opposite. It attempts to strengthen the ties between all currencies and gold. To say that the plan aims to destroy the supremacy which the dollar holds in international trade and finance is an obvious falsehood.

The gentleman from Ohio says that the scheme would involve the assumption by the United States of \$5,000,000,000 or more of British debts. This is complete nonsense. An early draft of the fund proposal provided for the purchase by the fund of very limited amounts of blocked balances on those occasions on which the fund finds it desirable to do so, and only under terms and conditions which make it actually impossible for the fund to incur a loss. This provision, I believe, has already been dropped. Strangely enough, in view of my colleague's inferences, I understand it was dropped because of the opposition of the British experts.

The gentleman from Ohio says that the control of our money would be given over to an international money authority. Again I wonder whether he has read the proposal. There is nothing in it which reduces the authority of the United States over its monetary system or over the dollar. The fund can make no change in the value of the dollar and the proposal specifically reserves to each country the complete control of its money policies.

My esteemed colleague has placed before you a chart which purports to show you the figures on the gold holdings and gold contributions of some of the United Nations. The figures shown are completely erroneous. They are based largely upon data published years ago, some going back as far as 1935, and I am surprised that anyone should assume that data of this character can at all represent the actual situation. I am told, incidentally, that this table overlooks half the gold holdings of the other United Nations. The true information, I might point out, is secret and cannot be given out by any country. The publication of a completely unfounded table by the gentleman from Ohio serves no purpose other than to confuse and mislead the interested public.

I do not know what the gentleman from Ohio means when he says that the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme—and by the way, there is no such thing; the British,

French, Canadians, and Americans all had preliminary drafts, all published, all different—he says the scheme could involve the United States to the extent of upward of \$15,000,000,000. The tentative proposal by the American technicians specifically states that our participation shall be limited in the neighborhood of \$2,000,000,000. This is a small error of 700 percent on the part of the gentleman and involves some \$13,000,000,000.

Finally the gentleman from Ohio seems to be disturbed by the fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission was different in 1887 from what it is now. This perhaps is the key to the understanding of his entire speech. This Republican gentleman is complaining because we cannot meet the complex problems of the 1940's with the facilities of the years when as a free, sun-kissed barefoot boy he first graced Shanesville, Ohio, in the 1880's. He was born there, I understand in 1884, and like the Interstate Commerce Commission, has altered his earlier limits and become increasingly complex in the intervening years.

The preliminary work on stabilization—and all the work that has been done to date is preliminary—is an effort by an alert Government department to prepare a remedy beforehand for a difficulty that seems certain to strike when the war is over, or before.

When the economies of various countries began to shudder under the strain of approaching war, Secretary Morgenthau and his technical experts anticipated that world reconstruction would be very difficult indeed if all the moneys of the world had no common denominator and if there were no basis for international cooperation. If we were to come out of the war with a sound dollar and all other nations were bankrupt and their exchange were fluctuating in a disruptive manner, the Secretary recognized that the soundness of our dollar would be a virtue in a vacuum.

The war is likely to aggravate a situation which will make it extremely difficult to avoid a break-down of international economic relations.

In an effort to find a solution to this problem—and unless a solution is found, the reconstruction, restoration of a prosperous level of world trade and the establishment of sound monetary systems will be delayed indefinitely—in an effort to find a solution, Secretary Morgenthau's technicians began exploratory conversations with technical representatives of other nations.

Now, in spite of those who, through lack of understanding or for political purposes, choose to distort the facts in the case, these early conversations were not launched with the idea of letting the United States rescue or support the other nations of the world—any of them. Mr. Morgenthau is no economic Santa Claus. Anyone who has watched the handling of Treasury matters over the past 10 years knows that. The present Secretary of the Treasury has worked hard and long to make and keep Washington the financial center of the world. He has been diligent in keeping foreign debts in

hand, and he invented reverse lend-lease to help keep dollar balances down. So you may rest assured that our country's economic wherewithal will not be dissipated across the oceans by the watchdog of the Treasury Department.

But let me repeat, the point at issue is really whether or not, having seen the necessity for stabilizing foreign exchange, our Secretary of the Treasury would have served the public interest better by pretending no problem exists, and accordingly doing nothing about it. By inference, at least, the gentleman from Ohio and others who criticize a plan which still is in its formative stage are, apparently, suggesting that we go back to those good old do-nothing days—those days that reached their pinnacle in 1929—when the administration in power realized full well that calamity lay just over the horizon, but chose to make no effort whatever to stop it. They felt that it was none of the Government's business to keep people from starving, to keep businesses from closing their doors, to keep the wheels of commerce from slowly grinding to a stop.

I do not believe that we should return to those unrealistic days of "let us pretend it is not so." I believe that we should continue to anticipate problems and try to find solutions before they have an opportunity to send the international economy into a tailspin. And further I believe that this viewpoint is representative of a large majority of the American people. Most Americans would rather see us on the ball than behind it.

Some people have a tendency to view with alarm anything going on that they do not quite understand. Certainly there is no crime in being alert, but it seems to me aimless for anyone to take up time to discuss, as though it were a fait accompli, a plan which in the first place is in its preliminary stages and in the second place he has confused with at least one other plan. And especially since he has not revealed the pertinent fact that this thing which he views with such alarm is nothing more than a logical, conservative development which has evolved out of proved practices of this Government. It would appear that my colleague is so concerned about motives that he is losing sight completely of the facts in the case.

I should like to take a few minutes to tell you how this proposal for monetary cooperation, aimed at the protection of the American economy, came about. Its evolution is as important as the project itself, for it demonstrates its basic simplicity.

The story of this stabilization fund really began back in the twenties, when a surprisingly large and substantial group of people suddenly awakened to the fact that fortunes could be made by trading in foreign exchange; and nations believed that, by manipulating exchange rates, they could avoid payment of war debts to this country.

All this was going on during the Coolidge administration, and it continued through the Hoover administration. There was no mystery about it. The Republican administration which then

had the responsibility of safeguarding the welfare of the American people knew all about it.

In the record of the Hoover administration written by William Starr Myers and Walter H. Newton, much is said about—

The deliberate credit inflation policy undertaken by the Federal Reserve System and the important central banking systems of Europe in the year 1927.

Then the authors review the growth of that inflation policy. They say, and I quote:

In late 1925 the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, through its governor, Benjamin Strong, entered into the discussion of a program of joint action with Montagu Norman, governor of the Bank of England. This was joined in by the officials of various central banks of continental Europe. The objectives were the expansion of credit, "easy money policies" by "open market" operations, and the manipulation of discount rates. The purpose of the arrangements was to strengthen the situation in Europe.

The book then points out that Mr. Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, protested vigorously, and is reported to have said:

As to the effects of these Reserve policies upon the United States, it means inflation with inevitable collapse which will bring the greatest calamities upon our farmers, our workers, and legitimate business.

As Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hoover seems to have had some influence, for this inflationary program was apparently sidetracked for the time being.

But in July 1927, Mr. Norman, of the Bank of England, Dr. Schacht, president of the Reichsbank, and Prof. Charles Rist, deputy governor of the Bank of France, visited the United States, and in spite of Mr. Hoover, who was soon to become President and certainly in a position to protest if he wanted to, these redoubtable gentlemen apparently got the plot started all over again, and this time they went through with it. Now, mind you, Mr. Hoover made no move to stop it, though he was on record as knowing what the consequences would be. Perhaps he had been won over by those Republican leaders who seem so fond of inflationary policies that they have maintained a startling record of supporting inflation up to the present day.

In the final analysis, there could be only one cure for this disease which had been started so deliberately in the Coolidge administration. That cure was administered on March 6, 1933, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt closed the banks for 4 days "because of unwarranted withdrawals of gold and currency from banking institutions for the purpose of hoarding, and undue speculative activity abroad in foreign exchange."

That was a medicine swiftly and courageously administered. Less than a year later, concrete steps were planned to make it impossible for such calamity as we knew in 1929-30 and 31 to befall us again. These steps were planned under the same Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau, Jr., who has just been criticized for trying to get things done, and consisted of setting up a stabiliza-

tion fund in the United States to protect the value of the dollar abroad, and to make it difficult for foreign currencies to be manipulated to the great detriment of the American economy.

This stabilization fund, which has been functioning for 9 years with complete success, was the real foundation of the present International Stabilization Fund idea.

Through the use of this fund, the American Government, on many occasions, has invested temporarily in foreign currencies for stabilization purposes.

In all of the 9 years that this fund has been in operation, the United States Government has not lost a cent.

To those who say a stabilization fund will not work, here is pretty strong evidence that it will work. Ours has been working in this limited field for 9 years.

In 1936, Secretary Morgenthau took another step to reinforce international stabilization. He established the tripartite arrangement with the Governments of England and France. The Governments of Belgium, the Netherlands, and Switzerland also held to this agreement. This, too, was successful until the outbreak of war made it impossible to continue for obvious reasons.

The present international stabilization plan which we have heard so bitterly denounced as impractical, is a combination and extension of these two tried and proved methods of stabilization.

In January of 1942 the ministers of foreign affairs of the American republics, meeting in Rio de Janeiro, recognized the need for a greater degree of cooperation in the stabilization of currencies. Accordingly, they adopted a resolution recommending—

First, that the governments of the American republics participate in a special conference of ministers of finance or their representatives to be called for the purpose of considering the establishment of an international stabilization fund;

Second, that the conference in considering the establishment of such a fund shall formulate the plan of organization, powers, and resources necessary to the proper functioning of the fund, shall determine the conditions requisite to participation in the fund, and shall propose principles to guide the fund in its operation.

Following this conference, an American technical committee was set up to pursue the subject further. Represented on that committee were the Treasury Department, the State Department, the Department of Commerce, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Board of Economic Warfare. This group prepared a tentative proposal which, in March 1943, the Secretary of the Treasury sent to the ministers of finance of the United Nations for study by their technicians.

On April 5, Secretary Morgenthau reported to seven committees of the House and Senate on the progress of this study, even though it was then in its infancy, so to speak. I think it is important that the Secretary asked permission to keep

us advised, a program which he has maintained consistently on this and other projects falling within the scope of the Treasury Department. On April 5 he said, in part:

For some time we in the Treasury have been deeply concerned with the threat of international monetary chaos at the end of this war.

We feel that international currency stability is essential to reconstruction in the post-war period and to the resumption of private trade and finance. It is generally held that this formidable task can be successfully handled only through international cooperation.

I think further that most of us would agree that the establishment of a program adequate to deal with the inevitable post-war monetary problems should not be postponed until the end of hostilities. It would be ill-advised, if not dangerous, to be unprepared for the difficult task of international monetary cooperation when the war ends. No one knows how long or how short the war will be. We therefore believe it is desirable to begin now to devise an international monetary agency adequate to cope with the problems with which we shall be confronted when the war does end.

The completion of such a task is certain to take many months at the least. Specific and practical proposals must be formulated and must be carefully considered by the policy-shaping officials of the various countries.

And then the Secretary said very clearly, so that we could not fail to understand:

In each country acceptance of a definitive plan can follow only upon legislative or executive action.

After explaining the nature of the preliminary proposal which was sent to the other nations to start them thinking, the Secretary said, upon leaving:

I have been anxious to discuss this matter with you and to keep you informed of developments. Obviously, we are still in the early stages of our thinking and discussions. However, I did want you to know what we are doing and I do want to feel free to come back from time to time and discuss the subject with you and obtain your views and advice.

Here I should like to point out that the gentleman from Ohio has taken advantage of this offer on numerous occasions. He has written many letters to the Treasury and each has been answered, although the answers to many of them seem for the most part to have been misinterpreted.

One of these letters I must comment upon here. He wrote to the Secretary, asking the Secretary for a direct answer as to whether or not contributions to the fund will be physically delivered to one central point in one of the United Nations.

In answer, Mr. Morgenthau told him that it was generally assumed that at least the major contributions to the fund would simply be earmarked and kept in the contributors' central banks. In other words, our gold would be kept right here if that is what interests the gentleman from Ohio.

Whereupon the esteemed gentleman from Ohio, apparently misinterpreting what "earmarked" means, throws his hands in the air and says, "See what I told you. How could there be any ques-

tion about the manner in which the gold should be delivered? How could it be done except by shipping?"

But let me continue with the progress of the stabilization fund.

Following the April 5 report, there were many meetings of the technical experts of various countries. By fall the technicians had made enough progress so that a revised proposal could be prepared, and the Secretary again reported to the committees in the House and the Senate. He said at that time:

I want to emphasize that the International Stabilization Fund, tentatively proposed by the technical experts of this Government, is fundamentally an adaptation of the methods we have successfully used on a more limited scale with our own Exchange Stabilization Fund. We have tried to adapt that experience to the broader and more difficult currency problems confronting the world during the post-war years. The International Stabilization Fund is an extension of the principle of the tripartite agreement that the responsibility for maintaining stability of exchange rates is international and that countries must cooperate to maintain stability of exchange.

The obligations a country assumes under this proposal are no more than a country voluntarily imposes on itself when it pursues a policy of exchange stability and refrains from resorting to discriminatory exchange practices. Beyond that, there is only the duty of consulting and agreeing before altering exchange rates, an extension of the principle that we have embodied for years in our own stabilization agreements.

We have held technical conversations with the experts of more than 30 countries and we are continuing these discussions with the experts of some of the countries. These exploratory conversations have been unofficial and confined to the technical level. No government, including the United States, is committed to any of the tentative proposals for international monetary cooperation that have been presented by the experts.

The Secretary then explained some of the changes which had been made in the proposal previously described to the committees and presented a summary of a tentative proposal for a United Nations Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the principal function of which would be to "guarantee loans made by private capital for sound and constructive purposes, when such loans are also guaranteed by a member government."

Upon leaving the committees, the Secretary said:

I want to assure you again that I shall always be available for discussion of both the bank and fund proposals. I know that some members of your committees are desirous of cooperating with us in studying these problems. Speaking for the Treasury, we would be very happy if an informal committee were formed which would consult with our technical men as frequently as feasible.

That is the story of the international stabilization fund to date. It is the whole story.

On the basis of a rumor circulating in a foreign capital, some sections of the House of Representatives seem to have become excited about possible infractions of the rights of Congress by the Treasury Department. Statements have been made that the executive department of the Government is making

agreements with foreign nations, which is wholly and absolutely absurd. There have been inferences that the Treasury Department, behind the backs of Congress, has been making arrangements to give away our money and our credit. This, of course, is even more absurd than the first charge.

Secretary Morgenthau assured the gentleman from New York, Representative Bloom, only last week that sufficient progress had not yet been made to warrant taking the time of House and Senate committeemen to listen to a further report.

The entire project is still at the level of various Government technicians. A group of technical men from Russia is at present discussing the matter with the American technicians at the Treasury. When progress has been made, when a recommendation has been agreed upon by the technicians, a formal meeting will be held by accredited representatives of the various governments and following that, the various legislative bodies will decide upon what action to take.

I think Congress should commend Secretary Morgenthau for keeping us abreast of developments concerning the stabilization fund project, rather than criticize him for having made agreements which we all know very well he has not and could not make, and which he himself described on April 5 of last year as being out of his province.

All this is a tempest in the teapot.

It is an effort to create a political issue where no political issue could possibly exist. I suppose we can expect more and more of this as we come closer to election.

But I sincerely hope that the administration will not find it necessary to curtail its investigations and forehanded projects, because some groups want to make it politically inexpedient to do anything but sit.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CANFIELD, for Wednesday, March 22, on account of official business.

To Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio, for March 23 and 24, on account of official business.

To Mr. WARD, for March 23, 24, and 27, on account of official business.

To Mr. BULWINKLE, for 9 legislative days, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 324. An act to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual-salary basis, and fix their rate of pay; and provide allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof; and

H. R. 4410. An act to extend for an additional 90 days the period during which certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed may be imported from foreign countries free of duty.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1349. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York certain lands within the Brooklyn Navy Yard in the city of New York;

S. 1410. An act to amend section 4 of the act approved June 13, 1940;

S. 1428. An act to amend the provision of the act authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of officers, enlisted men or nurses of the Navy or Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

S. 1635. An act to eliminate a pay discrimination against the teacher of music at the United States Military Academy; and

S. 1653. An act to provide title for heads of staff departments of the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 23, 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., Thursday, March 23, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold an executive meeting on Thursday, March 23, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., to further consider H. R. 2994.

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 23, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., to consider H. R. 1565, relating to the appointment of postmasters; and H. R. 3688, to change the name of "watchman" in the Postal Service to that of "post-office guard." Hearings will be had.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1322. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, in the amount of \$80,000,000, for the Navy Department and naval service for the fiscal year 1945, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 508); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1323. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 14, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the navigation provisions of the project for the improvement of the Mississippi River adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended, with a view to determining the advisability in the interest of navigation and flood control of increasing the depth of the navigable channel from 9 to 12 feet between Cairo, Ill., and Baton Rouge, La. This report was requested by resolutions of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on March 8, 1943, and the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted on March 9, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 509), to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1324. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting a copy of estimate of personnel requirements, for the quarter ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1325. A letter from the Chairman, War Production Board, transmitting the tenth report on the operations of the Chairman of the War Production Board; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1326. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, to remove the limitation on the right to command of officers of the Dental Corps of the Army which limits such officers to command in that corps, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1327. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1328. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 31, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Detroit River, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 20, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1329. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 11, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Detroit River, Mich., with a view to improvement along the easterly shore of Grosse Ile, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on December 8, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

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. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 480. Resolution authorizing the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 166, Seventy-eighth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1274). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 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; with amendment (Rept. No. 1275). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2850. A bill to authorize the rezoning of certain property in the District of Columbia as a residential area; without amendment (Rept. No. 1276); to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4219. A bill to provide for the appointment of female pilots and aviation cadets in the Air Forces of the Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 1277). 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. CANNON of Florida:
H. R. 4455. A bill to provide duplicate posthumous awards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4456. A bill to amend that portion of the act approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 697, 750), authorizing the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 4457. A bill to provide that, in disposing of lands which have been acquired by the United States for national defense or war purposes, a preference shall be given to the former owners of such lands or their successors in interest; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 4458. A bill for the relief of J. G. Power and L. D. Power; to the Committee on Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania introduced bill (H. R. 4459) for the relief of Dominik Tyckowski, which was referred 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:

5315. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Christian and Missionary Alliance Church, of Beaver Falls, Pa., representing approximately 120 persons urging the passage of House bill 2082, making unlawful the manufacture, sale, or transportation within the United States of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5316. By Mr. HART: Petition of the New Jersey State Bar Association board of trustees, presenting a resolution which they adopted favoring passage of Senate bill 1559 for the appointment of an additional judge for the Third Circuit Court of Appeals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5317. By Mr. HORAN: Memorial of both houses of the Washington State Legislature, urging revision of foreign policies to permit return of Jews to Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5318. Also, memorial of the Washington State Legislature (lower house), urging post-war road construction; to the Committee on Roads.

5319. Also, memorial of the Washington State House of Representatives, urging constitutional amendment to permit voting at 18; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

5320. By Mr. KUNKEL: Petition of Arthur Brady and 63 others of Harrisburg, Pa., protesting against passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5321. Also, petition of Kenneth J. Condon and 298 others of Harrisburg, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5322. Also, petition of Carl Welsenford and 75 others of Steelton, Pa., sponsored by the Fifth Ward Republican Club, against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5323. Also, petition of Frank English and 54 others of Swatara Station, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5324. By Mr. MYERS: Petition of sundry citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, urging the enactment of omnibus bills H. R. 3917 and S. 1617; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5325. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the

passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5326. By Mr. TOWE: Petition of James N. Marshall and nine other residents of Ridgefield, N. J., supporting the American Legion's omnibus bill; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 23, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O patient Father, we pray Thee to ever hold us to the endless truth that he who is willing to lose his life for the sake of some good cause, some duty, some benevolence, shall find it in everlasting remembrance; the workman dies but the work goes on forever. We would register in our hearts the example of the poor widow with her mite and Mary at Bethany. Let us do cheerfully that for which we cannot be paid; Thy recompense transcends all gains of earthly rewards.

In this mistaken world, O God, men have fallen into wrong and wicked paths; teach us self-forgetfulness that we may turn aside from the outward things that perish and reach for that which is an eternal reality. Blessed Lord, let us not allow the millions of Thy children be caught by the undertow of the wild seas of hate and revenge, and those whose homes are devastated by the mad torrents of destruction. Oh, may America glorify our Saviour's name by her sacrificial toil and pity for the nations that are living in dismay and terror, in hunger and darkness, deep and thick. Bring all to that glorious day of prediction when peace shall reign and the earth shall see Thy salvation. In the name of Jesus Christ, St. Mary's Holy Child. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1029. An act to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 250. An act to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to assure a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in regulation of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife.

CHARLES P. KEYSER

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, today there is a vacant chair in the press gallery. Charles Phillip Keyser, who has been a familiar figure among Washington newspapermen since the turn of the century, died at his home in Washington Tuesday evening and is being buried this afternoon.

Charlie Keyser as we knew him entered the newspaper field at Mount Sterling, Ill., where he was born, became city editor of a Peoria, Ill., paper, and then joined the staff of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. He was political reporter and covered the Legislatures of Missouri and Illinois for this outstanding newspaper, and then was transferred to Washington. He started his career here during the term of President McKinley in charge of the Washington bureau of the Globe-Democrat. He was known throughout the Nation among the leaders of both parties and was always on duty at the press table at national conventions. Mr. Keyser was a very active member of the Gridiron Club, the White House Correspondents' Association, and was one of the organizers of the National Press Club. While he was rather inactive for the last 2 years, he remained a contributing editor to the newspaper that he had served so long. It was my privilege to be able to call him my close personal friend. He was devoted to his country and was a writer of the old school. An outstanding journalist has passed away. He was a credit to his profession. He was known for his fairness and possessed a personality that made him friends with all he came in contact with. I think some of the happiest days of his life were when he was preparing for the annual Gridiron dinners. He helped to write the skits as well as take an active part with other members of the club during those famous dinners. He leaves a devoted wife and two children. Mrs. Keyser, ever since she came to Washington, has been extremely active among civic organizations, especially those that assist unfortunate people. They have lost a devoted husband and father, and I a close personal friend, and I am sure all his friends join me in extending sympathy to his family in their hour of sorrow.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

[Mr. CANNON of Missouri addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LIGHTERAGE AT PORT OF NEWARK

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the day before yesterday I made complaint concerning conditions in New York Harbor with reference to the monopoly of the lighterage business out of the port of