tion of available personnel and facilities of other departments and agencies and coordination of activities abroad of the United States under a Foreign Service for the United States unified under the guidance of the Department of State; without amendment (Rept. No. 2028). 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. CASE:

H. R. 5588. A bill to extend the renegotiation Act to December 31, 1945, and to authorize the President to make an additional extension of not more than 6 months after such date; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 5589. A bill to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of the old lighthouse keeper's residence in Manitowoc, Wis., to the Otto Oas Post, No. 659, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Manitowoc, Wis.," approved June 16, 1938; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. R. 5590. A bill to increase clerk hire, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Miss SUMNER of Illinois:

H. R. 5591. A bill to prevent United States participation in violations of the Atlantic Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. Res. 670. Resolution requesting the Smaller War Plants Corporation to investigate the possibilities for establishing small, independent enterprises in Alaska by veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

6233. By Mrs. BOLTON (by request): Petition of 113 citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against enactment of such legislation as the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6234. By Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania: Resolution of the Pioneer Elders' Association of Chester and Delaware Counties, Pa., endorsing the action of Governor Martin ordering the closing of State liquor stores on Victory Day and recommending that all Presbyterian Churches be kept open to give public thanks therein for this partial victory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6235. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city clerk, Council of the City of Dearborn, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the proposed Federal housing project to be located in the city of Dearborn; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

SENATE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, November 21, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Bishop Edwin Holt Hughes, of the Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the work of Thine hands. They shall perish, but Thou remainest: and they all shall wax old as doth a garment: and as a vesture shalt Thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but Thou art the same, and Thy years shall not fail.

Once again we commit our dear country in the midst of a changing world to the changeless God, asking for Thy guidance for our President, and for all rulers everywhere, and for those associated with them in the governance of the peoples; giving over to Thy merciful protection our sons and daughters in all war places, whether on island, or continent, on sea or in air; and commending to Thy consoling grace all the anxious and sorrowing of our bewildered world.

Above all else, we ask for Thy help and strength that we may serve our generation by the will of God and may be admitted at last to that realm where the will of the Heavenly Father is the law of all his children; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, December 6, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, its assistant enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 156) to extend the statute of limitation in certain cases.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 837) to restore and add certain public lands to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Mr. WHITE, Mr. PETERSON of Georgia, Mr. MOTT, and Mr. LECOMPTE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4311) to authorize the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5219. A bill to provide for the granting of rights-of-way for pipe lines for petroleum and petroleum products and for telephone and/or telegraph lines through and across lands of the United States within the area of Indian Rock Dam and Reservoir, located in York County, Pa.;

H. R. 5543. A bill extending the time for the release of powers of appointment for the purpose of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5565. A bill to authorize collectors of internal revenue to receive certain checks and money orders in payment of taxes and for revenue stamps.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 218. An act to authorize relief of disbursing officers of the Army on account of loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, or papers in their charge;

S. 267. An act relating to marriage and divorce among members of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians;

S. 556. An act for the relief of Pedro Jose Arrecoechea;

S. 616. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Vullo;

S. 1002. An act to compensate Roy W. Olsen for the loss of an eye on account of negligence of Works Progress Administration employees September 25, 1938, at Cranston, R. I.;

S. 1274. An act for the relief of Vodie Jackson;

S. 1462. An act for the relief of Solomon and Marie Theriault;

S. 1557. An act for the relief of Joel A. Hart;

S. 1732. An act for the relief of Arthur M. Sellers;

S. 1740. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Marjorie E. Drake, Edith Mae Drake, Minnie L. Bickford, and Irene M. Paolini;

S. 1756. An act for the relief of William Luther Thaxton, Jr., and William Luther Thaxton, Sr.;

S. 1853. An act for the relief of Dr. Frank K. Boland, Sr.;

S. 1869. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mamie Dutch Vaughn;

S. 1897. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sophia Tannenbaum;

S. 1899. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Alfred Files;

S. 1900. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the estate of Bertha L. Tatrault;

S. 1942. An act for the relief of Dr. E. S. Axtell;

S. 1958. An act for the relief of Fire District No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt.;

S. 1960. An act for the relief of Clifford E. Long and Laura C. Long;

S. 1968. An act for the relief of Elizabeth A. Becker;

S. 1987. An act for the relief of Gordon Lewis Coppage;

S. 1993. An act for the relief of the estates of Joseph B. Gowen and Ruth V. Gowen;

S. 1997. An act for the relief of Jack Stowers, B & O Store, and Cotton County Poultry & Egg Co.;

S. 2006. An act for the relief of J. A. Davis;

S. 2008. An act for the relief of Herman Philyaw;

S. 2042. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Nancy Frassrand, a minor;

S. 2064. An act for the relief of Richard H. Beall;

S. 2168. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1744. An act to provide Government protection to widows and children of deceased World War No. 1 veterans, and for other purposes; and

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

H. R. 4311. An act to authorize the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Gerry	O'Daniel
Austin	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Green	Overton
Ball	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Gurney	Reed
Bilbo	Hall	Revercomb
Brewster	Hatch	Reynolds
Brooks	Hawkes	Robertson
Buck	Hayden	Russell
Burton	Hill	Shipstead
Bushfield	Holman	Stewart
Butler	Jenner	Taft
Byrd	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Caraway	Kilgore	Tydings
Chandler	La Follette	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Langer	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Lucas	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	McClellan	Weeks
Cordon	McFarland	Wheeler
Danaher	McKellar	Wherry
Davis	Maloney	White
Downey	Maybank	Wiley
Ellender	Millikin	Willis
Ferguson	Murray	Wilson
George	Nye	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on important public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

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

INVITATIONS TO THE INAUGURAL CEREMONIES—STATEMENT OF JOINT CONGRESSIONAL INAUGURAL COMMITTEE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I present a statement of the Joint Congressional Inaugural Committee, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF THE JOINT CONGRESSIONAL INAUGURAL COMMITTEE

Senator BYRD, chairman of the Joint Congressional Inaugural Committee, after a meeting of the committee today, announced that the White House would furnish the list of those to be invited to the inaugural ceremonies and that the Members of Congress would each be provided with two tickets for the ceremonies; that no extra tickets would be provided Members of Congress; that the Joint Congressional Inaugural Committee would issue the tickets only from the list of those names submitted to the Committee by the White House.

DECEMBER 5, 1944.

JOHN C. SHAW, ADMINISTRATOR, ETC., OF THE ESTATE OF SYDNEY C. MCLOUTH, DECEASED—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. No. 252)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the United States Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, a bill (S. 1101) to provide for the payment of the claim of John C. Shaw, administrator de bonis non of the estate of Sydney C. McLouth, deceased, arising out of a contract between said deceased and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, for the construction of seagoing tugs.

The bill directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the administrator of the estate of Sydney C. McLouth $27,467.97 in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation and its successors, including the United States of America, arising out of a contract dated May 24, 1920, between McLouth, the deceased, and the Shipping Board, including particularly the obligation of the Shipping Board to adjust the claim of Ingram-Day Lumber Co., a subcontractor of the deceased.

The history of these claims may be summarized as follows:

The Ingram-Day Lumber Co. recovered a judgment against the estate of McLouth for the sum of $42,789.96 with interest from May 1925, on its subcontract with the decedent.

The United States, as assignee of the Shipping Board, recovered a judgment against the same estate in April 1933, in the sum of $40,165.40, the value of shipbuilding materials purchased or converted by the decedent.

A bill (S. 854) was subsequently enacted in the Seventy-third Congress to pay the Ingram-Day Lumber Co. the sum of $42,789.96 in satisfaction of its claim. On June 18, 1934, I returned the bill without my approval on the ground that no provision was made for the Government's counterclaim.

The sum fixed in the present bill is apparently designed to meet my objection to the previous bill by deducting the amount of the judgment rendered in favor of the United States with interest.

The present bill is objectionable because the amount of interest included in the sum specified therein is out of all proportion to the principal sum involved and apparently is computed on an erroneous basis.

The two judgments which I have mentioned are founded on contracts made with the same principal contractor and on transactions which occurred about the same time. Deducting the judgment of the United States from the judgment of the Ingram-Day Co. leaves a balance in favor of the company of $2,624.56. It is on this sum that, in all fairness, any interest should be computed, and allowing the company 6 percent interest per annum from 1925 to date—a period of 19 years—the interest would approximate $2,992, which, added to the principal, would make the total sum of about $5,610.56.

In my opinion no valid reason exists under the circumstances for allowing the sum of $24,843.41 interest on a principal sum of $2,624.56.

I am constrained, therefore, to return the bill without my approval.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 6, 1944.*

CITY NATIONAL BANK BUILDING CO.—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 253)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 1453, entitled "An act for the relief of the City National Bank Building Co."

The bill, is enacted, would authorize and direct the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to consider and act upon a claim of the City National Bank Building Co., Omaha, Nebr., for a refund of income taxes and interest paid as deficiencies with respect to the fiscal years 1933, 1934, 1935, and 1936, and to make any refund found due the said company, in the same manner and to the same extent as if such claim had been filed within 2 years from the time such income taxes and interest were paid and had not heretofore been disallowed.

The deficiencies resulted from the disallowance by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of claims for depreciation on property which the taxpayer had refinanced by conveying the property to a trustee in fee and taking back a 99-year lease thereon, renewable forever and with an exclusive option to purchase.

The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia held in *City National Bank Building Company* v. *Helvering* ((1938) 98 F. (2d) 216), that under such financing the taxpayer was not entitled to claim a deduction for depreciation for the years 1929, 1930, and 1931. However, in *Helvering* v. *F. and R. Lazarus and Company* ((1939) 308 U. S. 252), the United States Supreme Court held, on comparable facts, that respondent was entitled to depreciation.

The deficiency assessments for the years 1933 through 1936 were paid on September 16, 1938. On September 27, 1940, the taxpayer filed claims for refund, which were rejected on October 29, 1940, by virtue of section 322 (b) (1) of the Revenue Act of 1932 and section 322 (b) (1) of the Revenue Act of 1934.

Congress has determined that it is sound policy to include in all the revenue acts, statutes of limitations, by the operation of which, after a certain period of time, it becomes impossible for the

Government to collect additional taxes or for the taxpayer to obtain a refund of an overpayment of taxes. This bill selects a single taxpayer for special treatment by excepting it from this policy. The whole body of Federal taxpayers is thus discriminated against, and a precedent is established, opening the door to relief in all cases in which the statute operates to the prejudice of a particular taxpayer, while leaving the door closed to the Government in those cases in which the statute operates to the disadvantage of the Government.

I know of no circumstances which would justify the exception made by S. 1453 to the long-continued policy of Congress, and do not believe that the field of special legislation should be opened to relieve special classes of taxpayers from the consequences of their failure to file claims within the period fixed by law.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 6, 1944.*

SECRETARY OF STATE STETTINIUS—STATEMENT BY R. C. LEFFINGWELL IN REPLY TO SPEECH BY SENATOR LANGER

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter written to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] by Mr. R. C. Leffingwell. This is in correction of certain statements made by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] in his speech opposing the nomination of Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., to be Secretary of State.

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

NEW YORK, *December 4, 1944.*

Senator CARTER GLASS,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In the course of his speech opposing the confirmation of Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., as Secretary of State, Senator LANGER, referring to the history of the First World War, said that J. P. Morgan placed Morgan representatives in the War Department and in the Treasury Department and that one of them, Edward R. Stettinius, Sr., was made an Assistant Secretary of War, and the other Russell Leffingwell, the second Morgan partner, was made an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, November 30, p. 8595).

It should not be necessary for me to say that neither Mr. Stettinius, the elder, nor I was placed in the Government service by J. P. Morgan & Co. Mr. Stettinius the elder was appointed by President Wilson at the desire of Secretary Newton D. Baker and confirmed by the Senate. His great service to his country in wartime needs no defense from me.

I was not a Morgan partner when I was appointed by President Wilson at the desire of Secretary McAdoo, nor was I associated with the Morgan firm in any way. I was a practicing lawyer before the war and I returned to my law practice after I retired from the Treasury in 1920. I did not become a Morgan partner until July 1, 1923, 5 or 6 years after the transactions criticized by Senator LANGER, which took place in 1917 and 1918, and 3 years after I retired from the Treasury.

Senator LANGER said (p. 8597) that "all of the loans advanced by J. P. Morgan to France and England were taken over by the Treasury." That is not so. The fact is that the demand loan, the only loan held by the Morgan bank and associates, was not taken over by the Treasury and the report of the Munitions Committee, presented by Senator CLARK June 1, 1936, so states (p. 70).

The two loans that were taken over by the United States Treasury were held by the public and not by J. P. Morgan & Co.

Senator LANGER states that he does not criticize taking over the loans but criticizes the fact that the "collateral was not transferred to the United States Treasury." The fact is that the United States Treasury was subrogated to the collateral security pledged for the loans that were taken over, and it was not released until June 1923, 3 years after I retired from the Treasury, when Secretary Mellon properly released it in connection with the funding arrangements which he consummated under congressional authority in 1923. The report of the Senate Munitions Committee submitted by Senator CLARK June 1, 1936, reports this without criticism (p. 74):

"After the war was over certain securities to which the United States had been subrogated in connection with the payment of the British maturities of February 1, 1918, and September 1, 1918 (a method followed in order to throw a special sanction about these advances and perhaps to allow of a later refunding of these by the British in the private money market), were returned to the British."

Finally the Senate Munitions Committee approved the action of the Treasury officials. The supplemental report submitted by Senator NYE, June 6, 1936, in conclusion states (p. 184):

"The committee finds that Treasury officials did all in their power to protect the fiscal interests of the United States but that the circumstances of war led to the use of money for ends not considered desirable when the United States entered the war."

As Senator LANGER reflected upon the integrity of the administration of the Treasury in the First World War under President Wilson and you and Mr. McAdoo and Mr. Houston, the three Secretaries of the Treasury under whom I served, I trust that you will think it suitable to have this letter of correction entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am, my dear Senator, with high regard,
Respectfully and faithfully yours,
R. C. LEFFINGWELL.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

A resolution adopted by the Rotary Club, of Mayaguez, P. R., protesting against alleged acts and discriminations in connection with the administration of treaties, conventions, etc., effected by the Department of State affecting Puerto Rico, and requesting a better treatment and a stricter defense of the economic interests of Puerto Rico, and also favoring revision of such treaties and agreements so far as they affect the industry and agriculture of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the National Council of Administration of the Regular Veterans Association, endorsing the reported selection of the senior Senator from Iowa, Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE, to be a member of the Surplus Property Board, established under the terms of the Surplus Property Disposal Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC DURING THE WAR—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present petitions for appropriate reference and also to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing 94 petitioners, praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Illinois	67
Pennsylvania	2
South Carolina	25
Total	94

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing 2,038 petitioners, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Alabama	153
California	32
Colorado	1
Delaware	174
District of Columbia	11
Illinois	346
Minnesota	606
New Jersey	303
New York	53
Pennsylvania	123
South Carolina	23
South Dakota	1
Texas	148
Virginia	10
Wisconsin	49
Total	2,038

TRANSPORTATION OF ADVERTISING MATTER TO PROMOTE LIQUOR SALES—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and also to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing 49 petitioners praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 569) to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

California	18
Minnesota	31
Total	49

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—STATEMENT BY S. R. STEBBINS, SUBLETTE, KANS.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a very interesting statement from S. R. Stebbins, a prominent farmer and businessman of Sublette, Kans., offering some sensible suggestions with respect to legislation now pending in the Congress. I think his statement will be helpful to many of my colleagues and I ask unanimous consent to have it

printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

SUBLETTE, KANS., *November 27, 1944.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are against the St. Lawrence seaway project, the United States of America would furnish the money and Canada own the canal.

Canada would get the large benefit in shipment of agricultural goods by her preferred treatment in buying and prices paid by Britain.

The United States of America will have less and less produce to ship that way.

Canada has no south outlet as do we, therefore has longer shipments by rail than the United States of America, which lessens her competition in produce.

Milled-in-transit grain at Buffalo and other points should be stopped as to foreign shipments.

* * * * *

Also we are opposed to the Tuttle Creek Reservoir on the Big Blue River, as it would destroy the largest part of good farm land in that community, and farm land there is scarce, as possibly 80 to 90 percent of the upland in that part is so badly eroded by water that paying crops cannot be raised.

We have lived in Kansas City and Manhattan, so are not strangers to the flood menace, but one large dam is not the answer.

A number of smaller dams can be built, that will not destroy by flooding the farm lands, yet hold much water to help control run-off.

But as we have written before, the real need of better farming as to plowing around the hills and terracing, also contouring land, then build the many farm ponds so that the water soaking into soil and held by ponds can with the number of smaller dams stop the floods there.

Also the smaller dams higher up can hold water where it may seep down into underground passages to help the diminishing supply for wells and springs, many of which have stopped altogether in the last half century.

As to T. V. A. we understand that the cost has been $765,000,000, over a 10-year period, and the cash returns over the 10-year period $100,000,000.

And that without paying any land tax or interest on the funds, or considering the cost of works in World War No. 1.

We favored selling Muscle Shoals to Henry Ford or other buyer.

Neither would Tuttle Creek pay taxes or interest, but rather call on Congress for more funds, so that much useless lands nearby would bear tax.

As to M. V. A., we have worked many years for improvements for the Missouri River watershed, but feel that the M. V. A. would simply strait-jacket the whole territory by Government control of all the irrigation waters, and every farmer would have to plant, cultivate, and sell as per orders, or water shut off, and loss of water would mean ruin.

Also the plans is for immense dams that could fill with silt and become a real menace in the future, as they do not mention anything about conserving water and soils on the uplands, so that dry farming could be continued and soil kept at home, so that the reservoirs could last indefinitely.

It seems best to us that the appropriation of bulk sum should be held up for a number of years, or until the agricultural population has been fully aroused to the situation as to wind and water erosion, and so get much done on the individual farms toward saving the water and soil right on the land where it belongs, if we are to have a prosperous agriculture, and Nation.

Then try to pick out some of the smaller projects that seem certain to be of real help to the whole people and appropriate sums for those particular projects and get work done as soon as may be.

Then when much water and soil has been stored on the farms, and much more in the smaller dams and reservoirs, it would be the time to make a new survey and find out just what reservoirs would be needed on the larger rivers, and the sizes, and build them.

The saving on the larger unneeded dams, or the cutting down in size would save enough money for all of the smaller projects, and leave some over.

Also it would allow for local and State control, and a general improvement and advancement in agriculture and business.

It is not our wish to put any stumbling block in the way of Missouri Valley improvements, but rather to see that the work done is really improvement.

* * * * *

We say stop the blanket appropriations for billions of dollars, then furnish money for individual projects that seem sure of real benefits, without depriving many other people of their rights.

Respectfully,

S. R. STEBBINS.

RESOLUTION BY PULASKI CLUB OF OMAHA—INTEGRITY OF POLAND

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on October 15 last, I attended and participated in the Pulaski Day program. I have just recently received a copy of the resolution adopted by this well-attended meeting of Nebraska citizens of Polish extraction. This splendid statement reciting Poland's contribution in this war was signed by Dr. Andrew Terry, president; Mr. A. Zaleski, chairman of the meeting; and by the distinguished Rev. John S. Palubicki, proponent of the resolution. I feel, Mr. President, that those who may have a part in establishing a just and permanent peace following this world war should have access to this splendid statement adopted by those in attendance at the Omaha meeting and therefore I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, and appropriately referred.

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

PULASKI DAY PROGRAM RESOLUTION

Whereas in response to the proclamation of the President of the United States, and the Governor of the State of Nebraska, calling for the fitting observance of Pulaski Day to pay tribute to that gallant Polish and American hero, citizens of Polish descent and their friends have assembled on this 15th day of October, 1944, at the Polish Home, in Omaha, Nebr., and to honor the memory of 31 men of Polish extraction from Omaha, who have died in the service of their country, and to commemorate the fifth anniversary of the invasion of Poland, and mourn the tragic fate of the capital city of Warsaw; and

Whereas Poland was the first to dare to resist by force of arms Nazi tyranny and world aggression, and Great Britain declared war to guarantee the integrity and sovereignty of Poland, and Poland has been assured by both Great Britain and the United States that her efforts and suffering shall not have been made in vain; and

Whereas the Atlantic Charter renounces territorial aggrandizement and provides that no territorial changes shall be made that do not accord with freely expressed wishes of the people concerned; and the signatory powers who signed that great document, including Russia, declared that they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them; and

Whereas it is the declared policy of this Government to oppose any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic affairs of any other sovereign state, however weak; and

Whereas Russia's attitude towards Poland has been grossly unfair, unjust, and constitutes a betrayal of all those principles, and her demands on Poland's territorial integrity and meddling into the internal affairs of Poland, is unwarranted, and a negation of sovereign rights of a faithful ally that has sacrificed relatively more than any other nation in this war, and despite suffering untold agonies, she is now asked to surrender far more to Russia than she refused to give to Hitler; and

Whereas today it is no longer a question of only half of Poland, but the whole is involved, and not only of Poland, but of the whole of Europe, and all Americans want this war to justify itself in the fruits of its ultimate and inevitable victory, and in the achievement of a durable peace that shall be permanent because it shall be just; and

Whereas Generals Pulaski and Kosciusko fought for American independence and the Poles have fought for centuries for their freedom and that of others against tyrants and over half a million of men of Polish ancestry are fighting for a just peace in the forces of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Poland's contribution in this war; her suffering; the cruel atrocities committed on her people be not forgotten; that the blood shed so freely by her heroic sons in the defense of her own country; in France; the Battle of Britain; at Narvik; Tobruk; in Italy; at Monte Cassino; and in the streets of Warsaw, in 1939, and again in 1944, when abandoned to her own fate; all over the world, under all banners against our enemy; be not shed in vain; that it be not spattered on the conscience of the world by any iniquitous and unjust peace that would violate her territorial integrity and her rights as a sovereign, independent nation; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States; the Governor or Nebraska; Secretary of State and to the Congressmen and Senators from the State of Nebraska.

DR. ANDREW TERRY,
President Pulaski Club,
A. ZALESKI,
Chairman.
REV. JOHN S. PALUBICKI,
Proponent of Resolution.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DANAHER, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 1033. A bill to suspend the effectiveness during the existing national emergency of the tariff duty on coconuts; without amendment (Rept. No. 1354).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1885. A bill for the relief of Oscar Griggs; with amendments (Rept. No. 1358);

S. 2002. A bill for the relief of John T. Cooper; without amendment (Rept. No. 1359);

S. 2123. A bill for the relief of Antonio Ruiz; without amendment (Rept. No. 1360);

H. R. 3250. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court of Maine; without amendment (Rept. No. 1361);

H. R. 3614. A bill for the relief of the Queen City Brewing Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1362);

H. R. 3639. A bill for the relief of Herman Weinert, Jr., M. D.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1363); and

H. R. 3709. A bill for the relief of Harley E. Carter; without amendment (Rept. No. 1364).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2005. A bill for the relief of Christine Mangrum, Luster Mangrum, and Nathan Mangrum; with amendments (Rept. No. 1365).

By Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 2189. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer for the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1366).

By Mr. BREWSTER, from the Committee on Finance:

S. Res. 341. Resolution calling on the United States Tariff Commission for information concerning certain products and the ratio of imports in relation thereto; with amendments (Rept. No. 1367).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 5551. A bill to transfer certain land in Nacogdoches County, Tex., to the United States Forest Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1368); and

H. R. 5563. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration to exchange certain land of the United States within the Angostura irrigation project, Hot Springs, S. Dak., for certain land owned by the city of Hot Springs, S. Dak.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1369).

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 5219. An act to provide for the granting of rights-of-way for pipe lines for petroleum and petroleum products and for telephone and/or telegraph lines through and across lands of the United States within the area of Indian Rock Dam and Reservoir, located in York County, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

H. R. 5543. An act extending the time for the release of powers of appointment for the purpose of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5565. An act to authorize collectors of internal revenue to receive certain checks and money orders in payment of taxes and for revenue stamps; to the Committee on Finance.

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES — CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD a report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of September 1944.

The total number of paid employees for September 1944 is 3,053,347, excluding 262,281 civilian employees of the War Department stationed outside of the continental United States as of June 30, 1944.

Forty-three departments and agencies have decreased 37,459 between August 31, 1944, and September 30, 1944, while only 20 departments and agencies have increased 2,798, making a net decrease of 34,661 for the month.

The greatest reductions were made by the following: War Department, 19,220; Navy Department, 8,637; Tennessee Valley Authority, 1,661; Interior Department, 1,345; and Agriculture Department, 1,341.

Substantial increases were made by the following: Post Office Department, 1,579; and Veterans' Administration, 322.

There has been a net decrease of 34,661 employees for the month of September. This amount is approximately 12,000 more than the reduction effected during the month of August. This reduction is largely due to the War and Navy Departments.

There being no objection, the statement first above referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Civilian employment of the executive branch of the Federal Government, by departments and agencies, for the months of August and September, showing the increases and decreases in number of paid employees

Department or agency	August	September	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
Bureau of the Budget	575	567	−8
DEPARTMENTS			
Department of Agriculture	82,689	81,348	−1,341
Department of Commerce	29,570	29,087	−483
Department of the Interior	46,677	45,332	−1,345
Justice Department	29,490	28,919	−571
Labor Department	6,540	6,324	−216
Navy Department	763,996	755,359	−8,637
Post Office Department	365,450	367,029	+1,579
State Department	8,877	8,962	+85
Treasury Department	93,622	92,759	−863
War Department [1]	1,240,253	1,221,033	−19,220
NATIONAL WAR AGENCIES			
Committee on Fair Employment Practice	116	126	+10
Division of Central Administrative Services	3,604	3,321	−283
Foreign Economic Administration	5,919	6,093	+174
National War Labor Board	3,596	3,679	+83
Office of Alien Property Custodian	855	842	−13
Office of Censorship	11,440	10,988	−452
Office of Civilian Defense	131	111	−20
Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	1,349	1,322	−27
Office of Defense Transportation	5,086	4,853	−233
Office of Economic Stabilization	11	12	+1
Office of Price Administration	61,432	61,638	+206
Office of Scientific Research and Development	1,362	1,354	−8
Office of Strategic Services	2,306	2,313	+7
Office of War Information	8,898	9,001	+103
Office of War Mobilization	67	67	--------
Petroleum Administration for War	1,230	1,197	−33
Selective Service	22,556	22,097	−459
Smaller War Plants Corporation	1,794	1,786	−8
War Manpower Commission	27,321	27,322	+1
War Production Board	15,880	15,388	−492
War Shipping Administration	4,950	4,876	−74
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	1	1	--------
Board of Investigation and Research—Transportation [2]	20	0	−20
Civil Aeronautics Board	346	348	+2
Civil Service Commission	7,101	7,077	−24
Employees' Compensation Commission	527	509	−18
Export-Import Bank of Washington	59	53	−6
Federal Communications Commission	1,593	1,583	−10
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	987	976	−11
Federal Power Commission	673	675	+2
Federal Security Agency	31,400	31,309	−91

Civilian employment of the executive branch of the Federal Government, by departments and agencies, for the months of August and September, showing the increases and decreases in number of paid employees—Continued

Department or agency	August	September	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—continued			
Federal Trade Commission	457	451	−6
Federal Works Agency	20,315	20,339	+24
General Accounting Office	12,564	12,499	−65
Government Printing Office	7,176	7,135	−41
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,122	2,074	−48
Maritime Commission	10,852	10,927	+75
National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics	6,365	6,217	−148
National Archives	365	359	−6
National Capital Housing Authority	244	242	−2
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	21	23	+2
National Gallery of Art	265	260	−5
National Housing Agency	17,778	17,463	−315
National Labor Relations Board	741	757	+16
National Mediation Board	84	93	+9
Panama Canal	30,489	30,326	−163
Railroad Retirement Board	1,807	1,787	−20
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	8,682	8,776	+94
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,146	1,140	−6
Smithsonian Institution	433	427	−6
Tariff Commission	295	298	+3
Tax Court of the United States	123	122	−1
Tennessee Valley Authority	20,932	19,271	−1,661
Veterans' Administration	54,403	54,725	+332
Total	[3] 3,088,008	3,053,347	−37,459 +2,798
Net decrease	--------	--------	−34,661
War Department civilian employees stationed outside of continental United States [4]	262,281	262,281	--------
Total	3,350,289	3,315,628	--------

[1] Does not include employees outside continental United States.

[2] Terminated on Sept. 18, 1944.

[3] Includes employees outside continental United States reported by the various departments and agencies; totals, August, 12,030 and September, 15,520. September total includes 3,764 employees for Interior previously reported but not designated as outside continental United States.

[4] Reported quarterly as of June 30, 1944.

NOTE.—Employment figures now reported to the committee include dollar per annum, terminal leave, and without-compensation employees of the consultant expert type who are authorized to receive per diem in lieu of subsistence.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE MADISON (WIS.) LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Madison League of Women Voters, at Madison, Wis., on October 16, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROBLEMS OF POST-WAR TRADE—ARTICLE BY SENATOR BREWSTER

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Let's Not Be Suckers Again," written by Senator BREWSTER, and published in the January 1944 issue of the American magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

NAZI MASS KILLINGS—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Genocide," commenting on the mass

killing of Jews and others in Europe, published in the Washington Post of December 3, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY AND POWER DEVELOPMENT—STATEMENT BY JOHN L. LEWIS

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject of the St. Lawrence waterway and power development, made by John L. Lewis, president, United Mine Workers of America, before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, July 28, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUPPLY OF AMMUNITION AND EQUIPMENT FOR FIGHTING FORCES—ARTICLE BY WESTBROOK PEGLER

[Mr. REED asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Westbrook Pegler concerning the amplitude of the ammunition and equipment being sent to American fighting men overseas, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD REACTIONARY REGIMES IN LIBERATED COUNTRIES

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Americans United for World Organization of its approval of the American policy toward reactionary regimes in liberated countries, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR RUBBER BATTLE IS WON—ARTICLE BY BRADLEY DEWEY

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Our Rubber Battle Is Won," by Bradley Dewey, published in the December 1944 issue of the American magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR FROM NEW JERSEY

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I present the credentials of my friend, Mr. H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey, who has been elected Senator from that State. Mr. SMITH is present and ready to take the oath of office. I have been informed by the Secretary of the Senate that the certificate of election has been examined, found to be in order, and has been properly attested by the secretary of state of New Jersey.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the credentials.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY—CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This certifies that at a general election held in the said State on the 7th day of November in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and forty-four H. ALEXANDER SMITH was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Jersey, to be a Senator from the said State, to represent the said State in the Senate of the United States to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable W. Warren Barbour.

In testimony whereof, are hereunto affixed my hand and the official seal at Trenton this 5th day of December A. D. 1944.

By the president of the senate, Acting Governor:

GEO. H. STANGER,
President of the Senate,
Acting Governor.

Attest:
[SEAL] J. A. BROPHY,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator-elect will present himself at the desk, the oath will be administered to him.

Mr. SMITH, escorted by Mr. HAWKES, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS

The Senate resumed the 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.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, before I resume my argument in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway from the point where I left off yesterday when I yielded so that other business might come before the Senate in executive session, I wish to discuss briefly a matter which was raised by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], and that is this. The Senator from Missouri brought up the fact that certain groups had in past years recommended an all-American waterway from the St. Lawrence to the Atlantic Ocean, that is, canal waterways which would lead from the Great Lakes across northern New York to the Atlantic Ocean, and he called attention to the fact that certain groups who advocated the all-American waterway were opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway, among these groups being certain persons connected with the port of Albany, N. Y.

I did not have opportunity to reach this matter last night because I yielded so the Senate might consider other matters. However, this question of an all-American waterway across northern New York to the Hudson River, and thence to the Atlantic Ocean, has been thoroughly investigated by the United States Army engineers, and they have advised against any such undertaking, and instead have recommended the route through the St. Lawrence River. The reasons for this are manifold, but principally because there is some question as to whether water would be available for an all-American route across northern New York without pumping it from some source at a lower level.

Then there is the matter of bridge clearances. The present Erie Canal, which has a depth of from 12 to 20 feet, has bridge clearance of 20 feet, whereas a canal for deep-draft vessels would require clearance of 120 feet, and that fact alone puts an all-American canal almost out of the question. So far as the St. Lawrence is concerned, the Thousand Islands Bridge, which was completed 5 or 6 years ago, does have a clearance, I think, of 120 or 150 feet, and was given that clearance in anticipation of the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and the use of it by the large vessels engaged in oceangoing commerce.

I think one reason for the opposition of certain persons living in Albany and connected with the port authority is that Albany is the eastern terminus of the Erie Canal, and they feel that if freight from the Lakes was enabled to go around through the St. Lawrence River and down the Atlantic coast to Portland, Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and other seaports, it might deprive the port of Albany of some business which it now gets from the Erie Canal. I think that fear is entirely groundless. That was pointed out in 1922, I believe, by the Frontier Corporation, a corporation comprised of the General Electric Co., the Aluminum Co. of America, and the du Pont Co., which sought to obtain a right to develop the St. Lawrence River. It was the claim of these corporations at that time that if the St. Lawrence could be developed and 1,100,000 horsepower of electricity made available to industry on the American side of the river, so much new traffic would be created that the Erie Canal would be taken out of its status as a losing proposition, and be made a paying proposition to the State of New York. It appears to me that the argument set forth by these giant corporations in that year are much more sound and plausible than are any reasons given by members of the port authority of Albany.

Furthermore, there would be bound to be more business for the Erie Canal if the St. Lawrence development goes through, because it would become a feeder line, taking freight from the interior of New York directly to the port of Oswego, and I think it is near Buffalo that the other branch of the Erie Canal comes out.

There is another reason why the port of Albany need have no fear whatsoever of the development of the St. Lawrence seaway, and that is because the development of this great seaway would inevitably be followed by the development of the so-called Champlain cut-off which leads from New York to Montreal by way of the Hudson River and Lake Champlain. There already is a 12-foot waterway from New York City clear to the Canadian border, and by deepening this and improving a few miles on the Canadian side of the river large ships would be able to carry cargo to and from New York and the different cities by way of this cut-off, and save a distance of 1,460 miles on the trip each way. When that comes to pass—and it cannot come to pass until the St. Lawrence seaway is completed—the port of Albany would undoubtedly realize more business than it has ever dreamed of until this time. I make this explanation because the question was raised by the Senator from Missouri yesterday.

Simply because members of the port authority of Albany are opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway does not mean that the people of Albany and Schenectady County and vicinity are opposed to it, because most of the labor unions of that vicinity are on record as favoring the St. Lawrence development, although at least one chamber of commerce is in opposition.

I now wish to proceed from where I left off yesterday. I call attention to the fact that previous to the war, back in 1940 and 1941, officials of our Government had pleaded unsuccessfully with the Congress to start construction of the St. Lawrence seaway because it was held to be absolutely necessary in order successfully to wage the war toward which everyone could see we were drifting. But they were unsuccessful in this; and, of course, after Pearl Harbor, construction of the seaway was given up for the

duration of the war. Now we are asking to have it approved as a post-war project. It appears that the same officials of our Government are equally desirous of having it completed as a post-war project, because they consider it essential to our post-war economy and national welfare.

I wish to present some of the statements from high Government officials who favor the St. Lawrence development as a post-war project; but first I wish to read a letter which was written to me under date of March 3, 1944, by the President of the United States. This letter came to me unsolicited. I had no idea that it was coming, and there certainly was no collusion between the White House and myself in connection with this letter. The letter reads as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 3, 1944.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: I am convinced that the time has come for a nonpartisan effort to secure congressional authorization for the St. Lawrence development in order that the project may be available for early post-war construction.

The undertaking will offer such important benefits to many States that I am sure it will provide a desirable stimulus to industrial and business activity which will assist the entire country in its reconversion to a stable peacetime economy on a continued high-production level. Many competent studies have shown that it will not hurt the railroads or ports through which foreign commerce now flows but will ultimately increase their business.

I am advising interested Federal agencies that your bill (S. 1385) modified to provide for construction as a post-war project, has my approval.

I have appreciated your consistent support of this great undertaking.

Very sincerely yours,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

As the chairman of the Committee on Commerce has said, from time to time he has requested reports from Government departments which might be interested in the development of the St. Lawrence seaway. I wish to submit those reports.

The first is from the Secretary of State. It will be noticed that four of the departments were asked for reports on October 8, 1943, and I wish to read those reports first. This is from the Department of State, dated April 10, 1944:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 10, 1944.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: I refer to your letter of October 8, 1943, transmitting a copy of S. 1385, a bill to provide for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes.

The bill would approve the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence agreement between the United States and Canada signed at Ottawa on March 19, 1941, providing for the construction of dams and powerhouses in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River and the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway. The bill would authorize the President to fulfill the undertakings made in that agreement on behalf of the United States. The construction would be undertaken under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers. The bill would provide for an agreement between the Federal Government and the Power Authority of the State of New York for the transfer to the State of the power facilities and the right to use the United States share of the waters at the project for hydroelectric purposes, such arrangement not to become effective until approved by the Congress.

I suggest that S. 1385 be amended to authorize construction as a post-war rather than as a wartime project. This could be done by deleting the word "immediately" in line 12, page 2, of the bill, as well as the phrase "and shall be diligently prosecuted with a view to making essential facilities of said project available for national defense uses at the earliest possible moment" in lines 16 to 19 on the same page. Consideration might well be given to the desirability of describing the terms of the arrangement with the Power Authority of New York by means of a formula rather than the statement of a particular amount.

I understand that since that time that matter has been satisfactorily settled between the State of New York and the Federal Government.

Subject to the foregoing suggestions, I recommend the enactment of S. 1385. I believe that it would be desirable to assure the availability of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project for early post-war construction. The enactment of this bill now would provide the authorization for undertakings which would make an important contribution to the post-war period in providing for the expansion of water-power development and for greater efficiency in transportation, as well as in providing employment on useful and essential public works during the period immediately following the war.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project has been supported by leaders in the United States for many years without regard to political affiliation. It is my earnest hope that Senator AIKEN's bill authorizing this great project will be enacted into law.

Sincerely yours,
CORDELL HULL.

Thus again the great Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, recorded himself as strongly favoring this project, to which he has given so much of his time and effort during the past 10 years.

The next report is from the War Department. It is similar in text, and I shall not read it. It was sent to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], chairman of the Committee on Commerce, in response to his request for a report on October 8, 1943. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter from the War Department, signed by Secretary Stimson, to the Senator from North Carolina printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 15, 1944.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: Reference is made to your letter of October 8, 1943, requesting a report on Senate bill No. 1385, "To provide for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes."

The bill would approve the agreement with Canada, published in House Document No. 153, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, providing for the construction of dams and power works in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, and the completion of the St. Lawrence deep waterway, and authorize the President to fulfill the undertakings made in said agreement on behalf of the United States. The construction would be undertaken under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers.

The bill would further authorize and direct the President to negotiate an arrangement with the power authority of the State of New York for the transfer to the State of the power facilities and the right to use the United States' share of the waters at the project for hydroelectric-power purposes upon terms and conditions to be agreed upon, including provision for payment of $83,375,000, with interest. This arrangement is not to become effective until ratified by Congress.

The Corps of Engineers, acting pursuant to Executive Order No. 8568, dated October 18, 1940, has made investigations of sites for the dams, powerhouse, and locks in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, and prepared plans and specifications for construction of some of these works, made surveys of the lands necessary for such development, and investigated the titles to said lands. Work can be started promptly after authorization and appropriation of funds.

Authorization of the St. Lawrence project at this time would pave the way for the incorporation of this important work in the post-war construction program. The bill S. 1385 provides a satisfactory and effective means of approving the agreement with Canada and authorizing the construction of the works allocated to the United States. It is suggested, however, that the language providing that the work be undertaken immediately and prosecuted diligently with a view to making the facilities available for national defense at the earliest possible moment should now be omitted. The language permitting the use of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts should also be omitted.

The copy of the bill herewith has been amended in accordance with the above suggestions. Some additional minor changes in wording which seem desirable in the interest of clarification have also been indicated. Enactment of the measure as thus amended is recommended.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,
HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. AIKEN. The next letter is from the Federal Power Commission. It is dated April 8, 1944, and reads as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
April 8, 1944.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BAILEY: In response to your communication of October 8, 1943, relative to S. 1385, a bill to provide for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes, we are enclosing herewith a report on the bill. This report has been submitted in accordance with Budget Bureau Circular No. 344, as amended, to the Bureau of the Budget, which advises that there would be no objection by that office to the presentation of the report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,
LELAND OLDS,
Chairman.

The report on the bill by the Federal Power Commission is not very long. I shall read it:

S. 1385 would approve the agreement between the Governments of the United States and Canada, published in House Document No. 153, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, which provides for the construction of dams and power works in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, for completion of the St. Lawrence deep waterway, and for development of plans for a better use of the resources of the Niagara River, including preservation of the scenic spectacle. The bill would authorize the President of the United States to fulfill the undertakings made in said agreement on behalf of the United States. The works allocated for construction by the United States under said agreement would be undertaken under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers.

The bill would further authorize and direct the President of the United States to negotiate an agreement with the power authority of the State of New York for the transfer to said authority of the power facilities, in connection with the St. Lawrence project, and the right to use the United States' share of the waters of that river for hydroelectric power purposes upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon, including provision for payment of $93,375,000 with interest, by the power authority of the State of New York. The agreement is to be reported to Congress and will become effective when ratified by Congress and the State of New York.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to point out that the bill I introduced, and which now is offered as an amendment to the pending rivers and harbors bill, does not make provision for the distribution of any of the electric energy from the International Rapids Dam. That would have to be considered later by the Congress, after the State of New York and the Federal Government had written a contract, and that contract will be subject to approval by the State of New York and the Congress of the United States. Therefore, the matter of the distribution of power does not enter into the amendment which I am offering at the present time.

I now continue to quote from the report of the Federal Power Commission:

The Federal Power Commission is familiar with the proposed power development in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River which S. 1385 would authorize. The Commission participated in the Inter-Departmental Board on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence project, which prepared an exhaustive economic survey of the entire undertaking, published as Senate Document No. 116, Seventy-third Congress, second session, in 1934. Furthermore, the Chairman of the Commission is serving as Chairman of the United States St. Lawrence Advisory Committee, established by Executive Order No. 8568, dated October 16, 1940, and participated in the negotiation of the agreement with Canada which would be approved by the proposed legislation. On the basis of its studies, the Commission is convinced that the St. Lawrence power project is of outstanding importance in connection with the region's post-war development.

The Commission, under the Federal Power Act, has also had direct responsibilities extending over a period of more than 20 years in connection with the utilization of the power resources of the Niagara River. On the basis of extensive investigations bearing on the comprehensive use of this great resource in terms of scenic beauty as well as power values, we are convinced that early reconsideration of the entire matter by the two Governments, as provided in article IX of the agreement with Canada, is essential to future development of the Niagara area, including the industrial centers of Buffalo, Niagara Falls, and adjacent communities. The great progress in the metallurgical and chemical industries during the war emphasizes the need for additional low-cost power for post-war expansion in the area.

For the above reasons the Commission is convinced that the enactment of S. 1385, at this time, would be in the public interest, providing the necessary authorization for undertakings which would make an important contribution to the country's post-war stability and strength.

The Commission believes that S. 1385 is satisfactory to accomplish this purpose, provided it is amended to authorize the undertaking as part of a program for meeting the country's post-war needs. We recommend deletion of the word "immediately," in line 12, page 2, and the phrase "and shall be diligently prosecuted with a view to making essential facilities of said project available for national defense uses at the earliest possible moment" in lines 16-19 on the same page. We would also direct attention to the provision in lines 18-22 on page 3 for reporting the arrangement with the Power Authority of the State of New York to Congress "upon the convening of its next session." This period may well prove too short and we suggest that this provision be changed so that the arrangement may be reported to Congress "during its next session."

With these changes, the Federal Power Commission recommends adoption of S. 1385.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
By LELAND OLDS, *Chairman.*

APRIL 4, 1944.

Mr. President, I will say that the amendment which is now offered has in it the suggested changes, and, of course, it authorizes the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project as a post-war project.

I hold in my hand a report from the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Paul H. Appleby, dated April 7, 1944, addressed to the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], chairman of the Committee on Commerce. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
April 7, 1944.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce.

MY DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: Under date of October 8, 1943, you referred to me for such suggestions as I deemed proper touching the merits of the bill, S. 1385, "To provide for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St Lawrence Basin in the interest of national defense and for other purposes."

This bill has been considered by the President, and he believes that the St. Lawrence project should be authorized at this time as a post-war project, through the enactment, modified to accomplish this purpose, of the bill, S. 1385.

I accordingly suggest the following amendments: Delete from the title the words "in the interest of national defense"; page 2, line 12, delete the word "immediately"; page 2, lines 17 to 19, delete the present words and substitute therefor "as expeditiously prosecuted as may be consistent with budgetary requirements."

The War Department recommends, and I would not object to, the following additional amendments: Page 3, line 3, delete the words "revised estimate of"; page 3, line 20, delete the words "upon the convening of" and substitute therefor the word "during"; page 4, lines 1 to 7, change the first sentence of the last proviso so that it reads "That the cost-plus system of contracting shall not be used. This authority to contract may be exercised through such officer or officers as the Secretary of War may designate."

Very truly yours,

PAUL H. APPLEBY,
Acting Director.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have two other reports. It will be observed that the four reports which I have already submitted are in response to a request of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce on October 8, 1943. After all those reports were in, the latest of them being under date of April 15, the chairman of the Committee on Commerce requested a report from the Department of Commerce. That request was made on June 26, 1944. That was long after we had expected hearings to be held on the bill by the Committee on Commerce.

I submit the letter from Jesse H. Jones to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], chairman of the Committee on Commerce, under date of July 13, 1944. It is apparent that Mr. Jones could not have reported earlier on the bill because he had not been requested to do so.

The letter reads as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, July 13, 1944.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR CHAIRMAN. Reference is made to your letter of June 26, 1944, in which you request my comments on S. 1385, a bill to provide for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes.

Based upon the extensive studies that the Department of Commerce has made, the Department has always supported this project, and I personally feel that this undertaking will strengthen our national economy.

Before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives in 1941 I gave my full support to the project as a national defense undertaking. I am equally convinced that it is an invaluable asset in any program of post-war production and commerce. The enactment of S. 1385 at this time is highly desirable so that we shall be ready to move ahead with construction as soon as conditions permit.

You will probably be interested in the attached copy of a letter that I wrote Judge MANSFIELD, chairman of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, on June 23, 1941, regarding H. R. 4297, a similar bill then pending before that committee.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this letter to the committee.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter from Jesse H. Jones to Judge MANSFIELD, chairman of

the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, dated June 23, 1941, printed in the RECORD at this point. In the letter to Judge MANSFIELD Mr. Jones set forth many good and sufficient reasons why the St. Lawrence development should be constructed.

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

JUNE 23, 1941.

Hon. J. J. MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE MANSFIELD: I have your letter of June 3, enclosing H. R. 4927, a bill to provide for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes, and stating that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors would like to have an expression of the views of the Department of Commerce relative to the advisability of enacting this measure into law.

At the request of the President, the Department of Commerce has been engaged for over a year in an extensive study of the St. Lawrence navigation and power project. The findings of this survey have been issued from time to time. In conducting this investigation the Department has had the cooperation of many agencies of the Government, among others, the United States Maritime Commission, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors of the War Department, the Bureau of Ships of the Navy Department, the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Labor. The survey has considered the navigational aspects, the economic and commercial phases, the shipbuilding facilities of the Great Lakes, and the relationship of industrial development to low-cost electric power.

As a result of these studies, the experts of the Department of Commerce have found that extensive commercial navigation through the proposed St. Lawrence route is wholly feasible. The only serious limitation upon free navigation over this channel is the closed season during the winter months, but this condition is no different from that existing in the Great Lakes and the port of Montreal. There is, of course, extensive utilization of the excellent port facilities in these areas.

Studies of the Department show that the canal would reduce transportation costs to the Atlantic Ocean of certain agricultural and other commodities for a substantial section of the country.

The Department's investigation of shipbuilding facilities in the Great Lakes area, which the canal would make accessible to the open seas, shows that there are extensive shipyards, some of which are equipped to construct oceangoing vessels, and some even naval vessels of the cruiser class. These facilities could, with the canal, be utilized in building oceangoing ships, and have the advantage of being far inland.

The survey of the power requirements in the New York State area indicates that the power is needed and would in any event soon be absorbed in the industrial progress of this region. Power to meet defense needs at this time and for any possible recurring emergency is vital.

As a means of commercial intercourse, just as the Panama Canal linked the east and west coasts, the St. Lawrence route would link the Middle West with the Atlantic, the Gulf, and the west coasts.

This enterprise should be considered in relation to its importance to the Nation as a whole, just as power dams and other waterways have been considered. We develop and maintain inland waterways and intercoastal canals. We provide navigation on the Hudson, Potomac, Delaware, James, Savannah, Warrior, Mississippi, Missouri, Illinois, Ohio, Monongahela, Kanawha, Cumberland, San Joaquin, Columbia, and Willamette Rivers, all for the benefit of agriculture and commerce. While each of these is of importance to its particular locality, they are also important to the Nation as a whole.

One development with which I am especially familiar is the Houston Ship Channel, which has been of inestimable benefit to agriculture and industry in the Middle West and Southwest, bringing the sea 50 miles inland, and providing another rail and water connection for intercoastal and foreign shipping.

We cannot have too many inland waterways, both in the interests of agriculture, trade, and industry, and for national defense. The value of the St. Lawrence project as a defense measure cannot be too strongly stressed, and I am not thinking just of the immediate emergency, although that is vital. Regrettable as the thought of war is, recent developments make it imperative that we be prepared to meet it on any basis at any time. And no time should be lost.

It is the Department's conclusion, therefore, that the project should be undertaken. If thought advisable, it could easily be financed through the issuance and sale of revenue bonds payable from toll charges and the sale of power, with no cost to the taxpayers.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. A representative of the United Mine Workers, a Mr. Howell, came to see me and called my attention to a statement which was made yesterday by the Senator in reference to coal. Mr. Howell stated to me that he thought the Senator from Vermont had made a statement which was not based upon fact with reference to Mr. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, and in quoting from his testimony in connection with the statement he gave before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors on July 28, 1941, about the competitive aspects of coal coming into the United States from other countries. He requested that it be called to the Senator's attention. I read from the statement of Mr. John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America, before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, July 28, 1941:

It is with the full realization of the poverty and misery that beset the coal miners of the Nation through the long depression period, and which extended in coal from 1925 until now, that we are prompted to be alert and opposed to any unnecessary displacement of coal for production of power and heat.

What good, what benefits can we hope for, if the Government joins with us on the one hand to stabilize the industry, and then immediately sets about to displace coal for the generation of electricity, and builds a waterway as an inducement to foreign coals? Foreign production enjoys subsidies from European governments, both as regards production and transportation. There can be no question but that the eventualities of this war, as regards international trade and finance, will be such, that bigger and better subventions will be the rule in many foreign coal-producing nations. The Canadian market is made to order for such an economic onslaught.

That is what Mr. Lewis calls attention to. He is not afraid of foreign competition with United States coal.

His statement continues as follows:

Canada is geographically linked to American coal. It is a natural American market. American coals used by Canada are for the most part transported in part, or full, by water transport.

A deepening of the St. Lawrence Channel cannot possibly help American coal in lowered transportation costs. It will help foreign coals deliver to additional Canadian ports and save connecting rail hauls.

Mr. Lewis' statement continues:

I want to point out to the committee that following the last war it was the great hope of the American coal industry that we would be able to develop markets in Central and South America to which we had shipped coal for the first time during the emergency.

What a lesson in coal marketing American coal operators learned?

The discovery was made that British and German diplomacy had in its grip all of the influential business leaders and socialites in these nations. They owned the docks and the lighters, and despite the fact that under normal freight charges American coal could be delivered cheaper, we could not meet the exorbitant docking and lighter charges, commissions of cliques and return loads, all of which spelled finis to American coal selling efforts. These conditions have not been removed, regardless of what our "Pollyanna" trade emissaries report.

I understand that the reason why Mr. Lewis asked that what I have read be shown in the RECORD is the Senator's misquotation of Mr. Lewis' statement with reference to the competitive side of the subject concerning coal coming into this country. Later I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the complete statement of Mr. Lewis from which I have read.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I shall be very glad, indeed, to have the Senator from Pennsylvania ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement of Mr. Lewis. If I inadvertently ascribed to Mr. Lewis any statements or arguments which were made by someone else, I shall be very glad to have the correction made in the RECORD.

I am interested in Mr. Lewis' statement that we had hoped to develop the coal industry, and develop business relations along that line with South America. If it can be done, it would seem to be a very logical thing to do. It is also logical that it can be accomplished more easily if we make direct shipments from the Great Lakes to South America instead of having to load the coal on cars, transmit it by rail to water, and then reload it into ships.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I received from Secretary of Commerce Jesse H. Jones under date of May 30, 1944, in which Mr. Jones reiterates his support of the St. Lawrence seaway. I shall not read the letter because it is similar to one which was sent to the chairman of the committee.

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

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, May 30, 1944.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of May 19, 1944, and a copy of S. 1385, which you introduced in the Senate, to provide for the approval of the agreement between Canada and the United States of March 18, 1941, and to authorize the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Based upon the extensive studies that the Department of Commerce has made, the Department has always supported this project and I personally feel, as you do, that this undertaking will greatly strengthen our national economy.

You will recall that I appeared before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee in 1941, giving my full support to the project as a national defense undertaking. I am equally convinced that it is an invaluable asset in any program of post-war production and commerce. I am sure that the approval of S. 1385 at this time is highly desirable so that we shall be ready to move ahead with construction as soon as conditions permit.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to read a letter which I received under date of November 25, 1944, from Mr. Grover B. Hill, Under Secretary of the Department of Agriculture and Deputy War Food Administrator. His letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., November 25, 1944.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: I am glad to comply with your letter of November 17 by stating my views on the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project. As you know this Department is already on record as favoring the project. Secretary Wickard, in a statement before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors 3 years ago, endorsed both the navigation and power phases of the proposal for developing the St. Lawrence waterway.

As Secretary Wickard pointed out in his statement, we believe that the development of the seaway would benefit American agriculture as a whole by lowering transportation charges on the things farmers sell and the things they buy. It will aid in the restoration of our foreign markets after the war. It will increase our national security in times of crisis.

In the post-war years ahead farmers will need every possible facility for promoting trade both in the markets here at home and in foreign markets. Transportation, always a vital factor in commerce, looms large in that trade. Seaways are of great importance to our agricultural Midwest. This is particularly true of the St. Lawrence project. In addition to providing the States of the Great Lakes Basin with cheaper transportation, the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway would link the people of this area to each other and to the outside world. Any reduction in transportation costs would be an important factor in strengthening the American farmer's competitive position in the world market.

The power possibilities of the St. Lawrence project hold great promise to agriculture in the States where the delivery of cheap hydro power generated on the St. Lawrence would be feasible. In the States of New York, Vermont, and New Hampshire alone, there are still almost 50,000 farms without central-station electric service. In addition, there are more than 85,000 unelectrified nonfarm homes and establishments in the rural areas of these States.

We hope you will call on us any time we can be of assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

GROVER B. HILL,
Under Secretary.

I consider this a most significant letter because up to date a great part of the demand for the St. Lawrence seaway has come from the American farmer, who realizes the tremendous benefits which would accrue to him when this project is completed and in operation.

It will be observed, Mr. President, that every agency of Government reporting on Senate bill 1385 has recommended the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power development as an essential post-war project. They recognize the fact that the years following the war may be no less critical than the years of the war itself.

I call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the fact that it was only after every interested agency of Government had reported favorably on the St. Lawrence seaway development as a post-war project that the committee chairman questioned the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee over the bill.

The post-war benefits to be derived from the development of the St. Lawrence seaway are threefold:

First, it will provide easy and direct access for the flow of goods to and from the Great Lakes Basin to the markets of the world. It will actually bring Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, and Buffalo as near, or nearer, to the ports of northern Europe as the ports of New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore are today.

In actual distance, Detroit is nearer to the markets of Russia and northern Europe than is the port of Baltimore, and yet Detroit, the most important exporting center in the United States in percentage of manufactured products, is cut off from the sea.

The St. Lawrence seaway will cut the cost of transportation from Great Lakes cities to the world markets as much as half on many items of goods and materials. It costs as much today to ship some kinds of freight from Detroit to the ports on the Atlantic seaboard as it does to ship those goods from Atlantic ports to Melbourne, Capetown, or Calcutta.

This is of particular importance to the city of Detroit where previous to the war exports amounted to 15 percent of the total industrial economy of that city. In the highly competitive world market, this saving in transportation costs alone may mean the difference between being able to sell in foreign markets and not being able to do so.

Here I should like to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that on the committee of about 50 who are working to bring about the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway, a national committee recently formed, are many of the industrial leaders of the city of Detroit, including representatives of the Borg-Warner Corporation, the Chrysler Corporation, and the Ford Motor Co., besides others.

To take the narrow provincial view that helping to maintain or improve the economic status of Great Lakes cities and the agriculture of the Plains States is detrimental to any other part of the United States is an absurdity.

The city of Detroit, for instance, buys goods from every State in the Union. The ability of Detroit, therefore, to place its goods upon world markets is of vital importance to every State. With the St. Lawrence seaway completed, lumber from the Pacific coast, sulfur from Texas and Louisiana, cotton from Mississippi and Alabama, resin from Georgia, pulp from South Carolina, manufactured goods and merchandise from the industrial East can be delivered in Detroit, Chicago, or Milwaukee by all-water transportation without unloading at any point and at a lower cost.

The business of the city of Detroit is almost of paramount importance to the machine-tool manufacturers of New England and the East, and yet only a couple of days ago one of the best-known machine-tool manufacturers of New England asked me, "How would it help us if Detroit had free access to the sea?" overlooking the fact that Detroit is the best customer they have.

The economic life of a nation depends upon the adequacy of its transportation. This will be truer than ever at the end of this war.

We have solved production problems, but we have not solved the problem of the distribution of goods and produce to the people who need them at a price which they can pay.

Fully half of the transportation costs of many foods are represented by transportation charges alone, thus contributing to a system of national scarcity and underconsumption. So long as this system of scarcity prevails in our country we will have unemployment and undernourished, underclothed, and underprivileged people. So long as it prevails throughout the world we will have wars.

The greatest step which can be taken toward making this land of ours a land of plenty is the expansion of a coordinated transportation system which will include airways, highways, railways, and waterways.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before the Senator leaves his discussion of the impact of this project upon Detroit I should like to tell him from my first-hand knowledge how totally the opinion of Detroit sustains his point of view. Many studies have been made which are very specific in their nature, and it is perfectly clear that great commercial benefits, industrial benefits, will accrue from tidewater transportation to and from this great automotive center of the earth. Tidewater connection with the ports of the world is inevitably found to produce an almost inestimable advantage for labor, capital, industry, and society generally in that area.

I wish to amplify that to this extent: We are constantly urged, as I suggested yesterday, that we must move into an era of freer international economy in the post-war period, and that it must be a time of lowering tariffs instead of increasing them.

While the automotive industry is not a tariff-protected industry the fact remains, it seems to me, that if there is any substantial hope of increasing the world's economy through lowered trade barriers between countries, and if under those circumstances we have any hope of maintaining our standard of living and wages, we must have offsetting advantages, and the greatest possible offsetting advantage we can obtain is the natural advantage of the cheapest possible traffic relationship with the other nations of the world. So that from the standpoint of intelligent selfishness, at the same time in connection with our purpose to contribute, so far as possible, to this wider post-war economy, it seems to me what the Senator from Vermont is saying regarding the St. Lawrence project is absolutely indisputable from any standpoint whatsoever.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Michigan for his observation, with which I entirely agree. I think anything that can be done to make the commerce of Detroit with the rest of the world greater is going to have an extremely beneficial effect, as I have said repeatedly, on every other State in the Union, because Detroit is the market for something that is either raised or manufactured in every State in the Union, and the more Detroit sells abroad—and Detroit is our greatest manufacturing export center—the more will every other State prosper.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me further, neither the Senator nor I would want to leave the implication that Detroit is to be the only beneficiary of this improvement.

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly not.

Mr. VANDENBERG. On the contrary, Detroit is merely the great assembly point for probably the greatest system of feeder industry in this country, and certainly throughout the remainder of the State of Michigan anything which contributes primarily to the industrial output and outlet of Detroit is a benediction to the entire State. But it goes infinitely beyond that, because, I repeat, the industry of Detroit, concerning which the able Senator from Vermont chiefly speaks, is an industry which ramifies throughout this country in probably the greatest system of interlocking industry in the world. So that the benefits which we have been discussing in relation to Detroit are in reality a benediction upon the entire Nation.

Mr. AIKEN. What the Senator says is entirely true. I was merely using Detroit as an example because it so happens that a larger percentage of Detroit manufactures are exported in normal times than are the manufactures of any other large city in the United States.

The greatest unfinished link in our system of transportation is the International Rapids of the St. Lawrence River, which landlocks the Great Lakes Basin with its population of 45,000,000 and its immense industries.

At this point I wish to read two excerpts from an interesting letter which I read a few days ago in the New York World-Telegram. It is a letter from Mr. Wendell Phelps Dodge, publisher of the Marine News. It is headed "Waterways development for national wealth," and I read from it the following:

> With the greatest American merchant marine in history looming, it would be inexcusable not to make ready the Nation's harbors, channels, and roadsteads, and connecting inland waterways. All important east coast ports will surely have their navigation facilities ready, we are sure.
>
> America will soon be on the march again in peacetime pursuits. Employment will be our most important problem. Further development of our unparalleled natural waterways will provide useful work for thousands, increase local and natural assets, add to our military might.
>
> Distribution, too, is a major problem. Low-cost water transportation is a large part of its solution. Owing to necessity for economy, European nations make every possible use of their waterways. Development is constantly under way.

I quote further from the letter of Mr. Dodge, editor of the Marine News:

> It is indisputable that ores, coal, oil, gasoline, steel, sulfur, grain, and other bulk commodities, heavy manufactured products, can be moved at rock-bottom costs over waterways. We shall be seeking rock-bottom transportation costs during the post-war period—for a long time afterward.
>
> From absurd, prejudiced claims, much of the public has been made to believe that all waterborne commerce is transported only from one waterway terminal to another. Almost all of it is either prehandled or rehandled by other transportation systems, principally railways. The statement that waterway competition is injurious to other transportation systems is false. The opposite is true.
>
> Everyone, with facts and an interest in the country as a whole, knows that the improvement of a natural waterway for the benefit or protection of the people increase the wealth of the Nation.

Mr. President, opponents of the St. Lawrence project try to scare shippers and boat operators on the Great Lakes by telling them that foreign boats will come in and take their commerce. This is nothing but a falsehood. Foreign shipping will not be permitted to engage in coastwise trade on the Great Lakes any more than it can take the business of the boats that ply between Norfolk and Baltimore and New York and Boston today.

Opponents of the seaway have gone so far as to say we should not develop it because it would benefit Canada. What a narrow, selfish view this is.

To be sure Canada would have half of the water power developed, but three-fourths of the shipping on the Lakes today is done by the United States. Why should we not want to help Canada, anyway? Is it not better for us to have a strong neighbor to the north than a weakling? If Canada is strong, she is a better customer for our goods. She is a better protection against foreign enemies.

The economic welfare of our two countries is so closely bound together that, in general, what helps Canada helps us and what helps us helps Canada.

As nations, we should grow stronger together for the day may come when we will need that strength and unity even more than we do in this hour.

The relationship between Canada and the United States has long been the finest example of international amity in the world. Three thousand miles of boundary lines stretch between the two countries without military protection. Anyone who raises his voice against Canada in the matter of the St. Lawrence or in any other matter is doing a disservice to the United States. The present effort by interests opposing the St. Lawrence to repudiate the plain purpose of the United States-Canadian Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 and the 1941 agreement is an attempt to get the Senate itself to administer a rebuff not only to our great Secretary of State Cordell Hull, but to the best friend we have among the nations of the world as well.

The second great benefit to be derived from the seaway and power project is the great amount of electric energy which will be produced.

Opponents of the St. Lawrence are again raising the time-worn and shabby cry that we will not need the power after this war. They said it a generation ago, they said it after the last war, they are saying it today, and they say it every time anyone mentions development of a great public source of electric energy. They think of nothing new except different ways of confusing with the same old baseless arguments the steps taken to complete this public improvement.

There is bound to be a shortage of power after this war. Of course, rates for electricity can be held so high that there will always be a surplus, or they can be put so low that there will always be a shortage. Do we want the rates held high? Will that make for greater production and greater employment in America? Decidedly not.

Let us now see what happened after the First World War. Even back in those days people were saying we would have a surplus of power when the war ended.

In 1915 the total production of electricity in America amounted to only 16,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

In 1918 this had increased to 33,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

Then the First World War ended. Let us see what happened to the prediction that we would then have a surplus of power.

In 1920 the consumption of power shot up to 44,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

In 1922 it had reached 47,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

In 1929 the consumption was 96,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. That was the year when the financial crash came and the depression started, and one might naturally have assumed that the use of electricity would fall off with the coming of the great depression.

But by 1940, after 10 years of depression, it had reached a total of 144,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours; and this year, 1944, we will consume 240,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, or nearly 10 times as much as we used during the First World War.

There can be no doubt that the 6,600,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity which will be generated in New York at the dam at Massena will be necessary to implement our present supply within the

next few years, provided it is made available to the American people at reasonable rates.

We are becoming more and more dependent on electricity with each passing year and there is no indication that the saturation point is yet in sight.

People today would be buying hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of new electrical equipment if they could get it. Over 4,000,000 farms still remain without central station service in our own land. The record of many countries, even those with which we are at war, is much better than our own in this respect.

In the States of New York, Vermont, and New Hampshire, as was pointed out by Mr. Grover B. Hill, Under Secretary of Agriculture, approximately 50,000 farms almost within a stone's throw of the site of the St. Lawrence development are without electricity, and approximately 85,000 other rural homes do not have the blessings of electric current.

As evidence of this I read a short news item which appeared on November 29 of this year in the St. Albans Messenger, St. Albans, Vt. This town is approximately 75 miles from the site of the Massena Dam. The article is headed "Critical need for electric power noted—County's utility prepares to fill post-war want":

Waiting backstage for the curtain to go up on the post-war stage is the electrical power industry—waiting to energize many helping arms such as home appliances and farm devices.

Possibilities for such expanded service in St. Albans and elsewhere throughout Franklin County have been surveyed carefully by the Public Electric Light Co., it was learned today from A. W. Peterson, vice president and general manager.

Mr. President, I wish to say in explanation that the Public Electric Light Co. is not publicly owned. That is the name of this small private utility which is very efficiently managed, and which I am sure is one of the distribution systems which would be prepared to distribute St. Lawrence power at as low a cost as any publicly owned system could properly do it. There are some privately owned systems which cannot properly distribute this power. They are not in condition to distribute it at a low cost because they have not as yet squeezed the water out of their capital structures. The opposition which comes from the electric power industry to the development of the St. Lawrence seaway I am sure comes largely from such companies, and not from companies which are prepared to distribute power at low cost.

I continue to read from the article:

In the countryside the farmer already has attached the power-giving wires to some of his barn equipment; after the war it is expected he will want to do more in this direction and will want to lift some of the burden of his wife's housekeeping routine. Consequently there is expected to be a demand for automatic washing machines, for electric ranges and water heaters. And for the whole family's sake there is expected to be many installations of frozen locker and storage units and much better lighting.

Mr. Peterson's findings, which, incidentally, coincide with those made by 80 other executives throughout the country, indicate city residents also are ready to use many more appliances. And they are going to ask for germicidal lamps for schoolrooms and bedrooms, as protection against colds and other infections, and they will want television sets and other equipment that will add comfort and minimize household drudgery.

Should the war in Europe end early next year, some of the most needed items may begin to appear late in the year, but Mr. Peterson counsels withholding hopes for a dependable flow of such equipment until guns everywhere have been silenced.

His own company has been gearing itself for this much wider range of activity. Pointing to the expansion that took place since 1920—an increase in power production from 2,500,000 kilowatts yearly to 44,000,000—he revealed a chart showing how this capacity is to be boosted 10 percent a year up to 1960.

Today all home and farm needs are being met and besides power is being sent on to industrial centers. After the war considerable of the latter portion probably will be made available to augment that going to home and farm.

"We feel that the power industry and the allied fields of appliances and mechanical equipment will have considerable social significance in making life much more enjoyable," declared Mr. Peterson.

This small company, which now produces 44,000,000 kilowatts of power annually, and which anticipates an increase of 10 percent in demand each year until 1960, is located, as I said about 75 miles from the site of the Massena Dam in the proposed St. Lawrence development.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that there are 4,000,000 unserved farms in this country, and an untold number of unelectrified rural homes, we ought to be ashamed that such a condition has been permitted to exist so long. Of those who already have electric service, every farm, every home, and every industry will use more and more as time goes on.

We have entered the age of nonferrous metal production and use. The production of aluminum is measured in billions of pounds and, as I stated yesterday, it takes 10 kilowatt-hours of electricity to make 1 pound of aluminum. Aluminum is principally electricity when it comes to cost.

Magnesium has entered permanently into the field of commercial-metal production and will be used more and more where the lightness of the metal used is important. Cheap electric power is essential in the manufacture of magnesium. There is plenty of ore in the vicinity of the St. Lawrence development but there is a shortage of power. Therefore magnesium is not manufactured there at the present time.

Our tremendous chemical industry, with gigantic advances necessitated by the war, will continue as a peacetime servant of the people.

Farmers today are using low-cost nitrate fertilizer as a result of new discoveries which can only be utilized if electric energy is plentiful and cheap. The farmers of America can never go back to the days of high-priced nitrogen if they are to produce food and fiber in competition with the rest of the world.

Since this war began, thousands upon thousands of farms in the north country have been equipped with electric milking machines and milk coolers. Only through this increased use of electricity has the American farmer been able to supply the enormous production which has been demanded of him.

During the past year, in spite of the scarcity of material, the emergency has been so great that the War Production Board has authorized the extension of electricity to 78,000 farms on the R. E. A. systems alone. The number of farms connected to private utility systems must also be very great, probably equally great.

There are still millions of rural homes that are not served with electric light and power. We must not be content until every farm home in America is equipped for electricity.

I have already said that the dam at Massena will have an annual output on both sides of the river of 13,200,000,000 kilowatt-hours. This is a greater amount than has been produced in all the Tennessee Valley Authority this year. It is three times as great as the output of the great Dnieper Dam in Russia.

At this point I want particularly to call attention to the fact that plans are already being made in American factories for the restoration at the earliest possible moment of the power plant at the great Dnieper Dam, which was destroyed when the great Russian retreat took place. I thought it was destroyed by the Russians, but I read in the newspapers a couple of days ago that it was probably destroyed by the Germans. It does not matter who destroyed it. It has been destroyed; and the fact remains that our own factories in America are now drawing plans for the restoration of that great dam in Russia. Our factories will obtain business, and will furnish equipment for this dam and others all over the world which have been destroyed during this war.

While Congress quibbles and permits selfish interests to block the construction of the St. Lawrence project right at our front door, American factories are designing and building tremendous turbines and other equipment for shipment abroad and planning the construction of gigantic power developments, not only for the Dnieper River, but for almost every other country on the face of the globe.

St. Lawrence power will be the cheapest power in North America. It will cost about one mill per kilowatt-hour at the dam. It can be delivered within a 200-mile radius for 2½ mills per kilowatt-hour. This 200-mile radius would take in most of New York, all of Vermont, all but a little of New Hampshire, a little of Maine, much of Massachusetts, and part of Connecticut. The 300-mile radius, which is considered an economical transmission distance, would include virtually all of New England except, I believe, a part of Cape Cod and some of Aroostook County, Maine, all of New York, and a large part of Pennsylvania and New Jersey. This power can be delivered anywhere in northern New York, Vermont or New Hampshire for 2½ mills per kilowatt-hour. Contrast this price with the cost of 1.39 cents which the New Hampshire Electric Cooperative now has to pay for power. The price of St. Lawrence power would be less than 20 percent of what the New Hampshire rural electric cooperative now has to pay.

This price of 2½ mills would mean that our farm people in New York and New England and our little industries could enjoy the benefits of cheap light and power which the people of the T. V. A. and Pacific Northwest now have, and which I hope every part of our country will have in the near future.

Mr. President, I hope that everyone will stop and consider the position of the northeastern section of our country at this time. We have been losing industry. We are bound to lose more industry after the war. It is not industry that is going anywhere. It is industry that is dying because it cannot continue with the handicaps under which it must suffer.

In Vermont there is a factory which is owned by a company in Buffalo, N. Y. The factory in Vermont sent me its bill for power for the month of April, as I recall. It appeared to be approximately twice what had to be paid for power at Niagara.

I do not know what good it would do the rest of the country to have the New England States and northern New York lose industry and population. I am told that New York State alone has lost 500,000 population within the past few years. When one section of the country loses its industry, its economy, and its income, there is an adverse effect upon every other section of the country.

Some years ago, I am told, it was planned here in the city of Washington that the great hydroelectric resources of three areas of our country were to be developed. First was the Tennessee Valley; secondly, the Grand Coulee and Bonneville projects of the Pacific Northwest; and third, the St. Lawrence development in the northeast.

The Tennessee Valley Authority was created in 1933. The power developments there are now nearing completion. Even now its erstwhile bitter enemies dare not speak out in public against it, because it has been so successful.

The power from the Grand Coulee and Bonneville developments has brought about a tremendous increase in the productivity of the North Pacific States. But the St. Lawrence still runs unharnessed to the sea.

Utility companies protest, usually privately, that St. Lawrence power would force them to reduce their rates, and that they cannot afford to do so. They are afraid to change their ways of doing business because they think that to do so would be disastrous to them, although the experience of almost every electric distribution system in the country has shown that when rates have been reduced net income has not been reduced, but because of the increased sale a better net income has been enjoyed. I agree that if the St. Lawrence power were developed, most of the private utilities would have to reduce their rates, but I cannot agree that they would lose money if they should do so.

Attempts have been made to spread fear among the stockholders of utility companies that development of St. Lawrence power would jeopardize their investment. The best answer to this is the statement of Hon. Leo T. Crowley, chairman of the board of directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, testifying before a House committee on July 3, 1941. At that time Mr. Crowley said:

It has been contended that the opening of this seaway would harm the railroads and public utilities of the northeast section of the country. If this were true in any appreciable degree, the security obligations of these businesses would suffer. Since the banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation hold about $850,000,000 of railroad security obligations and $625,000,000 of public utility security obligations, I could not support this legislation if I thought that the railroads and public utilities would, on the whole, be affected adversely. Fortunately, the evidence indicates that the great advantages of opening up the Great Lakes to ocean traffic will not bring corresponding harm to the railways, and that the energy developed in the St. Lawrence will not hurt the utilities, but will rather fit into the long-term growth of our need for power.

There is, therefore, little possibility that the investment character of railroad and public utility security obligations will be harmed by the legislation under consideration. Indeed, it may well be that their investment quality will be enhanced. * * *

It is entirely reasonable to conclude that the eastern roads will be gainers rather than losers on balance.

Then Mr. Crowley said:

What I have said relative to the effects of the St. Lawrence project on the railroads applies equally well to the public utilities. The power development will not hurt them and may indirectly benefit them. I have already pointed out that according to predefense estimates some $2,500,000 more horsepower of energy will have to be made available to the people of New York State in the next 10 years. Inasmuch as the American share of St. Lawrence power, about 1,100,000 horsepower, would provides less than half of this increase in anticipated demand, it is obvious that the hydroelectric development at the International Rapids constitutes no competitive threat whatever to existing public utilities.

Mr. President, that is the statement of Mr. Crowley, who is known as a hard-headed businessman, and who is responsible for the safety of millions of dollars of bank deposits in this country. Would Mr. Crowley be likely to advocate a development which would impair the value of those deposits?

Inasmuch as his testimony was given 3 years ago, I was interested to learn whether he had changed his position regarding this matter. I wrote to him and asked him whether he had, and what his present attitude is. On September 21, 1944, he wrote me as follows:

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., September 21, 1944.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: Thank you for your letter of August 31 and the enclosure. I want to take this opportunity to reaffirm my support of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Your bill (S. 1385) is identical in all respects to H. R. 4927 which I supported before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee in 1941. As Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, I stated then that there was no danger of any adverse effect from the construction of this project on the security obligations of railroads and public utilities. With regard to the transportation aspects, our analysis then showed that in the importation of raw materials and the export of agricultural and manufactured products the seaway would give substantial savings in transportation costs both to consumers and producers. The power supply provided by this project is needed in the northeastern section of the United States in an area that contains 20 percent of the population and nearly 25 percent of manufactures in the United States. This power is also among the cheapest new sources of power in continental United States and will, when developed, help bring great prosperity to New York and the New England States.

Coming as I do from Wisconsin, I understand and sympathize with the urge of the people of mid-continental United States to have direct access to the open seas by cheap water transportation. As we return to peacetime commerce we are going to need this facility more than ever before because greater international exchange of goods and services must be one of the foundations of peace. A basic factor in industrial progress and improvement in standards of living is reduced cost of production and transportation. The ability to provide goods at reasonable cost on a commercial basis in international trade is an important element in the maintenance of full employment in the United States and we must do everything within our power to promote such trade.

Let me say in conclusion that I know of no instance where lower power rates have hurt either those providing such services or those receiving them. It is a basic tenet of economics that lower costs stimulate consumption, trade, and employment.

* * * * *

I want you to know that I appreciate the bipartisan support this project is receiving, as it is truly a project for the national welfare.

I have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that this matter has been considered by the President, and he favors the authorization of the St. Lawrence project at this time as a post-war project.

Sincerely yours,

LEO T. CROWLEY,
Administrator.

This statement and this letter from the man who is responsible for the protection of billions of dollars' worth of bank deposits, a large percentage of which are invested in railroads and public-utility holdings, ought to satisfy even the most skeptical investor in utility stock that his investment would be absolutely safe if the St. Lawrence seaway is constructed.

Mr. President, we have heard a great deal about the opposition of railroads to the St. Lawrence seaway. It is a fact that the Association of American Railroads is formally on record as opposing the development not only of the St. Lawrence seaway but of other waterways as well. I think that is a short-sighted attitude to take. I hope the Association of American Railroads will reconsider and will correct its position at some time in the near future. I know for a fact that many persons engaged in railroading are not only not opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway but are actually in favor of it, and some of them are working for it.

As evidence of the fact that the seaway would not hurt railroads in the Northeast, but actually would benefit them, I read an excerpt from a dispatch which appeared in the Wall Street Journal for November 16, 1944. In the States of New York and Vermont there is a 400-mile railroad, the Rutland Railroad. It was formerly controlled by two larger railroads, and at one time had a nice reserve, which was used up in paying increased stock dividends when the depression struck. Thereafter it was forced

into receivership. Naturally, it has applied for permission to file a reorganization plan. The dispatch in the Wall Street Journal reads as follows:

Rutland Railroad soon will petition the Vermont district court for an extension of time in which to file a plan of reorganization, now due to be filed by December 6, it was reported from Washington.

Prospective developments affecting the road's traffic and earnings, including the possibility that Congress will approve the St. Lawrence seaway project which is paralleled by the Rutland's Ogdensburg branch, will be cited as reasons for the delay. The construction of the seaway project would have a highly beneficial effect on the road's traffic volume, it was said.

That statement appeared in the Wall Street Journal with regard to the Rutland Railroad, which we all know would be tremendously benefited by the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Along the same line of reasoning, I cannot see why the New York Central would not also be greatly benefited, insofar as its lines running through this area would be affected, because it certainly would have a vast increase in the amount of freight it would carry, particularly during the winter months when the seaway could not be used and the additional freight would have to be carried by some other means.

It is estimated that the International Rapids section development would require an average of 11,150 men at the site if built in 4 years and an average of 7,440 at-site employees if built in 6 years. At-site man-hours are estimated at 82,486,000 and off-site man-hours as 140,225,000, the total exceeding 220,000,000 man-hours.

A little figuring will show that the total number of men required for the International Rapids development would be approximately 25,000 at the site and off the site. I assume that the off-site employment would be utilized largely in the manufacture of materials and in transportation. The employment of that number of men over a 4-year period cannot be considered lightly.

During the course of the hearings held by the House committee in 1941, opponents of the seaway maintained that it would require the labor of 100,000 men, 80 percent of them skilled or semiskilled, over a 4-year period. They objected to the great development at that time because, as they said, we could not spare the manpower. It appeared that the estimate of 100,000 was arrived at by including the number of men who would be required for the expansion and development of other facilities in the Great Lakes area, which expansion and development, much of it private, would follow the completion of the seaway.

The very arguments which were used against the construction of the seaway at that time will bear heavily in favor of its construction at the end of this war. The giving of work to 100,000 men in public and private industry means direct support for half a million people. It means more than that. It means business for railroads, business for coal mines, and business for merchants and manufacturers. It means that more shoes, shirts, gloves, tools, and equipment manufactured all over the United States will be sold directly for use on the project itself and for use of the families of the men employed.

It means lightening the fear of returning soldiers that they may have to join the ranks of the unemployed. We do not want any more W. P. A. and relief rolls. We have had enough humiliating makework projects. There is sufficient work to be done to give every returning serviceman an honest job.

If the St. Lawrence seaway development will result in the employment of 100,000 skilled and semi-skilled workmen over a 4-year period, it will stand out as one of the most important public works ever undertaken.

It will be one of the most important for more than the reason that it will provide employment over those years for a hundred thousand men. It will be more important because when its navigation and power facilities are completed, it will contribute directly to the prosperity of the forty-five to fifty million people who live in the Great Lakes Basin, and indirectly to the 135,000,000 who live in the United States. It will create new wealth and its contribution to the battle against unemployment will thereby become permanent. Likewise, it will create permanent facilities of a lasting value to the defense and security of the United States, Canada, and the entire Western Hemisphere.

The opposition to the St. Lawrence development that distresses me most is the opposition which is concentrated in a few sections and localities of our country. It is true that there are few of them. There should be none. I have a strong suspicion that the opposition is fostered and inspired by certain well-organized interests rather than by the people themselves.

When we say that developing the resources and increasing the wealth of one part of our country will be detrimental to other parts of the Nation, we are admitting that we have reached the limit of our economic growth. I shall never concede that to be true. I maintain that we must develop our wealth in whatever part of this Nation we find it, and that in so doing we will benefit the entire Nation.

Ours is not a static economy. The very fact that the electrical output of the United States increased from 14,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1914 to 240,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1944 should convince anyone of the truth of that statement.

The Department of Commerce has made the following statement:

The average tons of freight originating in the decade of 1950 will probably be between 242,000,000 and 374,000,000 greater than the average of 1930–39. The 10,000,000 tons of additional American traffic which may use the St. Lawrence at maximum utilization would be but a fraction of the expected increase in railroad activity.

Assuming 300,000,000 tons to be the average increase for the decade of 1950, the St. Lawrence seaway would carry only 3 percent of it. Railways, highways, airways, and other waterways must be expanded to carry the remaining 97 percent.

We know that after this war we must substantially increase the amount of business done. We know that when we reconvert to peace it must not be to the 1939 or 1940 economy, but to not less than a 50 percent increase over the national economy of those years.

A tremendous increase in shipping and in air transportation will open a new era in world commerce. International commerce can be the world's greatest industry after this war.

The production of American farms and factories will find its way to every country on the globe, and raw materials and goods from those countries will be received by us in return.

The imagination cannot comprehend the extent of the potential increase in world commerce. We must be ready for it. We must work for it.

Much of the commerce of other countries will originate on inland waterways, or be loaded directly on ocean-going vessels. Five-sixths of the earth's area is covered by water. For the most part, the world's commerce will be water-borne.

We face a highly competitive world. If we are to maintain the standard of living which Americans now enjoy, we must meet that competition. We must meet it successfully, or lose business and see American wages and standards beaten down.

Mr. President, about a month ago I spoke to the Detroit Board of Commerce, and I should like to read for about 2 minutes from the address which I delivered at that time, as follows:

A second factor which we must consider in relation to foreign markets is the importance of low prices in international competition. The manufacturing centers of Europe will be under pressure to sell abroad at almost any price in order to secure foreign exchanges for the importation of their food requirements. We must remember that they are finally learning the art of mass production, particularly since the war which has given them knowledge of American methods and access to American equipment under lend-lease and other devices.

They will be able to produce under comparable technological conditions, with the difference of wages as the principal distinguishing factor in the cost of production. We will be unable to compete with these other countries in foreign markets except by lowering the delivered cost of the goods.

We should, therefore, do everything possible to lower the cost of transportation as this is a major cost where the products are manufactured in the midcontinent and have to be shipped several hundred miles by rail to shipside. In the case of many products, the St. Lawrence seaway will make a difference of almost 50 percent in the cost of transportation. European manufacturing centers are largely within easy access of deep sea water transportation.

Although in Russia many of the manufacturing centers are located in the interior of the country, the present Russian Government has foresightedly created a waterway system that connects the Arctic Ocean and the White Sea with the Baltic Sea, the Baltic Sea with the Caspian Sea, and the latter, through a connection between the Volga River and the Don River, with the Black Sea. Hence Russia is able to bring her produce into foreign markets by means of cheap water transportation.

Russia may not wish to export during the reconstruction period of 5 or even 10 years, except enough to import essential products. It is foreseeable, however, that sooner or later Russia will want to enter foreign markets and then we will be up against the most formidable competitor in the world.

What helps the country as a whole helps Detroit and I am sure that the rest of the country realizes that the reverse of this is equally true. Your ability to purchase raw materials and semifinished products from Massachusetts and Connecticut, from New Jersey, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Oregon, and from Illinois and Wisconsin, depends upon your ability to sell your products to the rest of the country and abroad.

Mr. President, I think that any high military officer will say that the reason Germany is still in the war is because of her magnificent system of inland waterways which permits her to continue fighting us even after we have blown up her railroads.

It is also true that had it not been for the great inland system of waterways in Russia, Russia would have been put out of the war at the time the Germans advanced into Russia until they were finally held at Stalingrad in 1942.

Low-cost transportation and power will be vital factors in meeting our postwar competitive problems. Transportation and power must be both cheap and adequate. Manpower must be complemented with lost-cost electric power if the high wage level of American industry is to continue. The St. Lawrence seaway will contribute materially to both these factors. It will be almost indispensable and the people of this country have every right to demand authorization for its construction by the Congress now.

Mr. President, before I conclude I ask to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a copy of the boundary waters treaty between the United States and Great Britain signed at Washington January 11, 1909, and also a copy of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence agreement between the United States and Canada, signed March 19, 1941.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHERRY in the chair). Without objection, the request of the Senator from Vermont is granted.

The treaty and agreement are as follows:

BOUNDARY WATERS AND QUESTIONS ARISING ALONG THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND CANADA—TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND GREAT BRITAIN

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION

Whereas a Treaty between the United States of America and His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, to prevent disputes regarding the use of boundary waters and to settle all questions which are now pending between the United States and the Dominion of Canada involving the rights, obligation, or interests of either in relation to the other or to the inhabitants of the other, along their common frontier, and to make provision for the adjustment and settlement of all such questions as may hereafter arise, was concluded and signed by their respective Plenipotentiaries at Washington on the eleventh day of January, one thousand nine hundred and nine, the original of which Treaty is word for word as follows:

The United States of America and His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, being equally desirous to prevent disputes regarding the use of boundary waters and to settle all questions which are now pending between the United States and the Dominion of Canada involving the rights, obligations, or interests of either in relation to the other or to the inhabitants of the other, along their common frontier, and to make provision for the adjustment and settlement of all such question as may hereafter arise, have resolved to conclude a treaty in furtherance of these ends, and for that purpose have appointed as their respective plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America, Elihu Root, Secretary of State of the United States; and

His Britannic Majesty, the Right Honorable James Bryce, O. M., his Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at Washington;

Who, after having communicated to one another their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following articles:

Preliminary article

For the purposes of this treaty boundary waters are defined as the waters from main shore to main shore of the lakes and rivers and connecting waterways, or the portions thereof, along which the international boundary between the United States and the Dominion of Canada passes, including all bays, arms, and inlets thereof, but not including tributary waters which in their natural channels would flow into such lakes, rivers, and waterways, or waters flowing from such lakes, rivers, and waterways, or the waters of rivers flowing across the boundary.

Article I

The High Contracting Parties agree that the navigation of all navigable boundary waters shall forever continue free and open for the purposes of commerce to the inhabitants and to the ships, vessels, and boats of both countries equally, subject, however, to any laws and regulations of either country, within its own territory, not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation and applying equally and without discrimination to the inhabitants, ships, vessels, and boats of both countries.

It is further agreed that so long as this treaty shall remain in force, this same right of navigation shall extend to the waters of Lake Michigan and to all canals connecting boundary waters, and now existing or which may hereafter be constructed on either side of the line. Either of the High Contracting Parties may adopt rules and regulations governing the use of such canals within its own territory and may charge tolls for the use thereof, but all such rules and regulations and all tolls charged shall apply alike to the subjects or citizens of the High Contracting Parties and the ships, vessels, and boats of both of the High Contracting Parties, and they shall be placed on terms of equality in the use thereof.

Article II

Each of the High Contracting Parties reserves to itself or to the several State Governments on the one side and the Dominion or Provincial Governments on the other as the case may be, subject to any treaty provisions now existing with respect thereto, the exclusive jurisdiction and control over the use and diversion, whether temporary or permanent, of all waters on its own side of the line which in their natural channels would flow across the boundary or into boundary waters; but it is agreed that any interference with or diversion from their natural channel of such waters on either side of the boundary, resulting in any injury on the other side of the boundary, shall give rise to the same rights and entitle the injured parties to the same legal remedies as if such injury took place in the country where such diversion or interference occurs; but this provision shall not apply to cases already existing or to cases expressly covered by special agreement between the parties hereto.

It is understood, however, that neither of the High Contracting Parties intends by the foregoing provision to surrender any right, which it may have, to object to any interference with or diversions of waters on the other side of the boundary the effect of which would be productive of material injury to the navigation interests on its own side of the boundary.

Article III

It is agreed that, in addition to the uses, obstructions, and diversions heretofore permitted or hereafter provided for by special agreement between the Parties hereto, no further or other uses or obstructions or diversions, whether temporary or permanent, of boundary waters on either side of the line, affecting the natural level or flow of boundary waters on the other side of the line, shall be made except by authority of the United States or the Dominion of Canada within their respective jurisdictions and with the approval, as hereinafter provided, of a joint commission, to be known as the International Joint Commission.

The foregoing provisions are not intended to limit or interfere with the existing rights of the Government of the United States on the one side and the Government of the Dominion of Canada on the other, to undertake and carry on governmental works in boundary waters for the deepening of channels, the construction of breakwaters, the improvement of harbors, and other governmental works for the benefit of commerce and navigation, provided that such works are wholly on its own side of the line and do not materially affect the level or flow of the boundary waters on the other, nor are such provisions intended to interfere with the ordinary use of such waters for domestic and sanitary purposes.

Article IV

The High Contracting Parties agree that, except in cases provided for by special agreement between them, they will not permit the construction or maintenance on their respective sides of the boundary of any remedial or protective works or any dams or other obstructions in waters flowing from boundary waters or in waters at a lower level than the boundary in rivers flowing across the boundary, the effect of which is to raise the natural level of waters on the other side of the boundary unless the construction or maintenance thereof is approved by the aforesaid International Joint Commission.

It is further agreed that the waters herein defined as boundary waters and waters flowing across the boundary shall not be polluted on either side to the injury of health or property on the other.

Article V

The High Contracting Parties agree that it is expedient to limit the diversion of waters from the Niagara River so that the level of Lake Erie and the flow of the stream shall not be appreciably affected. It is the desire of both Parties to accomplish this object with the least possible injury to investments which have already been made in the construction of power plants on the United States side of the river under grants of authority from the State of New York, and on the Canadian side of the river under licenses authorized by the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Ontario.

So long as this treaty shall remain in force, no diversion of the waters of the Niagara River above the Falls from the natural course and stream thereof shall be permitted except

for the purposes and to the extent hereinafter provided.

The United States may authorize and permit the diversion within the State of New York of the waters of said river above the Falls of Niagara, for power purposes, not exceeding in the aggregate a daily diversion at the rate of twenty thousand cubic feet of water per second.

The United Kingdom, by the Dominion of Canada, or the Province of Ontario, may authorize and permit the diversion within the Province of Ontario of the waters of said river above the Falls of Niagara, for power purposes, not exceeding in the aggregate a daily diversion at the rate of thirty-six thousand cubic feet of water per second.

The prohibitions of this article shall not apply to the diversion of water for sanitary or domestic purposes, or for the service of canals for the purposes of navigation.

Article VI

The High Contracting Parties agree that the St. Mary and Milk Rivers and their tributaries (in the State of Montana and the Provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan) are to be treated as one stream for the purposes of irrigation and power, and the waters thereof shall be apportioned equally between the two countries, but in making such equal apportionment more than half may be taken from one river and less than half from the other by either country so as to afford a more beneficial use to each. It is further agreed that in the division of such waters during the irrigation season, between the 1st of April and 31st of October, inclusive, annually, the United States is entitled to a prior appropriation of 500 cubic feet per second of the waters of the Milk River, or so much of such amount as constitutes three-fourths of its natural flow, and that Canada is entitled to a prior appropriation of 500 cubic feet per second of the flow of St. Mary River, or so much of such amount as constitutes three-fourths of its natural flow.

The channel of the Milk River in Canada may be used at the convenience of the United States for the conveyance, while passing through Canadian territory, of waters diverted from the St. Mary River. The provisions of Article II of this treaty shall apply to any injury resulting to property in Canada from the conveyance of such waters through the Milk River.

The measurement and apportionment of the water to be used by each country shall from time to time be made jointly by the properly constituted reclamation officers of the United States and the properly constituted irrigation officers of His Majesty under the direction of the International Joint Commission.

Article VII

The High Contracting Parties agree to establish and maintain an International Joint Commission of the United States and Canada composed of six commissioners, three on the part of the United States appointed by the President thereof, and three on the part of the United Kingdom appointed by His Majesty on the recommendation of the Governor in Council of the Dominion of Canada.

Article VIII

This International Joint Commission shall have jurisdiction over and shall pass upon all cases involving the use or obstruction or diversion of the waters with respect to which under Articles III and IV of this treaty the approval of this Commission is required, and in passing upon such cases the Commission shall be governed by the following rules or principles which are adopted by the High Contracting Parties for this purpose:

The High Contracting Parties shall have, each on its own side of the boundary, equal and similar rights in the use of the waters hereinbefore defined as boundary waters.

The following order of precedence shall be observed among the various uses enumerated hereinafter for these waters, and no use shall be permitted which tends materially to conflict with or restrain any other use which is given preference over it in this order of precedence:

(1) Uses for domestic and sanitary purposes;

(2) Uses for navigation, including the service of canals for the purposes of navigation;

(3) Uses for power and for irrigation purposes.

The foregoing provisions shall not apply to or disturb any existing uses of boundary waters on either side of the boundary.

The requirement for an equal division may in the discretion of the Commission be suspended in cases of temporary diversions along boundary waters at points where such equal division can not be made advantageously on account of local conditions, and where such diversion does not diminish elsewhere the amount available for use on the other side.

The Commission in its discretion may make its approval in any case conditional upon the construction of remedial or protective works to compensate so far as possible for the particular use or diversion proposed, and in such cases may require that suitable and adequate provision, approved by the Commission, be made for the protection and indemnity against injury of any interests on either side of the boundary.

In cases involving the elevation of the natural level of waters on either side of the line as a result of the construction or maintenance on the other side of remedial or protective works or dams or other obstructions in boundary waters or in waters flowing therefrom or in waters below the boundary in rivers flowing across the boundary, the Commission shall require, as a condition of its approval thereof, that suitable and adequate provision, approved by it, be made for the protection and indemnity of all interests on the other side of the line which may be injured thereby.

The majority of the Commissioners shall have power to render a decision. In case the Commission is evenly divided upon any question or matter presented to it for decision, separate reports shall be made by the Commissioners on each side to their own Government. The High Contracting Parties shall thereupon endeavor to agree upon an adjustment of the question or matter of difference, and if an agreement is reached between them, it shall be reduced to writing in the form of a protocol, and shall be communicated to the Commissioners, who shall take such further proceedings as may be necessary to carry out such agreement.

Article IX

The High Contracting Parties further agree that any other questions or matters of difference arising between them involving the rights, obligations, or interests of either in relation to the other or to the inhabitants of the other, along the common frontier between the United States and the Dominion of Canada, shall be referred from time to time to the International Joint Commission for examination and report, whenever either the Government of the United States or the Government of the Dominion of Canada shall request that such questions or matters of difference be so referred.

The International Joint Commission is authorized in each case so referred to examine into and report upon the facts and circumstances of the particular questions and matters referred, together with such conclusions and recommendations as may be appropriate, subject, however, to any restrictions or exceptions which may be imposed with respect thereto by the terms of the reference.

Such reports of the Commission shall not be regarded as decisions of the questions or matters so submitted either on the facts or the law, and shall in no way have the character of an arbitral award.

The Commission shall make a joint report to both Governments in all cases in which all or a majority of the Commissioners agree, and in case of disagreement the minority may make a joint report to both Governments, or separate reports to their respective Governments.

In case the Commission is evenly divided upon any question or matter referred to it for report, separate reports shall be made by the Commissioners on each side to their own Government.

Article X

Any questions or matters of difference arising between the High Contracting Parties involving the rights, obligations, or interests of the United States or of the Dominion of Canada either in relation to each other or to their respective inhabitants, may be referred for decision to the International Joint Commission by the consent of the two Parties, it being understood that on the part of the United States any such action will be by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and on the part of His Majesty's Government with the consent of the Governor General in Council. In each case so referred, the said Commission is authorized to examine into and report upon the facts and circumstances of the particular questions and matters referred, together with such conclusions and recommendations as may be appropriate, subject, however, to any restrictions or exceptions which may be imposed with respect thereto by the terms of the reference.

A majority of the said Commission shall have power to render a decision or finding upon any of the questions or matters so referred.

If the said Commission is equally divided or otherwise unable to render a decision or finding as to any questions or matters so referred, it shall be the duty of the Commissioners to make a joint report to both Governments, or separate reports to their respective Governments, showing the different conclusions arrived at with regard to the matters or questions so referred, which questions or matters shall thereupon be referred for decision by the High Contracting Parties to an umpire chosen in accordance with the procedure prescribed in the fourth, fifth, and sixth paragraphs of Article XLV of The Hague Convention for the pacific settlement of international disputes, dated October 18, 1907. Such umpire shall have power to render a final decision with respect to those matters and questions so referred on which the Commission failed to agree.

Article XI

A duplicate original of all decisions rendered and joint reports made by the Commission shall be transmitted to and filed with the Secretary of State of the United States and the Governor General of the Dominion of Canada, and to them shall be addressed all communications of the Commission.

Article XII

The International Joint Commission shall meet and organize at Washington promptly after the members thereof are appointed, and when organized the Commission may fix such times and places for its meetings as may be necessary, subject at all times to special call or direction by the two Governments. Each Commissioner, upon the first joint meeting of the Commission after his appointment, shall, before proceeding with the work of the Commission, make and subscribe a solemn declaration in writing that he will faithfully and impartially perform the duties imposed upon him under this treaty, and such declaration shall be entered on the records of the proceedings of the Commission.

The United States and Canadian sections of the Commission may each appoint a secretary, and these shall act as joint secre-

taries of the Commission at its joint sessions, and the Commission may employ engineers and clerical assistants from time to time as it may deem advisable. The salaries and personal expenses of the Commission and of the secretaries shall be paid by their respective Governments, and all reasonable and necessary joint expenses of the Commission, incurred by it, shall be paid in equal moieties by the High Contracting Parties.

The Commission shall have power to administer oaths to witnesses, and to take evidence on oath whenever deemed necessary in any proceeding, or inquiry, or matter within its jurisdiction under the treaty, and all parties interested therein shall be given convenient opportunity to be heard, and the High Contracting Parties agree to adopt such legislation as may be appropriate and necessary to give the Commission the powers above mentioned on each side of the boundary, and to provide for the issue of subpoenas and for compelling the attendance of witnesses in proceedings before the Commission. The Commission may adopt such rules of procedure as shall be in accordance with justice and equity, and may make such examination in person and through agents or employees as may be deemed advisable.

Article XIII

In all cases where special agreements between the High Contracting Parties hereto are referred to in the foregoing articles, such agreements are understood and intended to include not only direct agreements between the High Contracting Parties, but also any mutual arrangement between the United States and the Dominion of Canada expressed by concurrent or reciprocal legislation on the part of Congress and the Parliament of the Dominion.

Article XIV

The present treaty shall be ratified by the President of the United States of America, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by His Britannic Majesty. The ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible and the treaty shall take effect on the date of the exchange of its ratifications. It shall remain in force for five years, dating from the day of exchange of ratifications, and thereafter until terminated by twelve months' written notice given by either High Contracting Party to the other.

In faith whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed this treaty in duplicate and have hereunto affixed their seals.

Done at Washington the 11th day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and nine.

ELIHU ROOT [SEAL]
JAMES BRYCE [SEAL]

And whereas the Senate of the United States by their resolution of March 3, 1909, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein) did advise and consent to the ratification of the said Treaty with the following understanding, to wit:

"Resolved further, as a part of this ratification, That the United States approves this treaty with the understanding that nothing in this treaty shall be construed as affecting, or changing, any existing territorial or riparian rights in the water, or rights of the owners of lands under water, on either side of the international boundary at the rapids of the St. Mary's river at Sault Ste. Marie, in the use of the waters flowing over such lands, subject to the requirements of navigation in boundary waters and of navigation canals, and without prejudice to the existing right of the United States and Canada, each to use the waters of the St. Mary's river, within its own territory, and further, that nothing in this treaty shall be construed to interfere with the drainage of wet swamp and overflowed lands into streams flowing into boundary waters, and that this interpretation will be mentioned in the ratification of this treaty as conveying the true meaning of the treaty, and will, in effect, form part of the treaty;"

And whereas the said understanding has been accepted by the Government of Great Britain, and the ratifications of the two Governments of the said treaty were exchanged in the City of Washington, on the 5th day of May, one thousand nine hundred and ten;

Now, therefore, be it known that I, William Howard Taft, President of the United States of America, have caused the said treaty and the said understanding, as forming a part thereof, to be made public, to the end that the same and every article and clause thereof may be observed and fulfilled with good faith by the United States and the citizens thereof.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this thirteenth day of May in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and ten, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and thirty-fourth.

[SEAL] WM H TAFT

By the President:

P C KNOX
Secretary of State.

PROTOCOL OF EXCHANGE[1]

On proceeding to the exchange of the ratifications of the treaty signed at Washington on January 11, 1909, between the United States and Great Britain, relating to boundary waters and questions arising along the boundary between the United States and the Dominion of Canada, the undersigned plenipotentiaries, duly authorized thereto by their respective Governments, hereby declare that nothing in this treaty shall be construed as affecting, or changing, any existing territorial, or riparian rights in the water, or rights of the owners of lands under water, on either side of the international boundary at the rapids of the St. Mary's River at Sault Ste. Marie, in the use of the waters flowing over such lands, subject to the requirements of navigation in boundary waters and of navigation canals, and without prejudice to the existing right of the United States and Canada, each to use the waters of the St. Mary's River, within its own territory; and further, that nothing in this treaty shall be construed to interfere with the drainage of wet, swamp, and overflowed lands into streams flowing into boundary waters, and also that this declaration shall be deemed to have equal force and effect as the treaty itself and to form an integral part thereto.

The exchange of ratifications then took place in the usual form.

In witness whereof, they have signed the present Protocol of Exchange and have affixed their seals thereto.

Done at Washington this 5th day of May, one thousand nine hundred and ten.

PHILANDER C KNOX [SEAL]
JAMES BRYCE [SEAL]

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE AGREEMENT, MARCH 19, 1941

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
March 19, 1941.

The President of the United States of America and His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, in respect of Canada, have decided to conclude an Agreement in relation to the utilization of the water in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin and to that end have named as their respective plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British dominions beyonds the Seas, Emperor of India, for Canada:

Who, after having communicated to each other their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles:

PRELIMINARY ARTICLE

For the purposes of the present Agreement, unless otherwise expressly provided, the expression—

(a) "Joint Board of Engineers" means the board appointed pursuant to an agreement between the Governments following the recommendation of the International Joint Commission, dated December 19, 1921;

(b) "Great Lakes System" means Lakes Superior, Michigan, Huron (including Georgian Bay), Erie, and Ontario, and the connecting waters, including Lake St. Clair;

(c) "St. Lawrence River" includes the river channels and the lakes forming parts of the river channels from the outlet of Lake Ontario to the sea;

(d) "International Section" means that part of the St. Lawrence River through which the international boundary line runs;

(e) "Canadian Section" means that part of the St. Lawrence River which lies wholly within Canada and which extends from the easterly limit of the International Section of Montreal Harbor;

(f) "International Rapids Section" means that part of the International Section which extends from Chimney Point to the village of St. Regis;

(g) "Governments" means the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada;

(h) "countries" mean the United States of America and Canada;

(i) "Special International Niagara Board" means the board appointed by the Governments in 1926 to ascertain and recommend ways and means to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls;

(j) "deep waterway" means adequate provision for navigation requiring a controlling channel depth of 27 feet with a depth of 30 feet over lock sills, from the head of the Great Lakes to Montreal Harbor via the Great Lakes System and St. Lawrence River, in general accordance with the specifications set forth in the Report of the Joint Board of Engineers, dated November 16, 1926.

ARTICLE I

1. The Governments agree to establish and maintain a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin Commission, hereinafter referred to as the Commission, consisting of not more than ten members of whom an equal number shall be appointed by each Government. The duties of the Commission shall be—

(a) to prepare and to recommend plans and specifications for the construction of works in the International Rapids Section in accordance with and containing the features described in the Annex attached to and made part of this Agreement, with such modifications as may be agreed upon by the Governments;

(b) upon approval of the plans and specifications by the Governments, to prepare a schedule allocating the construction of the works in the International Rapids Section on such a basis that each Government shall construct the works within its own territory or an equivalent proportion of the works so approved;

(c) to approve all contracts entered into on behalf of either Government for the works in the International Rapids Section;

(d) to supervise the construction of the works and to submit reports to the Governments from time to time, and at least once each calendar year, on the progress of the works;

(e) upon satisfactory completion of the works, to certify to the Governments that they meet the plans and specifications drawn by the Commission and approved by the Governments;

[1] This protocol of exchange was ratified by Great Britain June 4, 1910.

(f) to perform the other duties assigned to it in this Agreement.

2. The Commission shall have the authority to employ such persons and to make such expenditures as may be necessary to carry out the duties set forth in this Agreement. It shall have the authority to avail itself of the services of such governmental agencies, officers and employees of either country as may be made available. The remuneration, general expenses, and all other expenses of its members shall be regulated and paid by their respective Governments; and the other expenses of the Commission, except as provided for under Article III, paragraph (b) of this Agreement, shall be borne by the Governments in equal moieties.

3. The Governments agree to permit the entry into their respective countries, within areas immediately adjacent to the Niagara River and the International Section to be delimited by exchange of notes, of personnel employed by the Commission or employed in the construction of the works, and to exempt such personnel from the operation of their immigration laws and regulations within the areas so delimited. In the event that the Commission, pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 1 (b) of this Article, allocates to either of the Governments the construction of works, any part of which is within the territory of the other Government, the latter Government shall make provision for the according, within the area in which such a part is situated, of such exemption from customs, excises, and other imposts, federal, state, and provincial, as may be reasonably practicable for the effective and economical prosecution of the work. Regulations providing for such exemptions may be settled by the Governments by exchange of notes.

4. The Governments shall, by exchange of notes, prescribe rules and regulations for the conduct of the Commission. They may by the same means extend or abridge its powers and duties; and reduce or after reduction increase the number of members (provided that there must always be an equal number appointed by each Government and that the total number of members shall at no time exceed 10); and upon completion of its duties, the Governments may terminate its existence.

ARTICLE II

The Government of Canada agrees:

(a) in accordance with the plans and specifications prepared by the Commission and approved by the Governments, to construct the works in the International Rapids section allocated to Canada by the Commission; and to operate and maintain or arrange for the operation and maintenance of the works situated in the territory of Canada;

(b) to complete, not later than December 31, 1948, the essential Canadian links in the deep waterway, including the necessary deepening of the new Welland Ship Canal and the construction of canals and other works to provide the necessary depth in the Canadian section of the St. Lawrence River: provided that, if the continuance of war conditions or the requirements of defense justify a modification of the period within which such works shall be completed, the Governments may, by exchange of notes, arrange to defer or expedite their completion as circumstances may require.

ARTICLE III

The Government of the United States of America agrees:

(a) in accordance with the plans and specifications prepared by the Commission and approved by the Governments, to construct the works in the International Rapids section allocated to the United States of America by the Commission; and to operate and maintain or arrange for the operation and maintenance of the works situated in the territory of the United States of America;

(b) to provide, as required by the progress of the works, funds for the construction, including design and supervision, of all works in the International Rapids section except (1) machinery and equipment for the development of power, and (2) works required for rehabilitation on the Canadian side of the international boundary;

(c) not later than the date of completion of the essential Canadian links in the deep waterway, to complete the works allocated to it in the International Rapids section and the works in the Great Lakes System above Lake Erie required to create essential links in the deep waterway.

ARTICLE IV

The Governments agree that:

(a) they may, in their respective territories, in conformity with the general plans for the project in the International Rapids Section, install or arrange for the installation of such machinery and equipment as may be desired for the development of power and at such time or times as may be most suitable in terms of their respective power requirements;

(b) in view of the need for coordination of the plans and specifications prepared by the Commission for general works in the International Rapids Section with plans for the development of power in the respective countries, the Commission may arrange for engineering services with any agency in either country, which may be authorized to develop power in the International Rapids Section;

(c) except as modified by the provisions of Article VIII, paragraph (b) of this Agreement, each country shall be entitled to utilize one-half of the water available for power purposes in the International Rapids Section;

(d) during the construction and upon the completion of the works provided for in the International Rapids section, the flow of water out of Lake Ontario into the St. Lawrence River shall be controlled and the flow of water through the International section shall be regulated so that the navigable depths of water for shipping in the harbor of Montreal and throughout the navigable channel of the St. Lawrence River below Montreal, as such depths now exist or may hereafter be increased by dredging or other harbor or channel improvements, shall not be injuriously affected by the construction or operation of such works, and the power developments in the Canadian section of the St. Lawrence River shall not be adversely affected;

(e) upon the completion of the works provided for in the International Rapids section, the power works shall be operated, initially, with the water level at the powerhouses held at a maximum elevation 238.0, sea level datum as defined in the report of the joint board of engineers for a test period of 10 years or such shorter period as may be approved by any board or authority designated or established under the provisions of paragraph (f) of this article; and, in the event that such board or authority considers that operation with the water level at the powerhouses held to a maximum elevation exceeding 238.0 would be practicable and could be made effective within the limitation prescribed by paragraphs (c) and (d) of this article, the Governments may, by exchange of notes, authorize operation, subject to the provisions of this article, and for such times and subject to such terms as may be prescribed in the notes, at a maximum elevation exceeding 238.0.

(f) the Governments may, by exchange of notes, make provision for giving effect to paragraphs (c), (d), and (e) of this article;

(g) during the construction of the works provided for in the International Rapids section, facilities for 14 foot navigation in that section shall be maintained.

ARTICLE V

The Governments agree that nothing done under the authority of this agreement shall confer upon either of them proprietary rights, or legislative, administrative, or other jurisdiction in the territory of the other, and that the works constructed under the provisions of this agreement shall constitute a part of the territory of the country in which they are situated.

ARTICLE VI

The Governments agree that either of them may proceed at any time to construct, within its own territory and at its own cost, alternative canal and channel facilities for navigation in the international section or in waters connecting the Great Lakes and to utilize the water necessary for the operation of such faciilties.

ARTICLE VII

The High Contracting Parties agree that the rights of navigation accorded under the provisions of existing treaties between the United States of America and His Majesty shall be maintained notwithstanding the provisions for termination contained in any of such treaties, and declare that these treaties confer upon the citizens or subjects and upon the ships, vessels, and boats of each High Contracting Party, rights of navigation in the St. Lawrence River, and the Great Lake System, including the canals now existing or which may hereafter be constructed.

ARTICLE VIII

The Governments, recognizing their common interest in the preservation of the levels of the Great Lakes System, agree that:

(a) each Government in its own territory shall measure the quantities of water which at any point are diverted from or added to the Great Lake System, and shall place such measurements on record with the other Government semiannually;

(b) in the event of diversions being made into the Great Lakes System from other watersheds lying wholly within the borders of either country, the exclusive rights to the use of waters which are determined by the Governments to be equivalent in quantity to any waters so diverted shall, notwithstanding the provisions of Article IV paragraph (c) of this Agreement, be vested in the country diverting such waters, and the quantity of water so diverted shall be at all times available to that country for use for power below the point of entry, so long as it constitutes a part of boundary waters;

(c) if any diversion of water from the Great Lakes System or the International Section, other or greater in amount than diversions permitted in either of the countries on January 1, 1940, is authorized, the Government of such country agrees to give immediate consideration to any representations respecting the matter which the other Government may make; if it is impossible otherwise to reach a satisfactory settlement, the Government of the country in which the diversion of water has been authorized agrees, on the request of the other Government, to submit the matter to an arbitral tribunal which shall be empowered to direct such compensatory or remedial measures as it may deem just and equitable; the arbitral tribunal shall consist of three members, one to be appointed by each of the Governments, and the third, who will be the chairman, to be selected by the Governments;

(d) the Commission shall report upon the desirability of works for compensation and regulation in the Great Lakes System, and, upon the approval by the Governments of any such works, shall prepare plans and specifications for their construction and recommend to the Governments an equitable allocation of their cost; the Governments shall make arrangements by exchange of notes for the construction of such works as they may agree upon.

ARTICLE IX

The Governments, recognizing their primary obligation to preserve and enhance the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River, and consistent with that obligation, their common interest in providing for the most beneficial use of the waters of that River, as envisaged in the Final Report of the Special International Niagara Board, agree that:

(a) the Commission shall prepare and submit to the Governments plans and specifications for works in the Niagara River designed to distribute and control the waters thereof, to prevent erosion, and to ensure at all seasons unbroken crest lines on both the American Falls and the Canadian Falls, and to preserve and enhance their scenic beauty, taking into account the recommendations of the Special International Niagara Board; the Governments may make arrangements by exchange of notes for the construction of such works in the Niagara River as they may agree upon, including provision for temporary diversions of the waters of the Niagara River for the purpose of facilitating construction of the works; the cost of such works in the Niagara River shall be borne by the Governments in equal moieties;

(b) upon the completion of the works authorized in this Article, diversions of the waters of the Niagara River above the Falls from the natural course and stream thereof additional to the amounts specified in Article 5 of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 may be authorized and permitted by the Governments to the extent and in the manner hereinafter provided:

(1) the United States may authorize and permit additional diversion within the State of New York of the waters of the River above the Falls for power purposes, in excess of the amount specified in Article 5 of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, not to exceed in the aggregate a daily diversion at the rate of five thousand cubic feet of water per second;

(2) Canada may authorize and permit additional diversion within the Province of Ontario, of the Waters of the River above the Falls for power purposes, in excess of the amount specified in Article 5 of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, not to exceed in the aggregate a daily diversion at the rate of five thousand cubic feet of water per second;

(c) upon completion of the works authorized in this Article, the Commission shall proceed immediately to test such works under a wide range of conditions, and to report and certify to the Governments the effect of such works, and to make recommendations respecting diversions of water from Lake Erie and the Niagara River, with particular reference to (1) the perpetual preservation of the scenic beauty of the Falls and Rapids, (2) the requirements of navigation in the Great Lakes System, and (3) the efficient utilization of equitable apportionment of such waters as may be available for power purposes; on the basis of the Commission's reports and recommendations, the Governments may by exchange of notes and concurrent legislation determine the methods by which these purposes may be attained.

ARTICLE X

The Governments agree that:

(a) each Government undertakes to make provision for the disposition of claims and for the satisfaction of any valid claims arising out of damage or injury to persons or property occurring in the territory of the other in the course of and in connection with construction by such Government of any of the works authorized or provided for by this Agreement:

(b) each Government is hereby released from responsibility for any damage or injury to persons or property in the territory of the other, which may be caused by any action authorized or provided for by this Agreement, other than damage or injury covered by the provisions of paragraph (a) of this Article;

(c) each Government will assume the responsibility for and the expense involved in the acquisition of any lands or interests in land in its own territory which may be necessary to give effect to the provisions of this Agreement.

ARTICLE XI

This Agreement shall be subject to approval by the Congress of the United States of America and the Parliament of Canada. Following such approval it shall be proclaimed by the President of the United States of America and ratified by His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland and the British dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, in respect of Canada. It shall enter into force on the day of the exchange of the instrument of ratification and a copy of the proclamation which shall take place at Washington.

In witness whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed this Agreement in duplicate and have hereunto affixed their seals.

Done at Ottawa, the — day of March in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and forty-one.

Mr. AIKEN. I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of November 29, 1944, entitled "Support the Agreement."

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

SUPPORT THE AGREEMENT

Congressional proponents of two great river improvement projects—one involving the establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority and the other the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes Waterway and power development—are seriously considering attempt to get those projects approved as amendments to the pending omnibus $1,000,000 flood-control bill.

This would be a mistake in both instances. Each of these proposals is too far reaching in its effect on the life of the Nation to be allowed to ride through Congress on the coattails of a piece of pork-barrel legislation. Each should be debated on its own merits, and the issues should not be confused by mixing them up with the arguments for or against small flood-control and power dams in widely separated parts of the country.

We must, therefore, join with the opponents of the M. V. A. and the St. Lawrence proposals in urging the Senate to reject either or both as amendments to the omnibus flood-control bill.

In connection with the St. Lawrence development, however, we cannot go along with the opponents in their insistence that this proposal must be presented as a treaty with Canada, requiring a two-thirds vote of the Senate for approval.

Whether United States approval of the project should come in the form of a treaty supported by two-thirds of the Senate or as an agreement backed by a majority of both houses of Congress is, we grant, debatable. But it is a technical debate, involving a search for treaty definitions going way back to the eighteenth century.

The sanctity of the Constitution is not, in our opinion, at stake, as the St. Lawrence opponents would like to have us believe. The difference between a treaty and an international agreement has never in American history been satisfactorily defined. It is reasonable to suppose that the authors of the Constitution, when they gave one-third plus one Member of the Senate the veto power over treaties, had in mind a type of international relation far removed from the joint improvement of a common waterway by two friendly nations which already had settled the issues of the waterway's joint use by formal treaty.

The real issue here is whether an improvement of immense value to the most populous region of the United States shall continue to be held up by a handful of Senators from States which for reasons either of selfish regional interest or just plain disinterest will not support the proposal, or shall be given a fair chance for approval by a simple majority of the American people's representatives in both houses of Congress.

A measure which has been earnestly advocated by every President since Theodore Roosevelt and which has been given the support of both parties in their election year platforms time after time, should not be rejected by a questionable legal technicality.

The Plain Dealer has believed from the time this great project was first proposed that it would prove a tremendous stimulus to industry and trade in this and other regions of the United States. Now more than ever, with hope for a permanent peace depending in part on a free and easy exchange of goods among the nations, this great industrial section of America should be given direct access to the ocean ports of the world by completion of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes waterway.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, question was raised by the Senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] as to coal, and I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a statement as to the effect of the St. Lawrence waterway on the coal industry of the United States. The statement has already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I think, on Friday, June 23, 1944, but I should like to have it reinserted in connection with the remarks which I have made.

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

19. How will the seaway-power project affect coal producers? The National Coal Association, representing bituminous coal producers, fears that the seaway would (1) permit British and Nova Scotian producers to invade the present Canadian market for United States coal and (2) reduce railway coal consumption in the United States. At the same time, the association fears that (3) if power is developed in upper New York State by harnessing the flow of the St. Lawrence and Niagara Rivers, instead of by building steam-generating plants, a potential market for coal will be lost. How do these fears square with the facts?

The United States produced about 450,000,000 tons of coal a year during peacetime. It exported an average of 11,000,000 tons of anthracite and bituminous coal to Ontario and Quebec annually (not 19,000,000 tons as claimed by the coal association). The bulk of our exports to Canada—an average of 8,700,000 tons—consists of bituminous coal shipped to the Province of Ontario. That British producers would not be able to invade this market after construction of the seaway is shown by the fact that we already sell nearly four times as much bituminous coal to the Province of Quebec, east of the International Rapids, as Britain does—during 1935-39 an average of 753,000 tons, as against 193,000 tons—and Quebec is a seaport Province. If Britain cannot outsell us in Quebec now, she certainly cannot outsell us in Ontario after the seaway is built.

The only other possible source of competition for the Ontario bituminous market would be Nova Scotia. United States coal has nothing to fear from the small Nova Scotian mines, however, because the present output of these mines could not be increased more than 2,800,000 tons a year—and this probably at an increased cost.

Construction of the seaway would increase the freight capacity of the St. Lawrence canal system by 16,000,000 tons a year. About 10,000,000 tons of this capacity would be available for United States traffic, so that only 6,000,000 tons would be left for Canadian traffic. Obviously, therefore, it would be a physical impossibility for British and Nova Scotian producers to ship 19,000,000 tons of coal a year through the seaway into Ontario markets, as the coal association asserts they would do if the seaway were completed. There is no such market to invade, and American coal is cheaper in Ontario than either British or Nova Scotian coal.

Construction of the seaway would not reduce the amount of coal now consumed by the railroads. If the seaway is built, however, a smaller amount of new railroad facilities will be needed to provide for future transport needs. Hence, the amount of additional coal which the railroads would otherwise use might be slightly reduced. It is a reduction from an increase.

If, 25 years ago, producers of oats had opposed the manufacture of automobiles on the theory that the new gasoline buggies would displace horses and thereby reduce the market for oats, their position would have been no more absurd than the present position of the coal producers on the St. Lawrence issue. Deep-water transportation is relatively less expensive than rail transportation. Yet the coal association opposes the seaway and advocates the expansion of high-cost rail facilities on the ground that this would increase the market for coal. Most people will be inclined to reject this kind of reasoning. They realize that economic betterment comes from lowering prices, not from raising them.

The coal association contends that the hydroelectric power development contemplated on the St. Lawrence and Niagara Rivers would reduce the future coal market by "between 30,000,000 and 35,000,000 tons of coal annually." The association's arithmetic is bad. According to the best engineering estimates, 5,500,000 tons of coal would be required annually to generate steam power in an amount equal to proposed hydropower production on the St. Lawrence and Niagara Rivers.

It by no means follows, however, that the St. Lawrence-Niagara hydrodevelopment would destroy a potential market for some 5,500,000 additional tons of coal at some future time. Experience in the Southeastern States since the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority strongly supports the conclusion that the development of cheap water power under public auspices has the effect of increasing the total industrial demand for electrical energy, thus increasing the market for coal for industrial use.

Between 1934, when T. V. A. began operations, and 1940, the amount of coal used in the generation of electric energy in the Southeastern States increased about 250 percent, whereas the increase in the United States as a whole was only 59 percent. The coal association charged in 1934 that T. V. A. was a menace to the coal industry, but whereas only 540,000 tons of coal was used in the T. V. A. area in 1934, 1,891,000 tons was so used in 1940. There is no reason to doubt that the coal industry would be similarly affected by the St. Lawrence-Niagara development.

Far from reducing coal consumption, the St. Lawrence project would increase it. The cheap transportation and the cheap power made available in the Great Lakes Basin would stimulate industrial expansion. Growing industrial activity would mean growing markets for coal. For these reasons, it is clear that in opposing the seaway-power project the National Coal Association is opposing its own best interests

REPORTS FROM FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance I report favorably without amendment House bill 5564, to freeze the rate of tax on pay rolls and wages for old-age and survivors benefits on employees and employers at the rate of 1 percent for the year 1945, and I submit a report (No. 1356) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. GEORGE. I also from the Committee on Finance report favorably without amendment House bill 5565, to authorize collectors of internal revenue to accept not only certified checks but also cashiers' and treasurers' checks and certain money orders in payment for internal-revenue stamps and taxes, and I submit a report (No. 1357) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR RELEASE OF POWERS OF APPOINTMENT

Mr. GEORGE. From the Finance Committee I report favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 5543) extending the time for the release of powers of appointment for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1355) thereon. The bill also extends the time for the approval of pension trusts and profit-sharing agreements.

The amendments change the provision of the bill as it passed the House by striking out "March 15, 1945," and inserting "June 30, 1945," so far as the time within which pension trusts which were presented to the Treasury prior to January 1, 1945, are concerned.

Since the bill must go back to the House because of the amendments which were offered in the committee and concurred in by the members of the committee present and by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], I ask unanimous consent that, without displacing the unfinished business, the bill may be immediately considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none. The unfinished business will be temporarily laid aside, and the clerk will read the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5543) extending the time for the release of powers of appointment for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendments of the Committee on Finance were, on page 2, line 13, after the word "ending", to strike out "March 15, 1945" and insert "June 30, 1945"; in line 15, after the word "by", to strike out "March 15, 1945" and insert "June 30, 1945"; and on page 3, line 5, after the word "with", to strike out "March 15, 1945" and insert "June 30, 1945."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Perry, one of its clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1827) for the relief of Oliver N. Knight, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. JENNINGS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 156) to extend the statute of limitation in certain cases, and it was signed by the Vice President.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS

The Senate resumed the 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, this afternoon I wish to state as well as I can, speaking under great difficulty, some of my opinions concerning the merits of the project which has been under discussion. During my service in the Senate I have felt it my duty to support projects for the development of various sections of the country, whether they affected the section where I live or related entirely to some other locality. The development of water power and water transportation, wherever they may have been developed, has vindicated itself far beyond expectations, and I am firmly of the belief that the development of public resources for power and transportation should be carried on to the limit.

On two different occasions I have traveled to Europe to study the water transportation systems there, and it seems an amazing phenomenon when one really sees what has been done for some of the small countries of Europe by the development of trade through low-cost transportation by water. With the tremendous areas of our country and with our great rivers and the Great Lakes on the Canadian border, we may at some time find it necessary to develop the power and the transportation facilities on the Great Lakes, as is proposed in the amendment which is being discussed; and, in my opinion, it can be done, it should be done, and the sooner the better.

Mr. President, on September 21 I joined with the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and with the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] in offering the amendment to include the

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project among the scores of projects in other sections of the country authorized by the pending river and harbor bill.

The amendment is virtually identical in terms with the St. Lawrence project bill, S. 1385, introduced in the Senate on September 28, 1943, by the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and also introduced in the House, as H. R. 2280, by the gentleman from Minnesota, Representative PITTENGER, and by four other Members of the House, from the States of New York, Wisconsin, Texas, and Michigan.

The completion of the St. Lawrence seaway in accordance with the terms of the amendment is, in my judgment, absolutely essential to the balanced post-war development, the healthy growth, and the future prosperity and well-being of our whole Nation, and especially to the immense region which extends from the Great Lakes area westward to the Rocky Mountains.

The project authorized by the amendment now before the Senate cannot rightly be approached from any narrow, selfish, sectional viewpoint. Removal of the last few remaining obstacles in the St. Lawrence River and in the connecting channels of the Great Lakes, as provided by the United States-Canadian agreement of March 19, 1941, and by the terms of the amendment, will give to the people of the great midcontinent area direct access to the sea by the use of ocean cargo vessels and an equal chance to share in our foreign trade and in our expanding intercoastal trade in the period following this war.

Not one dollar of the funds which will be expended for the project authorized by the amendment will be spent for construction work in the State of Minnesota. More than two-thirds of all the United States funds to be expended for completion of this project will, in fact, be spent for construction work in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River. Here, at the frontier of the State of New York and the Province of Ontario, the chief remaining bottleneck which today blocks off deep-draft navigation to and from the Great Lakes will be eliminated. By the way, I was amazed to learn, when on the west coast last summer, that the Grand Coulee Dam has not only been of immense help in the production of materials for war, but that sufficient money is now being made at the dam so that there can be turned back to the Government yearly $20,000,000.

The construction of works in the section drained by the St. Lawrence will simultaneously develop 2,200,000 horsepower of low-cost hydroelectricity This project, therefore, will not only provide post-war employment for construction workers and low-cost power of permanent value in the Northeast, but it will also open up the great interior region to the benefits of low-cost transportation. It will thus supply a stimulus to the post-war development of States, cities, and rural areas, thousands of miles removed from the actual sites of construction of the principal works authorized by the amendment.

I am not unmindful of the fact that the Committee on Commerce, to which Senate bill 1385 was referred on September 28, 1943, has failed for 14 months, up to this hour, to hold hearings on the merits of the St. Lawrence project and the terms of the bill. On May 4, 1944, in company with the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I appeared before the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce, then engaged in the consideration of the river and harbor bill, and joined in the request for public hearings on the merits of the St. Lawrence project. This application for a hearing on the project and the terms of the bill was denied by the chairman of the committee and the chairman of the subcommittee. The printed record of the hearings, as presented to the Senate, does not include the remarks made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] on that occasion, or any record or notation to indicate that the request for a hearing was made and refused.

I understand that on November 6, 1944, the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce, to which Senate bill 1385 was referred 14 months ago, announced to the press and to his colleagues on the subcommittee a plan for holding hearings on the bill. It was proposed, at such hearings, to exclude any testimony whatsoever on the merits of the project, but to confine the hearings solely to the question of whether the United States-Canadian accord of March 19, 1941, effectuated by the bill, is "of the character of a treaty or of the character of an agreement."

The subcommittee met, according to plan, on November 16, and in executive session adopted the proposal for this type of hearing advanced by the chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON]. On the same date, immediately following the executive session, public statements were made to the press by members of the committee, expressing their settled views, in advance of any hearing, that the accord of 1941 is, in fact, a treaty, and cannot be approved by the usual method of legislation.

The purpose of the limited hearing before the subcommittee is, of course, perfectly clear. The plan for the hearing on its face excluded the merits of the St. Lawrence development from discussion by witnesses or consideration by the subcommittee. On the other hand, the hearing was calculated to raise legal technicalities against the agreement successfully negotiated by Secretary of State Hull and submitted to both branches of Congress more than 3 years ago.

My views on the rights and the prerogatives of the Senate in the matter of ratification of general treaties by a two-thirds vote are well known to every Member of this body. It is understood by every Senator in this Chamber that I would not support any measure that set a precedent which would in any way weaken our constitutional power to ratify treaties that must follow this war. To my mind, it is absurd to argue that an agreement signed on March 19, 1941, after years of negotiation by Secretary Hull, could have been designed as a model for post-war settlements.

When it comes to authorizing a great public improvement and the construction of useful works on our frontier with a friendly nation, in whose canals and existing St. Lawrence channels we already have equal navigation rights, I see no difficulty in proceeding by the method of reciprocal and concurrent legislation. When it is considered that, under simple acts of Congress, we are expending billions in United States funds to build power plants, waterways, highways, and other gigantic projects in the four quarters of the globe, I do not see how it can be seriously contended that the pending agreement sets any new or harmful precedent. In any event, I do not propose to be diverted at this time from a discussion of the merits of this project by extraneous issues and technicalities invoked by those who, like the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], vigorously opposed the St. Lawrence improvement when it was presented to this body in 1934. We all understand that the purpose of the opposition in raising these issues is to defeat the project itself by every means within their power, whether it be presented in the form of a treaty or in the form of an agreement.

In spite of the fact that the Committee on Commerce has failed to hold hearings on the St. Lawrence project, the Senate is, nevertheless, fortunate in having available printed hearings on this improvement. These are far more extensive and detailed in scope than any hearings which have been presented to us in considering the various projects authorized in the flood-control and river and harbor bills, favorably reported by the committee.

I refer to the hearings of 1,074 printed pages conducted on the St. Lawrence waterway by a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Seventy-second Congress, second session, from November 14, 1932, to February 10, 1933, under the chairmanship of the late Senator from Idaho, Mr. Borah. At the close of these hearings, on the motion of the late Senator from Montana, Mr. Walsh, the full Committee on Foreign Relations approved the project by a vote of 15 to 5 in a report to the Senate.

We also have available the public hearings of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors on the Mansfield bill, H. R. 4927, identical in terms with the proposed legislation now before us. These hearings include the testimony of more than 100 witnesses, the statements of several hundred organizations and individuals, and cover every phase of the project in 2,284 printed pages of testimony and exhibits. At the conclusion of these hearings, the House committee overwhelmingly approved the St. Lawrence project by a vote of more than 2 to 1, and favorably reported it to the House on November 21, 1941, as a provision of the then pending river and harbor bill. At that time, the attack on Pearl Harbor suspended action by the House or Senate on any river and harbor legislation.

In our consideration of this project, we also have available seven volumes of

serial reports prepared by the St. Lawrence Survey of the Department of Commerce, submitted to Congress at intervals over the period from 1940 to 1942. The Department of Commerce study has been described by the Secretary of Commerce as the most complete and exhaustive survey ever made by any department of the Government on a project for the development of a single watershed.

We also have before us the official reports made by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, the Departments of State, War, Navy, Agriculture, and Commerce, the Power Authority of the State of New York, the United States Maritime Commission, the Rural Electrification Administration, and many other public agencies, all of which have recommended the enactment of the St. Lawrence project bill in the same form in which it is incorporated in the amendment.

Among the agencies which have strongly recommended the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, under the terms of the amendment now before us, is the Corps of Engineers, United States Army. It will be recalled that the Acting Chief of Engineers, Brig. Gen. George B. Pillsbury, and the Chief of Engineers, Maj. Gen. E. M. Markham, appeared before the Borah subcommittee of the Senate a decade ago and, in prophetic words, urged the need for the improvement to serve the expanding transportation and power requirements of this country in war and in peace.

At the House hearings in the last Congress, the Corps of Engineers again recommended this project in a written statement and in testimony presented by Maj. Gen. Thomas M. Robins, then Acting Chief of Engineers, and later Chief of the Division of Construction, Corps of Engineers. General Robins gave a concise physical description of the project and an excellent engineering analysis of its benefits which I wish to present to the Senate from the printed hearings on a bill identical with the so-called Aiken amendment.

I now quote from General Robins' testimony as it appears in the record of the hearings:

General ROBINS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the St. Lawrence River is a natural transportation route between the Great Lakes and the sea and offers an exceptional opportunity for the production of hydroelectric power.

In the early stages of the commercial development of North America the St. Lawrence River was partially improved for both navigation and power purposes, and for many years plans have been in the making for the complete and full utilization of the resources of this waterway.

It has been generally understood throughout the country that some day these plans would have to be carried out. In my opinion that day has now arrived. The country can no longer afford to be without the transportation facilities and the power which can be made available by full and comprehensive development of the St. Lawrence River, either from the standpoint of national defense or the commercial needs of our great inland empire bordering on the Great Lakes.

The plans for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project are now complete, having been worked out in detail and agreed upon wholeheartedly by duly accredited representatives of both the countries concerned.

There is no longer any argument as to what should be done and it is possible to make reliable estimates of costs of the undertaking.

This cost is not unreasonable or excessive and under the pending agreement will be divided as equitably as possible between the United States and Canada. The State of New York offers to take over and operate the power facilities that will be built on the American side of the border and to reimburse the United States for the cost of these power facilities.

Under the agreement which is pending between the two countries, the St. Lawrence waterway project covers the Great Lakes and the two sections of the St. Lawrence River, namely, the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence and the Canadian section of the St. Lawrence.

On the Great Lakes the project begins with a new lock at the Soo and includes a deepening of the connecting channels of the Great Lakes.

The construction of the MacArthur lock at the Soo was commenced in 1942 by the Corps of Engineers, and completed in 1943, and became indescribably valuable for the transportation of iron ore. The transportation of iron ore to the smelters in the eastern part of the United States was tremendously increased in volume due to the war. The completion of the MacArthur lock proved to be one of the most important developments in the carrying on of the war. It provided an extra channel for traffic at Sault Ste. Marie.

General Robins states further:

We then come to the International Rapids section, which is the main one under discussion.

The works in this section consist of a control dam at Iroquois Point, near the town of Iroquois on the Canadian side, a main dam at the head of Barnhart Island, and a powerhouse at the lower end of Barnhart Island; a navigation canal on the American side to get around and up into the pool formed by the Long Sault Dam, a readjustment of the Canadian canal in this stretch of the river so as to continue the 14-foot navigation that the Canadians have at present. Also the necessary highway and railroad relocations and dikes.

Then under the agreement the Canadian Government agrees to complete the navigation features in what is known as the Soulanges reach of the river and the Lachine reach. The Soulanges reach of the river is the reach in which the Beauharnois project is located and the navigation canal is to be built in connection with that project. They already have a power canal there and that will be deepened on one side to carry navigation and the necessary side canal to get into this power canal, and the necessary locks will be built there by the Canadians.

Getting on down to the last section, the Lachine section of the river just above Montreal, the Canadians agree to provide the necessary canal and locks to overcome the navigation difficulties in that section.

The channels in all these improvements are to be 27 feet deep and the locks are all to have 30 feet over the sills, at least, to provide for future deepening of the channel if that is found necessary.

Coming back to the International Rapids section, the powerhouse at the foot of Barnhart Island straddles the international boundary. Half of the powerhouse will be in Canada and the other half in the United States. The Canadians will take over and operate their half of the powerhouse and New York State will take over and operate the American half of the powerhouse.

It must be obvious to all thoughtful people how thankful we would be today if the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project were completed and available for use in the present emergency. No one knows how long the emergency will last or how soon it will occur again. I am convinced that immediate authorization of the St. Lawrence project is essential to all-out defense effort and that it is advisable to proceed with construction at as fast a rate as may be consistent with other pressing needs of national defense.

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

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator reading from General Robins' testimony?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Is not General Robins the Army engineer who had charge of the construction of the great dams in the Pacific Northwest?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I understand so—the Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams.

Mr. AIKEN. I bring that out to show that General Robins knows whereof he speaks when he discusses matters such as the proposed St. Lawrence development. As I understand, only a quarter of a century ago it was considered virtually impossible to put a dam across the St. Lawrence at this point. At that time, when the Frontier Corporation made its offer for the resources, it claimed that it would be incurring very large risks in constructing this dam, because no dam of such proportions had ever been constructed before that time, and there was a possibility that it could not be done. However, we now know that it can be done; and if any man can do it, General Robins is the man who can do it.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. General Robins' eminence as an engineer is so well demonstrated in the large dams which have been built to develop power throughout the West that I did not think it was necessary to call his ability to the attention of the Senate. The works are the greatest testimony to his ability, vision, and foresight.

Continuing with the statement of General Robins:

Canada has spent to date $132,672,000 on the project; the United States has spent to date $17,105,485. The total spent to date by both countries is $149,777,485, leaving the cost to complete for the entire project, $429,474,515, of which $144,418,000 is to be expended by Canada; $285,056,515 by the United States.

New York State offers to pay, under the terms of the bill before the committee, $93,375,000. Subtracting that from the $285,000,000 that the United States still has to spend, makes a net cost to the United States, based on these estimates of $200,000,000.

Mr. CULKIN. May I ask you this broad question, General; and you need not answer unless you want to: Is that power there that will be created by this dam, if Congress sees fit to adopt the project, is that needed now for national defense?

General ROBINS. It is.

Mr. CULKIN. And that will be a continuous need; will it not?

General ROBINS. It will be a continuing need, even leaving national defense out of it. The country will need that power just as sure as the sun rises and sets.

Mr. CULKIN. Yes. It will be just as splendid a contribution to our national economy as Boulder Dam and Grand Coulee and Cen-

tral Valley and all these other projects, will it not?

General ROBINS. Yes, sir; it is a better power proposition than any of them, except Bonneville.

Mr. CULKIN. It is what the engineers call a "natural," is it not?

General ROBINS. It is a "natural" from an engineering standpoint, and it is located in a very densely populated region with an almost unlimited power market.

Mr. CULKIN. Now, all the waters of the Great Lakes—and I have heard the statement that it constitutes half of the fresh water of the globe—flows down through the narrow gorge in the St. Lawrence?

The CHAIRMAN. Chicago gets some of it.

General ROBINS. All of it that does not go down the Illinois.

Mr. CULKIN. What is the cubic second-feet flow there at the St. Lawrence, at that point?

General ROBINS. The mean flow over a period of some 60 years is about 240,000 second-feet. It fluctuates very little comparatively. I think it has got as high at one time as 318,000, and as low at one time as 170,000; but that wide fluctuation is due to ice conditions and not to the water available.

Mr. CULKIN. Yes. There is nothing like it in the world?

General ROBINS. No, sir.

Mr. CULKIN. No place in the world where power, which is now a part of our defense economy in the United States and abroad, can be created at so low a cost; is that correct?

General ROBINS. I think that is correct. I do not know of any other place that can develop that quality of power at such a cost.

Mr. DONDERO. Is it not true that this being an international project, the procedure differs from that of a domestic engineering project?

General ROBINS. Yes, sir; that is true. In this case the economic studies and reports have been made by the Department of Commerce, but the engineering estimates and the plans for this project have been passed on by the Office of the Chief of Engineers in the same way as any other project that is handled and reported upon by the Board of Engineers.

Mr. President, in order to save time, I ask to have the remainder of this cross-examination of General Robins by the House committee members printed in the RECORD without reading.

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

Mr. DONDERO. And the reports that have been filed have been by really an international board of engineers of the two countries?

General ROBINS. The International Board of Engineers is the agency that reports on the engineering questions, but the men working on the cost estimates and the plans and everything connected with the engineering features of the project are exactly the same men that work on other projects that the Engineer Department has in charge.

Mr. DONDERO. Has the Board of Engineers of this country always been represented on that Board?

General ROBINS. Yes, sir; since the beginning.

Mr. DONDERO. The Board of Engineers has been represented on this Board that has made the reports on the project?

General ROBINS. Yes; either the Chief of Engineers or the Assistant Chief of Engineers has always been on the joint boards considering the St. Lawrence project.

Mr. DONDERO. All of the work that was carried on in 1932 and 1936—was that carried on mainly by American funds and American engineers?

General ROBINS. It was.

Mr. DONDERO. The procedure in making these estimates by the Joint Board of Engineers differed in no manner from the usual procedure employed by the Board of Army Engineers in engineering matters in our own country?

General ROBINS. As soon as this investigation and restudy was ordered by the President in 1940 we established an engineer district at Massena, N. Y., and that district has been staffed by many of our regular employees and has functioned just the same as any other engineering district; and we have in addition to that employed eminent consulting engineers on this work, just the same as we do for all our river and harbor work.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I now wish to present for the RECORD, Mr. President, a statement issued November 28, 1944, by the National St. Lawrence Association, headed by an advisory committee of 50 leading businessmen, representatives of State and National farm organizations, editors, and other civic leaders. The president of this association is Hon. Julius H. Barnes, a distinguished citizen of my own State and one of the leading businessmen of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, without reading.

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

THE NATIONAL ST. LAWRENCE ASSOCIATION,
Detroit, Mich.

The National St. Lawrence Association appeals to American fair play and American business sense at this timely crisis.

New factors of recent years demand the open seaway to ocean routes.

On the Great Lakes industrial cities have developed amazing growth. Cleveland, Toledo, Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee, Duluth, typify American labor skills and management genius, applied to large-scale production.

This area of 50,000,000 people, after this striking war service, must reach by water large markets of new earning and buying power. High-wage employment must be thus stabilized.

Twenty agricultural States find in this full labor employment their most secure and ready market.

The problem is simple. Just modernize 50 miles, still with its old-fashioned locks and channels of a half century ago. That is the only block left by American enterprise in an unequaled waterway of 2,400 sheltered miles.

West of that block ships have grown from 2,000 to 20,000 tons. Transport costs prove amazingly low.

In that 50 years the outlet of Lake Superior has been provided with 6 great locks instead of 1. St. Clair channels are now 27 feet deep instead of 15. Around Niagara, at Canada's own expense, the new Welland waits with ocean-size locks of 30 feet depth.

Meantime the St. Lawrence 14-foot channels and 260-foot locks wait, as half a century ago, to serve the small ships that have passed away. Its modernization costs 1 day's expenditure in war.

In this last decade American power requirements have arisen from 90,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours to 190,000,000,000. More is needed for farm and industry. The St. Lawrence flows to the sea unused with power 3 times Russia's famed Dnieper Dam.

This growth in American industry and American power requirements emphasize today's timeliness.

The Senate majority of 1934 should have initiated the construction which, if it had preceded World War No. 2, would have shortened the submarine menace by 1,500 miles. That means thousands of lives and hundreds of ships and months of war which should have been saved. It would have greatly relieved the war strain on our railroads and on Atlantic port labor. With large oil tankers on that route, that precious war material could have followed a safer route, and ahead of the war-constructed long pipe lines from western fields. It would have saved 500 water-miles each way to Britain, France, and Russia. The New World commerce in coming days of peace needs the same economy of distance and costs.

Six last Presidents favored this project. President Roosevelt has our commendation for his steadfast recognition. Senator AIKEN deserves well of America for his vision and steadfast courage. So does Congressman PITTENGER, both sponsors of today's agreement now before Congress. There are many men of proven vision in Congress.

We call on America to value the judgment of responsible public officers, the President, the Secretaries of State, War, Navy, Commerce, and Agriculture, the Army engineers, and the Maritime Commission.

We appeal to Congress to rise above sectional jealousy, single-industry selfishness, and the mistaken attitude of cities, sections, or industries that fear diversion of tonnage when every waterway records commercial growth and volume by its sheer economy. So the Suez and the Panama. The Panama faced the same kind of opposition in its day. The Jap would rejoice today if it had failed.

We urge Governors, legislators, businessmen, labor leaders, and agriculture to realize that here is the greatest unused natural resource of America. We do not exaggerate. The addition of a fourth seacoast in the heart of America added to the three great coasts already developed will strengthen America's leadership in the new day of world peaceful commerce. Have confidence in America's expanding future.

JULIUS H. BARNES,
President.
W. C. COWLING,
Executive Vice President.
ALLEN DEAN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, before this debate is concluded, I shall present to the Senate a concise summary of the voluminous hearings and reports of recent years bearing directly upon the merits of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. I wish to say now that the demonstration which has been made in these hearings and reports is overwhelming in its proof of the soundness and merit of the improvement. The experience of two destructive wars in a single generation has shown to all men that we need to develop our transportation and power facilities, in all sections of our country alike, to strengthen this Nation, to avoid shortages in war, and to maintain and improve our living standards in time of peace. Perhaps it is because the necessity of adequate low-cost transportation and low-cost power and the experiences of this war are so vividly present in the public mind that opponents of the St. Lawrence project in the Senate have refused to conduct hearings on the merits of the St. Lawrence project bill.

Mr. President, the claims which now are advanced to obstruct the St. Lawrence project run directly counter to the facts of the record, facts with which all of us who live in the Great Lakes area and who have watched the development and growth of this natural waterway are

entirely familiar. By succesive steps we have deepened channels, installed new works, and made other improvements to keep pace with the enormous growth in the size of ships now operating on the Great Lakes. The ships which reach 1,500 miles from the Coast to the greatest inland harbor in the world, at Duluth, are larger than the average ocean carrier. These channels today carry a greater annual commerce than the Panama Canal and the Suez Canal combined. This is the case, despite the fact that the mighty commerce of the Great Lakes is bottled up and prevented from sharing in our water-borne intercoastal and foreign trade by the outmoded 14-foot canals and unharnessed rapids of the St. Lawrence River.

It is a fact, Mr. President, borne out by the whole history of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system and by the legislative records of the Congress itself, that not a single navigation improvement has ever been made by the Government of the United States or by the Government of Canada in the entire Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system by means of a treaty. It is equally true that this Government has made numerous improvements in United States sections of these boundary waters by simple acts of Congress and that we have repeatedly provided for improvements across the line in Canadian waters, by authorizations carried in river and harbor bills. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, on page 8893, appears a list showing in detail the improvements we have carried out in Canadian waters, in the Livingston Channel, and elsewhere, under river and harbor acts authorizing the expenditure of tens of millions of dollars in United States funds.

I, therefore, contend that we are creating no new precedent, that we are violating no provision of the Constitution, when we provide for the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway by an amendment to the same kind of a river and harbor bill under which we have heretofore proceeded.

The improvements in Canadian waters to which I have referred have been carried out by our Corps of Engineers over a period of more than 40 years. The river and harbor bills authorizing these improvements became law when they were approved by Presidents Theodore Roosevelt, William Howard Taft, Calvin Coolidge, and nearly every other Chief Executive who has served since 1902, down to the present time. In some instances notes to make necessary arrangements to facilitate the work were transmitted by Secretaries of State, such as Elihu Root, Philander C. Knox, and Charles Evans Hughes. I do not believe, Mr. President, that the Senate of the United States at this hour is prepared to repudiate the course followed by former Secretary of State Hull and to reject the amendment to effectuate the agreement of 1941, when the record shows that Secretary Hull followed a well-beaten track of precedents.

It was no doubt because of those precedents that Secretary of State Elihu Root, in negotiating the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, was careful to make provision that agreements between the United States and Canada "expressed by concurrent or reciprocal legislation on the part of Congress and the Parliament of Canada" should not be subject, like the applications of private corporations for permits, to review and decision by the International Joint Commission set up by the treaty of 1909. I say that when the Senate ratified the treaty of 1909, this body had those precedents clearly in mind, and gave its countenance and approval to the continued improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system by acts of Congress such as the amendment now proposed.

I do not propose at this time to deal at more length with the numerous precedents we have before us for dealing with other nations by adoption of reciprocal legislation. On December 4, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] placed an extended but partial list of such acts of Congress in the RECORD. We know that in 1911 President Taft entered into an agreement with Canada for the mutual reduction of tariff duties, and that Congress passed legislation approving that reciprocity agreement.

The St. Lawrence project will remain under the control of the Congress at every stage of its construction and future operation. We are now asked to pass a mere authorization bill. Later Congress will be called upon to make appropriations for the carrying out of the construction of the works specified in the 1941 agreement. At every stage in the progress of this work, Congress will have full opportunity to exercise its power of investigation and review over the acts of the Corps of Engineers, and to do anything required to protect the rights of this Nation and the public interest.

Mr. President, I now return, in conclusion, to the merits of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project. For more than 20 years I have stood on this floor and battled, in season and out, in session after session, for the balanced development of the river basins and the power and navigation resources of this country. With all my strength, I have fought against the efforts of railroad and utility interests to hold back such developments, to obstruct rural electrification, T. V. A., and our Pacific coast public power projects, to hamstring the use of our inland waterways by cutthroat competition and by various devices of rate juggling.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JENNER in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I noticed that the Senator from Minnesota called attention to the fact that the United States has spent a great deal of money in improving channels in Canadian waters by reason of authorizations which were approved by the Commerce Committee and passed by the Congress. I wonder if the Senator also realizes that a great many dams have been built across international boundary waters, across streams which form the boundary between the United States and Canada, by the private utilities interests, and never once has a single voice been raised in objection to doing so because the franchises have been granted under the treaty of 1909. Yet, as soon as it is suggested that a dam be put across international boundary waters for the benefit of the public, certain persons suddenly become very righteous in their adherence to the Constitution, and raise the question and draw all kinds of red herrings across the trail. But they were significantly silent when franchises were being given to private utility companies to build dams across international boundary waters and to divert water from the rivers which form our boundaries.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is correct; that was done all the way from Winnipeg.

Mr. AIKEN. It was done all the way from Maine to Vancouver.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is correct. Whenever a dam was wanted, request was made of Congress for that purpose.

Mr. AIKEN. No, Mr. President; the permission of Congress was not asked in that connection. Permission was obtained from the International Joint Commission which was established under the treaty of 1909.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. That Commission has granted the requests of private utility companies to build dams across the international boundary waters.

It is so surprising that today men who were silent when that was being done suddenly come to life and acquire a great deal of reverence for the Constitution, when it is proposed to build a dam for the benefit of the public.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, when I said request had been made of Congress, and then the Senator from Vermont referred to the treaty of 1909, I referred to dams which were built prior to 1909. So far as the record shows, many dams were built without consulting any authority. The persons or organizations concerned merely went there and built them. But, of course, under the treaty of 1909, certain jurisdiction was given to the International Joint Commission and about 1923 some amendments were added to that treaty.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, at this time I should like to refer, for the benefit of the Senate, to a few sample cases which have been considered and acted upon by the International Joint Commission under the treaty of January 11, 1909, and without subsequent agreement between the two governments or action by the Congress of the United States and the Canadian Parliament.

The treaty of 1909 completely covered the case, so far as the private utilities were concerned, but it does not cover it according to some of the opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway, so far as public dams and the public good are concerned.

On January 21, 1914, the Algoma Steel Corporation applied for approval of diversion and use of waters on the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario. The application was approved.

On January 29, 1915, the St. Croix River Power Co. made application for the diversion of waters of the St. Croix River. The development required the construction of a dam. The application was approved by the International Joint Commission.

On February 20, 1925, the New Brunswick Electric Power Co. requested the approval of certain works to be constructed on the St. John River. I believe that the location of the work was to be between Maine and New Brunswick. The application was for hydroelectric power development, and was approved by the International Joint Commission.

On June 16, 1926, the St. John River Power Co. made an application for the construction of permanent works in the St. John River for the development of power. The application was approved, and no question was raised at that time as to the constitutionality of the approval.

At various times the Governments of the United States and Canada have made applications to the International Joint Commission either for the construction of dams or the diversion of water. I have been given four instances of such applications having been made to the International Joint Commission.

On April 7, 1937, the Government of Canada asked for the right to make improvements on the Richelieu River which would have raised the waters on the United States side of the boundary line. The application was approved.

On September 16, 1929, the West Kootenay River Power & Light Co. asked for the approval of the construction of a dam of sufficient height to raise the water level of the Kootenay River on the United States side of the boundary. The application was approved.

On October 3, 1940, the Government of the United States made application to the International Joint Commission for permission to raise the water levels on the Canadian side of the boundary resulting from the construction of the Grand Coulee Dam. The application was approved.

On August 22, 1941, the city of Seattle made application to construct a dam on the Skagit River, which would have affected the water level on the Canadian side of the river. The application was approved.

At no time was any question raised that the International Joint Commission did not have authority to grant those applications to which I have referred, and at no time was the question raised that the Constitution of the United States was in peril. It has been only upon the proposal to construct the dam which would provide the greatest benefits for the greatest number of people in North America that the question of constitutionality of the method of granting the approval has been raised.

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

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. On the question of whether the proposed project could be built between the United States and Canada by contract and not by treaty, I think some statutes can be cited. We can go back as far as 1874, Statutes at Large, volume 18, at page 237. A river and harbor appropriation of $25,000 was made for the removal of boulders and rocks in the Detroit River, partly in Canadian waters. The question has been raised that the St. Lawrence River project would have to be constructed under a treaty. The question has been raised because the work would have to be done, in part at least, in Canadian waters.

There were other statutes of a similar nature enacted following the last date to which I have referred.

On July 3, 1930, Statutes at Large, volume 46, at page 918, in relation to the building of the Livingstone Channel, which was mostly in Canadian waters, an appropriation was made. The amount authorized to be expended upon the channel was $29,266,000.

We find that in those particular cases the work was done not even under an executive agreement or a contract, but under merely an exchange of notes, and an appropriation of money by the United States Congress.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. In order that the record may be made clear, I might cite other acts.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I wish the Senator would do so.

Mr. FERGUSON. March 7, 1907, Thirty-fourth Statutes at Large, page 1073.

June 25, 1910, Thirty-sixth Statutes at Large, page 655.

March 2, 1919, Fortieth Statutes at Large, page 1286.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I thank the Senator. If I may be permitted to do so, I wish to compliment the Senator on the industry which he has shown in having looked up the precedents to which he has referred. I think he deserves much credit.

Mr. President, I have favored the development, not only of the upper Mississippi in my own State, but also of the lower Mississippi, the Tennessee and its tributaries, the Ohio, the Colorado, the Arkansas, the Missouri, and the Columbia. In the past 20 years I have joined with other Senators in voting billions in appropriations for those projects to develop resources outside my own State, just as I have helped to vote billions to improve our seaports and their approaches and a merchant marine which, until the St. Lawrence Rapids are overcome, can never enter Duluth and the other mighty harbors of the Great Lakes.

I believe that as we enter the postwar era the time has come to put forever behind us any policy in respect to the development of our natural resources which can possibly lead to pitting section against section. We now have in conference a flood-control bill which carries more than $200,000,000 for the lower Mississippi, increasing the total authorizations for that area to upward of $800,000,000. We have authorized in that bill improvements on the Missouri River of an initial cost in excess of $200,000,000, and an ultimate cost of more than $400,000,000. The pending river and harbor bill carries several items which would increase the authorizations on the Columbia, the Ohio, and other streams to more than $200,000,000 in the case of each of those river basins.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project can be completed at a net cost to the Federal Treasury of well under $200,000,000, with the Power Authority of the State of New York assuming the cost of the power development in that State. No one will deny that considering the developed commerce, population, and industry of the area served, the navigation and power benefits which will flow from the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence improvement far outstrip the benefits to the general public which can be expected from any other project authorized by either the flood-control or the river and harbor bill.

Under the circumstances, Mr. President, I appeal from the Committee on Commerce to the Senate itself to give full consideration to the St. Lawrence project on its merits, on a parity with other projects already authorized by the Senate. The great majority of Senators from States in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence area, from Vermont to Minnesota and westward to the Pacific coast, have endorsed this project and support it now. We have a right to demand, before the flood-control bill and the river and harbor bill are finally enacted into law at this session of an expiring Congress, that the merits of the St. Lawrence development and the post-war needs of our people shall receive proper consideration at the hands of this body.

Mr. President, the greatest territory in the world which has escaped the devastations of this war lies in the United States and Canada. North America is a tremendous continent, and we are merely in the beginning of its development. There are vast water resources on this continent which have been but barely touched. There are vast areas, particularly in Canada and in the Middle West, which have not been developed. During the next 50 years there will be need for the most extensive development of both the United States and Canada because the probabilities are that we are destined to make provision for a population of 250,000,000 people within the next 50 years.

CONDEMNATION OF BLOCS AND REGIONAL GROUPS AFFECTING INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, for the past 2 weeks I have had on my desk for presentation to the Senate a resolution which reads as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the formation or existence of any bloc or regional group of nations for military purposes, except in conjunction with and with the approval of a general world security organization, is inimical to international peace and security.

For fear of precipitating a debate which might cause the use of harsh words in the direction of one of our allies, I have hesitated to present the resolution. I for one have always been unwilling to pursue a course that may lead to

disunity among the United Nations. Today, on the eve of victory in Europe over Germany, Great Britain is taking the lead in causing disunity among the Allies, not only by words but by actual deeds. I am not surprised, because Great Britain is running true to form. She is a past master in the art of world politics and she has always been able to make weaker nations bow to her terms and to obtain the help of other nations to maintain her power.

In a speech delivered by me on the floor of the Senate on June 25, 1942, I said then, and I now repeat, that many of the decisions made by the British in the course of this war were based on political issues, rather than upon strategy that would lead to early decision. It will be recalled that on two occasions the British came near clearing north Africa of every vestige of territory held by our enemies. Instead of pursuing the enemy in north Africa when he was on the run, half of the British forces in that area were sent to aid helpless Greece. Churchill and his followers went to the aid of Greece against the advice of Britain's military and naval leaders. What was the reason for that action? It was in order to fulfill a promise made by Churchill to King George of Greece, all to the end that the British could look to the King of Greece for help around the peace table.

Several weeks ago the Russians had virtually driven the enemy from Greece and made that country no longer tenable for the Germans. In spite of that, the British saw fit to send an army to obtain control of that helpless country. Today Great Britain is engaged, by force of arms, in dictating to the Greek people whom they shall select as their leader. She is pursuing a similar course in Italy. She is causing much concern in Ethiopia by refusing to evacuate that country and by proclaiming that she intends not only to occupy a portion of Ethiopia during the war but to retain certain territory there. My belief is that Great Britain will persist in that attitude of seeking to expand her now vast empire and to form blocs of nations here and there all over the world so as to help her to maintain her pre-war world-wide domination, unless we in America take a hand. With a navy larger than the combined navies of all other countries in the world, and with a respectable army, it would seem to me that we should be able to force the British to see the light.

I pose this question: Why should Great Britain maintain armies in reconquered Greece, in reconquered Ethiopia, and in other reconquered territories, when those armies could be used to advantage against the western wall of Germany.

To digress for a moment, Mr. President, I ask Senators to take a look at the map indicating the battle line in western Europe, and they will note that the British occupy a few miles on the northern end of the line, while we are bearing the brunt of this holocaust of war.

Let me repeat, Mr. President, that, while we are shedding our precious blood, while we are dissipating our irreplaceable natural resources, the British are pursuing a course which is diametrically opposed to the objects and purposes for which we in America are fighting. We want to free the peoples of the earth and permit them to govern themselves.

As has been expressed on the floor of the Senate on many occasions, we as a nation do not desire more territory, except that which it may be necessary for us to obtain or control in order to prevent future wars. I shall not now attempt a discussion of that problem, but will reserve it for future debate.

Mr. President, the resolution which I have read is simple in its language and should not require much study to understand. It is simply a warning to Great Britain, and in fact to all other nations, that we as a Nation propose to help formulate a world security organization whose purpose it shall be to maintain peace; that we are desirous of letting the world know that this organization is not to be looked upon with suspicion or as a make-believe organization, but, instead, as an organization upon which every nation, be it large or small, can depend to be the instrumentality by which and through which world peace can be maintained. I do not want any nation, no matter how large or small, to fail to have the utmost confidence in the ability of this organization to maintain the peace of the world. I do not want any nation to feel that it is necessary for it to join in an alliance with the British or to join in an alliance with the Russians or an alliance with us in order to maintain peace. Let us keep the organization open, free, and aboveboard.

Mr. President, a few weeks ago that eminent statesman from Great Britain, David Lloyd George, was asked the question:

> What was the Allies' greatest mistake in dealing with Germany after the last war?

Rather grimly and without hesitation, he replied:

> America. If they had kept to their bargains instead of backing out and leaving the League of Nations, things would have gone differently.

That may be only partially true, but, if the truth were known, President Wilson failed to carry out his 14 points because of the existence of secret treaties, alliances, and agreements among the nations with which he was dealing. In the near future I expect to address myself further to that subject.

Mr. President, my hope is that when the United Nations of the World sit around the peace table for the purpose of working out plans in order to maintain a lasting peace, each can without hesitation state to the world that it has not made any secret treaties, that it has no alliances of any kind, but that the organization in contemplation shall be and will be the instrumentality through which peace throughout the world shall be maintained.

Mr. President, out of order I send the resolution to the desk and ask that it be referred immediately to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I will also ask that the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate consider it without delay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution (S. Res. 348) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the formation or existence of any bloc or regional group of nations for military purposes, except in conjunction with and with the approval of a general world security organization, is inimical to international peace and security.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS

The Senate resumed the 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.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask consideration of an amendment I send forward regarding the certificate of convenience and necessity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 16, it is proposed to strike out the period and to insert the following: "*And provided further*, That no inland waterway project, the necessity or justification for which depends in whole or in part upon the purposes of navigation and transportation, shall be authorized until the Interstate Commerce Commission, after public hearing, shall have submitted a report to the Congress concerning the public convenience and necessity for the navigation and transportation features of the project."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the keystone of American trade and commerce, and indeed of life itself, is transportation; and the organizations commonly called common carriers constitute the backbone of American transportation. A common carrier is defined as one who holds himself out to transport for public hire.

A common carrier is a servant of the public, of rich and poor, great and small, alike. In order to function properly, common carriers must have highways and terminal facilities. To obtain these it is often necessary to endow the carrier with the power to take private property and exercise the sovereign power of eminent domain. Common carriers are therefore public-service organizations, endowed, by the State or Federal Governments, with certain governmental powers in the shape of exclusive franchise and other things.

It is necessary to protect the public from abuses by the carriers by regulation of the carriers. It is also necessary to restrict the number of carriers and the scope of their operation, in order to protect the carriers from each other. Too many carriers would be the ruination of all. A carrier must make a reasonable profit in order to exist. If the traffic available for movement is divided between too many, some, or all, of the carriers will fail financially.

In 1887, 58 years ago, Congress passed the Interstate Commerce Act. That law was quite simple, and relatively narrow in its jurisdiction, but it has now grown to enormous proportions. The group of laws now referred to as the Interstate Commerce Act fill 210 pages.

Part I of the act now deals with the railroads and general questions of carrier regulations. Part II deals basically with motor carriers. Part III deals with water carriers.

Part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, under section 1, subparagraph 18, provides:

No carrier by railroad subject to this part shall undertake the extension of its line of railroad, or the construction of a new line of railroad, or shall acquire or operate any line of railroad, or extension thereof, or shall engage in transportation under this part over or by means of such additional or extended line of railroad, unless and until there shall first have been obtained from the Commission a certificate that the present or future public convenience and necessity require or will require the construction, or operation, or construction and operation, of such additional or extended line of railroad, and no carrier by railroad subject to this part shall abandon all or any portion of a line of railroad, or the operation thereof, unless and until there shall first have been obtained from the Commission a certificate that the present or future public convenience and necessity permit of such abandonment.

In addition to this provision, the railroads are also regulated in every detail of their management and operation. Provision has been made in the act for almost every conceivable activity, and Congress is constantly amending and expanding the act.

Part II is equally complete and thorough in providing for regulation of all activities of motor carriers, and this regulation extends to all motor carriers for hire, except some very narrow exemptions which are too small to mention here.

However, when we turn to the most recent part of the Commerce Act, that is, part III, we find a definition under subsection 302 which reads in part, as follows:

The term "common carrier by water" means any person which holds itself out to the general public to engage in the transportation by water in interstate or foreign commerce of passengers or property or any class or classes thereof for compensation, except transportation by water by an express company subject to part I in the conduct of its express business, which shall be considered to be and shall be regulated as transportation subject to part I.

Turning further in the act, we find under section 303 a most extraordinary exemption has been granted to certain carriers, which reads as follows:

Nothing in this part shall apply to the transportation by a water carrier of commodities in bulk when the cargo space of the vessel in which such commodities are transported is being used for the carrying of not more than three such commodities. This subsection shall apply only in the case of commodities in bulk which are (in accordance with the existing custom of the trade in the handling and transportation of such commodities as of June 1, 1939) loaded and carried without wrappers or containers and received and delivered by the carrier without transportation mark or count. For the purposes of this subsection two or more vessels while navigated as a unit shall be considered to be a single vessel.

And further along in the same section we find another exemption which covers all craft of 100 tons or less carrying capacity:

To transportation by small craft of not more than 100 tons carrying capacity or not more than 100 indicated horsepower, or to vessels carrying passengers only and equipped to carry no more than 16 passengers, or to ferries, or to the movement by water carriers of contractors' equipment employed or to be employed in construction or repair for such water carrier, or to the operation of salvors.

This means that vessels can be operated on our inland waterways capable of carrying 10 large truck loads of general freight, or equal to 3 freight carloads, without regulations of any kind under the Commerce Act.

I also find another interesting section under part III of the act, which is section 309 subsection (d), which in substance says that those carriers to which certificates of "public convenience and necessity" have been granted shall, without further authority, have the right to operate immediately over any additional inland waterways authorized by Congress. In other words, the water carriers may expand like an octopus as fast as Congress builds inland waterways at the expense of the taxpayer.

When a public road is to be constructed an elaborate procedure must be followed, as set out by the statutes of the several States. First, to locate the route of the new road; secondly, to publish a notice to the taxpayers that such a highway is contemplated, and then appropriate proceedings must be instituted to see if the property owner objects to such a route.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the famous Pennsylvania turnpike, which has been a great boon to motorists. This turnpike is a wonderful public facility, but it is not free. The motorists must pay tolls, and I am informed that heavily laden trucks sometimes pay more than $50 for the privilege of traversing the 160 miles of that highway. I do not advocate that all highways should be toll highways, far from it, for in the final analysis most of these highways are paid for by the car or truck operator in the form of gasoline, license, and franchise taxes. I am informed that the automobile and truck operators of the United States, as a group, pay approximately the same amount of taxes in any given year as do the railroads of the country. Regardless of what the exact figures may be, it is sufficient to say that the taxes collected far exceed the total sums spent upon highways. The railroads, in turn, must build their own tracks and maintain them, and after the tracks have been constructed taxes must be paid.

Under the present set-up, water carriers may extend their operations subject only to the limitation of a water channel upon which to operate. There are no tolls and no gasoline taxes. Indeed, the largest towboats shown in the various marine waterway magazines are coal burners. The extraordinary exemption of carriers of bulk cargoes and the exemption of vessels of 100 tons carrying capacity, creates a most dangerous threat to the stability of the carriers of the United States.

I am informed, and so advised the Senate, during the Beaver-Mahoning debate, that in the year 1942 more than 800,000 tons of coal moved into the Youngstown, Ohio, district by motortrucks alone. Millions of tons moved in by railroad and part of that railroad movement was over the rails of a so-called private railroad and a few miles of an electric railroad, which undoubtedly is a carrier built without any authority from the Interstate Commerce Commission or the State of Ohio. However, this situation developed upon the ownership and control of a large coal company and not in conjunction with any legitimate motor or rail carrier system operating in interstate commerce. This story of disregard and disrespect for law can be found in volume 150 of the I. C. C. reports on pages 43 and 619, in connection with the application made to the Commission by the Pittsburgh, Lisbon & Western Railroad.

The amendment which I have proposed is direct, simple, and essential to the welfare of the transportation industry of the United States. There must be some definite and impartial control set up to determine just what inland waterways built at public expense are justified, and are really in the public interest.

It is certainly not within the province of the United States Army engineers to determine this question. It is unfair to place this burden upon the engineers. They are a group of highly trained technicians, men who have shown that they are competent to build anything at any time at any place, whenever our Government so directs.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is the best qualified and equipped Government organization, available at this time, to consider and recommend action upon new inland waterways. The Commission has vast resources in the shape of statistical records; it has experience and, above all, it is honest and its motives are unselfish. The integrity of the Interstate Commerce Commissioners, as a group, is beyond question. From time to time criticisms have been leveled at certain Commissioners, but when there is a group of 11 men it is almost impossible for all 11 to be blameless in the eyes of all persons at the same time. It is enough to say that the great majority of these 11 men are able, honest, and sincere. I hope the Senate will agree with me that Congress must have some impartial and competent advice on the question of constructing new inland waterways, because these waterways not only create substantial barriers to other and existing inland transportation, but they also carry the potential threat of destruction to other qualified carriers.

Last, but not least, I want to say to the Senate that I have yet to see a substantial demonstration of the financial feasibility of any of our recent inland waterways projects. I think that even the Army engineers would agree that if these works were properly capitalized and if a proper amount of taxes were included in the operating costs, not one of them would be worthy of serious consideration.

I am not proposing, and the amendment does not propose, to shut the door on any worthy project. I think that Congress should proceed as it has in the

past to investigate thoroughly and determine each particular case as it arises, but in the future let us have the impartial and helpful recommendation of the Interstate Commerce Commission concerning the economic status of projects under existing circumstances and their probable results as well.

Mr. President, I believe that the amendment I have proposed will achieve these results, and I ask most careful and favorable consideration of it by the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before the Senator takes his seat, I should like to ask him to comment on one phase of the matter which disturbs me. I entirely agree with the Senator's basic theme that we ought to have coordinated judgments in the development of our total transportation facilities. But, since the Interstate Commerce Commission historically has dealt almost exclusively with railroads, since its function primarily is to create adequate railroad rates, and to maintain them against exploitation, what has the Senator to say to the suggestion that the Interstate Commerce Commission might not be the independent judicial body which ought to be chosen to exercise this over-all control, because it might be very definitely weighted. I do not mean in any improper sense, but by historical character and by tradition and by habit it might be weighted in favor of railroad transportation as against water transportation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am glad the distinguished Senator from Michigan has asked that question. The railroads were the first and only consideration of the Interstate Commerce Commission. When the trucking companies began to operate on the highways of the Nation it was the Interstate Commerce Commission which supplied the certificates of convenience and necessity. I do not think there has been any undue favoring of the railroads against the trucking interests of the Nation, and I feel that the same situation would apply in consideration of the inland waterways. I see no reason why we should feel that the Interstate Commerce Commission would in any way favor either the railroads or the truckers as against the inland waterways.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Wyoming is that no navigation project shall hereafter be authorized by the Congress until after it has been submitted to the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Interstate Commerce Commission has conducted public hearings thereon and made a report as to public convenience and necessity.

I believe that a mere statement of the amendment is sufficient to carry the conviction that it should not be adopted. I know of no amendment which would more thoroughly clog the wheels of progress of navigation and the authorization of navigation projects than such an amendment as this.

The Senate is well aware of the infinite care with which these projects are investigated by the Army engineers. They have a division which looks into all the economics of a navigation project and its effect on navigation before it is reported upon. The Army engineers make a thorough and comprehensive study of each project and much more quickly than the Interstate Commerce Commission could do under the procedure suggested by the amendment.

It is well known that the Interstate Commerce Commission is far behind in its work. Under the Transportation Act of 1940 the inland waterway carriers now have at least 100 applications pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission, which have not been acted upon.

That overloaded and overburdened Commission could not possibly consider these projects and report upon them within any reasonable length of time. Take the projects in this bill. There are approximately 288 of them. They would have to be submitted to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and we would have to wait until it had determined whether or not there was public convenience and necessity. I am quite sure that Congress would not be able to act for a number of years, possibly 10 or 15 years. I hope that I have not fallen into a gross exaggeration in making that statement.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is a very slow-moving body. Furthermore, I do not believe that its approach to the subject would be from the proper angle. I think it would be thoroughly imbued with the thought of protecting the interests, or supposed interests, of the railroads, as against water-borne commerce. I am wondering why the able junior Senator from Wyoming did not suggest that no project be acted upon by Congress until it had been approved by the American Association of Railroads. The purpose of the amendment is simply to thwart and impede congressional action in respect to these projects. I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. WHITE suggested the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Cordon	Johnson, Calif.
Austin	Danaher	Johnson, Colo.
Bailey	Davis	Kilgore
Ball	Downey	La Follette
Bankhead	Ellender	Langer
Bilbo	Ferguson	Lucas
Brewster	George	McClellan
Brooks	Gerry	McFarland
Buck	Gillette	McKellar
Burton	Green	Maloney
Bushfield	Guffey	Maybank
Butler	Gurney	Millikin
Byrd	Hall	Murray
Capper	Hatch	Nye
Caraway	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Chandler	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Clark, Idaho	Hill	Overton
Clark, Mo.	Holman	Radcliffe
Connally	Jenner	Reed
Revercomb	Taft	Weeks
Reynolds	Thomas, Okla.	Wheeler
Robertson	Tunnell	Wherry
Russell	Tydings	White
Shipstead	Vandenberg	Wiley
Smith	Wagner	Willis
Stewart	Walsh	Wilson

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming on page 2, in line 16.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 45, after line 16, it is proposed to insert:

Santee-Congaree Buckingham Landing Site, S. C.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I accept the amendment. There is no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from South Carolina whether the amendment provides for a survey.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina is agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. It is a survey item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 50, between lines 23 and 24, it is proposed to insert "with a view to the protection of the shore line and repairs to the existing protective works on Lake Pontchartrain at Mandeville, La."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment to page 41 of the bill, which lies on the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 41, after line 25, it is proposed to add the following:

Ocean City Harbor and Inlet, and Sinepuxent Bay, Md.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, on page 42 I offer the amendment which lies on the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 42, line 11, after the word "Creek", it is proposed to insert "and Fresh Water Pond."

The amendment was agreed to.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN LANDS TO UINTAH AND OURAY RESERVATIONS, UTAH

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 837) to restore and add certain public lands to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah, and for other purposes, and requesting a con-

ference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HATCH. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HATCH, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. GURNEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

PLACING OF PORTION OF STATE OF IDAHO IN THIRD TIME ZONE

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1326, House bill 1997, to repeal section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say I understand there is no controversy at all in reference to the bill, and that it will be passed without debate.

Mr. STEWART. That is my understanding. I make the request in behalf of the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], who is ill. I have understood that there would be no controversy about it. The bill would affect only a portion of Idaho, and would move it into the third time zone. I had charge of the matter in the subcommittee, and the amendment to the bill was agreed to by both Senators from Idaho. They have telephoned me and asked that I request that the bill be considered and disposed of.

Mr. President, I ask for immediate consideration of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce with an amendment, on page 1, after line 2, to strike out:

That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 15, sec. 264), which provides for placing a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone, is hereby repealed.

And insert:

That beginning with the effective date of this act and for the duration of the period during which daylight saving time is in effect pursuant to the act entitled "An act to promote the national security and defense by establishing daylight saving time," approved January 20, 1942, so much of the State of Idaho as is now within the United States standard mountain time zone shall be part of the United States standard Pacific time zone. Upon the termination of such period such part of the State of Idaho shall again be within the United States standard mountain time zone.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill establishing Pacific standard time for that part of the State of Idaho now on mountain standard time, for the period during which daylight saving time is in effect."

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS

The Senate resumed the 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.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as stated yesterday, it is the desire of the proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway to reach a vote on the amendment at the earliest possible date. I do not desire on the part of the proponents of the amendment to delay the Senate in reaching a vote on the amendment and a final vote on the bill itself. Four Members of the Senate have expressed a desire to speak on the river and harbor bill, with particular reference to the inclusion in it of the St. Lawrence seaway amendment. I expected that one of them would be ready to make his speech at this time. However, I find that all four of them expect to speak tomorrow.

Therefore, Mr. President, I believe that now is a good time to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some material which I had expected to ask to have printed in the RECORD later as the debate drew near to a close. I know that when a project of the magnitude of the one proposed is suggested, people naturally want to know who is endorsing it. I had intended to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of the names of some of the persons who are proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway and power development. I expect that the opponents of the project will ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD lists of their own, because I realize that there are opponents of this great and worthy project, just as there are opponents of every worthy project which has ever been proposed. We know that when the Panama Canal was proposed opponents of the Canal successfully fought it for more than 30 years. We know that when the Suez Canal was proposed opponents of that canal opposed for 80 years its construction. We do not expect the opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway to last for 30 years or 80 years, but we realize that there are those who oppose its construction. We know that they represent a group of people similar in character to the group which opposed the extension of the railroads across the Plains and also the group which opposed the Sault Ste. Marie Canal being constructed in northern Michigan. Through that canal shipping has moved at the rate of 100,000,000 tons a year, even though the water there is frozen over for 4 or 5 months of the year.

The current interest in the St. Lawrence seaway began approximately 25 years ago. Between the early twenties and the early thirties various States of the Union began to promote jointly the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. I believe it would be interesting to the Senate to have printed in the RECORD the names of the States of the United States which made appropriations for the purpose of furthering the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. I believe that 21 States have taken such legislative action, and that 2 others have joined in the movement by executive action. The States which have supported the St. Lawrence seaway by legislative action are Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Montana, North Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, Wyoming, California, Idaho, Utah, Oregon, and West Virginia, where a great deal of coal is mined; Kentucky, where a great deal of coal also is mined, as well as Washington, a State in which a great deal of lumber is produced, the shippers of which would like the opportunity of shipping it directly to the cities of Chicago, Milwaukee, Detroit, and other eastern and Middle West cities. I must also include the State of South Dakota. Two States joined in the movement in the late 1920's by executive action. They were Missouri and South Carolina. Some of the States which I have named are continuing their appropriations even to this day for the purpose of promoting the St. Lawrence seaway. I believe the States which are continuing their appropriations are largely Western Plains States. A few years ago Vermont, my own State, organized the St. Lawrence Commission. It has not, however, functioned during recent years.

Recently, a great revival has taken place in public sentiment in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway and power development. During the past 15 or 20 years various organizations have kept alive the movement. During the depression there was very little activity on the part of those organizations, but this year there has been a substantial and determined movement to organize for the purpose of putting through this tremendous project, the development of the greatest natural resource in the world. Only last month, in November, about the time Congress convened, or shortly thereafter, there was organized in Detroit a committee of 49 men, as I recall the number, representing different trades, industries, and professions, from various parts of the country for the purpose of bringing about the St. Lawrence seaway development. I should like to read to the Senate at this time the names of the men who have organized for this purpose, because when I read them, every Senator will recognize the high caliber of those who are now asking Congress to authorize the St. Lawrence River development.

The name of the association is the National St. Lawrence Association. The officers are as follows:

Julius H. Barnes, president, of Duluth, Minn. Mr. Barnes will be remembered as the world wheat coordinator in World War No. 1, and as the close associate of President Hoover in a great many of his activities. Mr. Barnes was three times elected president of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

The executive vice president is William C. Cowling, of Detroit, Mich.

The secretary and treasurer is Mr. Allen Dean, of Detroit, Mich., the transportation manager of the Detroit Board of Commerce.

The other members of the committee are as follows:

Henry J. Allen, of Wichita, Kans., ex-Governor of Kansas.

Mr. F. A. Augsbury, president of the George Hall Corporation, Ogdensburg, N. Y.

Mr. H. E. Babcock, of Ithaca, N. Y. Perhaps H. E. Babcock does not mean so much as it would mean to say "Ed" Babcock, who was president of the Council of Farmer Cooperatives only 3 years ago, and has been one of the leading advocates of cooperation among farmers all over the United States. Mr. Babcock's name is known to every farmer in the whole United States, and he is a member of this committee organized to promote the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. John C. Beukema, of the Muskegon Chamber of Commerce, Muskegon, Mich.

Mr. H. E. Brockel, who is secretary of the Great Lakes Harbors Association, of Milwaukee.

Mr. Manferd Burleigh, president of the Great Lakes Greyhound Corporation, Detroit, Mich.

Mr. E. B. Crosby, president of the Northern Federation of Chambers of Commerce, Massena, N. Y.

Then we come to a publisher, Mr. John Cowles, publisher of the Des Moines Register-Tribune, Look Magazine, and other publications, of Des Moines, Iowa.

Mr. James E. Davidson, a shipbuilder, of Bay City, Mich.

Mr. Cyrus Eaton, well known in steel and railroad circles, and president of Otis & Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. Marshall Field III, owner of the Chicago Sun, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. Henry Ford II, executive vice president of the Ford Motor Co., Detroit, Mich.

Mr. Julius Frank, president, Frank's Department Store, Ogdensburg, N. Y.

Mr. F. J. Freestone, ex-chairman of the executive committee of the National Grange, and a member of the New York State Power Authority, Syracuse, N. Y.

Mr. Roy W. Gifford, who is vice president of the Norge Division of the Borg-Warner Corporation, of Detroit, Mich.

Mr. George E. Hardy, of the Ohio Waterways Commission, Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. Walter Havighurst, of Miami University, and author of Long Ships Passings, of Oxford, Ohio.

Mr. Daniel W. Hoan, president of the Great Lakes Harbors Association, and many times mayor of the city of Milwaukee, Wis.

Mr. Rollo F. Hunt, chairman of the Minnesota Tidewater Commission, Duluth, Minn.

Mr. Perry W. Jenkins, Wyoming director of the National Reclamation Association, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Mr. Harold B. Johnson, publisher of the Watertown Times, Watertown, N. Y.

Mr. D. S. Kiskadden, vice president and manager of the Buhl Land Co., Detroit, Mich.

Mr. Arnold Leraan, president of the Marine Iron & Shipbuilding Co., Duluth, Minn.

Mr. Murray D. Lincoln, secretary of the Ohio State Farm Bureau, Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Lincoln is one of the best-known men in farm-cooperative circles today, if not the best known. It was through Mr. Lincoln's efforts that the Ohio Mutual Farm Bureau Automobile Insurance Co. was built up until it is, I think, the fourth or fifth in size among all the mutual automobile insurance companies in the country today. Certainly Mr. Lincoln is known the world over for his work with cooperatives, and now he is working just as hard to get the St. Lawrence seaway developed, because he knows the tremendous benefits which will flow to the farmers of all the central part of the United States.

Mr. William Loeb, publisher of the Burlington Daily News, Burlington, Vt.

Mr. A. L. Lott, president of the Motor Products Corporation, of Detroit, Mich.

Mr. Seth Marshall, president of Marshall-Wells Co., Duluth, Minn.

Mr. P. R. Moore, president of Klearflax Linen Looms, Inc., Duluth, Minn.

Mr. Albert P. Newell, president of the Newell Manufacturing Co., Ogdensburg, N. Y.

Mr. Edward J. Noble, chairman of the Blue Network, New York City.

Mr. C. J. Reese, president of Continental Motors, Detroit, Mich.

Then there is another publisher, Mr. Bernard Ridder, publisher of the Pioneer Press, St. Paul, Minn.

Mr. T. Mel Rinehart, president of the Highland Oil Corporation, of Detroit.

Another publisher, Gideon Seymour, vice president and executive director, Star Journal and Tribune, Minneapolis, Minn.

George R. Shafer, ex-Governor of the State of North Dakota, Bismarck, N. Dak.

Sydney Smith, president, Anchor Storage Co., Chicago, Ill.

P. H. Stevens, president, Commercial Securities Co., Gary, Ind.

In passing, let me remark that the city of Gary, Ind., is officially on record as requesting the Congress to authorize the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. The nearby city of Valparaiso, Ind., is also on record as approving the seaway.

Mr. W. A. Stinchcomb, director of the Cleveland Metropolitan Park District, Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. C. B. Thomas, president, Chrysler Export Co., Highland Park, Mich.

Another ex-Governor, Mr. Murray D. Van Waggoner, ex-Governor of the State of Michigan, Detroit.

Mr. Oscar Webber, vice president and general manager, J. L. Hudson Co., Detroit, Mich.

Another publisher, Mr. William L. White, publisher of the Emporia Gazette, Emporia, Kans.

Also Mr. Harold Wilde, editor of the Great Lakes Outlook, Milwaukee, Wis.

Mr. N. A. Woodworth, president of the N. A. Woodworth Co., Ferndale, Mich.

Mr. Fred M. Young, president, Young Radiator Co., Racine, Wis.

And, finally, Mr. Frank A. Seiberling, of the Seiberling Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

Certainly, Mr. President, no one who reads this list of 49 men who have joined together in a concerted effort to secure the approval of the St. Lawrence seaway and power development by the Congress, can say that the proposal emanates from the lunatic fringe, because every one of them is a substantial and successful man in his own business. In fact, they are among the most successful of the businessmen of this whole country.

I read in that list the names of two ex-Governors, one from North Dakota and one from Michigan. I wish to say that there are many Governors of the States at the present time who are actively supporting the seaway. Perhaps the best known of these is Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, the titular head of the Republican Party, so that the heads of both the Republican and the Democratic Parties of this country are very definitely in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway and power development. Both Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Dewey have reiterated their support of this project time and time and time again. When I spoke in Detroit in late October I received messages from both of them to be delivered to members of the Adcraft Club and the board of commerce before whom I spoke, again reiterating their support of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

Mr. President, I have with me two letters from Governors. I have others at my office, but not with me on the floor. I should have inserted these two letters in the RECORD some time ago but did not do so. They are both dated June 10, 1944, and both Governors had thought that hearings on the St. Lawrence bill would be held before the Committee on Commerce about that time. It seems they were in error in that respect. The first letter which I wish to read into the RECORD is from Gov. Edward J. Thye, of the State of Minnesota. Governor Thye wrote me on June 10, 1944, as follows:

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: On behalf of the State of Minnesota, I strongly support Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN's bill (S. 1385) for legislation approving the agreement reached between our Government and the Dominion of Canada for the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence power and navigation project.

Minnesota has officially supported this project for 25 years.

In 1941, when hearings were had on similar legislation before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House, Gov. Harold E. Stassen, of Minnesota, appeared and testified, as appears in the record of those hearings. I heartily endorse everything that Governor Stassen said at those hearings.

We believe that this project is comparable to the Panama Canal in economic importance to this Nation. It is hard to believe, that with a natural waterway from the Atlantic seaboard to the heart of this continent, which, with the improvement of a comparatively small section of 48 miles in length, would make it navigable for 80 percent or more of all oceangoing shipping, we have not yet removed this barrier. Water transportation is and will always be the cheapest transportation. In our great area of wheat producing, and dairy and farm products, with a population of some 40,000,000 people, the economic development of this Nation makes it imperative that we have the full advantage of the water transportation

which nature has provided. To deprive the great section of this Nation tributary to the Great Lakes of the fullest development of this natural watercourse is to deprive it of its natural right to development and progress. The importance of this development is emphasized by conditions brought about by the present war, when railroad facilities are taxed to the utmost. It would enable us to lay down the products of this great area on the Atlantic seaboard at a great saving in cost to the people living in the congested areas of the eastern portion of this Nation, and also furnish us with cheaper transportation to the markets of the world. While we know that it would greatly benefit the area in which we live, we know that it would also benefit the entire country.

As a part of the war effort, Great Lakes shipyards have contributed substantially to the urgency of increasing our shipping facilities. We have been building oceangoing vessels in the heart of this continent, in an area most secure of any from coastal war danger and attack. If the St. Lawrence waterway were completed, we could build in this haven of comparative safety all warships short of battleship size. With the congestion of coastal shipyards, the advantages of the full use of this waterway would have been of vast consequence in the war effort.

It is my sincere hope that the Congress of the United States, looking at this great project from its national aspect and importance, will no longer permit any delay in its development.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. THYE,
Governor.

Mr. President, I wish to read a letter from Hon. John Moses, Governor of North Dakota. The letter is dated Bismarck, N. Dak., June 7, 1944. At that time Governor Moses was in this city to attend hearings of the Rivers and Harbors Committee. The letter is as follows:

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
June 7, 1944.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

Re: St. Lawrence waterway project.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: I understand that S. 1385, relating to the St. Lawrence waterway project, is due to be considered by the subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee on June 12.

That assumption on his part was wrong. It appears that the chairman of the Commerce Committee was still asking for reports from departments on June 26.

On July 3, 1941, the writer had occasion to appear before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives, in support of this project, speaking in behalf of the State of North Dakota, which has constantly advocated this development for more than 20 years. I should like to reiterate my unqualified endorsement of this measure at this time, and to recommend its prompt adoption by the Congress.

An early completion of this waterway development would not only bring ocean commerce into the heart of America, which is now landlocked, but it would provide much needed power for industrial purposes in the East. In order to fully utilize the agricultural, industrial, and water resources of the great midwestern area of the United States in the post-war period, and to speed the economic rehabilitation of the Nation, it is essential, in my judgment, that this project be included in the Government's post-war waterway-development program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN MOSES, *Governor.*

I have received letters from the Governor of North Dakota and the Governor of Minnesota. I also have favorable letters from Gov. E. P. Carville, of Nevada, as well as from the Governors of several of our Southern States, who do not take the selfish attitude that in order to build up the South they must tear down the North. I am very glad that these southern Governors from whom I have heard take that attitude. It is certainly fair of them to do so.

Besides the governors, we have endorsements from innumerable mayors of cities. I have a strong letter of endorsement of this project from Mayor Jeffries, of Detroit, and from the mayors of many of the cities of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. One of the strongest advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway and power development is Mayor LaGuardia, of New York. Mayor Kelly, of Chicago, has also been a strong advocate of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

Chambers of commerce all over the North Central part of the United States are on record as favoring the development of the seaway. Notable among them is the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Toledo, Ohio. It seems that the attitude of the officials of that city was somewhat questioned as to whether the city favored the seaway or not, so a poll was taken of the members of the chamber of commerce. Several hundred responded to the poll, and there was a decisive vote in favor of the development of the seaway. Other Ohio cities have also endorsed the seaway, notably the city of Lorain, Ohio, the largest coal-shipping city on the Great Lakes.

Mr. President, besides the support of civic bodies, mayors, Governors, chambers of commerce, and others who have favored the seaway as individuals, as groups, or as businessmen, it has the unqualified support of most of the farm interests of the country. Time and again the National Grange has adopted resolutions favoring the construction of the St. Lawrence development. At Grand Rapids last year it adopted a very strong resolution. At Winston-Salem this year it reiterated the resolution which it adopted in 1943. That resolution was inserted in the RECORD by the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] day before yesterday, I believe.

The Farmers' Union has consistently favored the St. Lawrence seaway development. So far as I know, the Farm Bureau Federation has never taken action on it as a national organization; but in a great many cases State organizations of farm bureaus have adopted resolutions favoring the St. Lawrence seaway. I do not remember offhand the names of all the farm organizations in the various States which have taken this position, but I know that there are a great many of them. Iowa has been particularly insistent on the part of its farm bureaus. The Kansas Farm Bureau supports the seaway. Farm Bureau organizations in South Dakota, Minnesota, Wyoming, and, I believe, Utah, also favor it. I know that my own Farm Bureau in Vermont very strongly supports the seaway, as does the Vermont State Grange. Cooperatives all over the United States are supporting the seaway project.

I have before me a list of labor unions which are supporting the great St. Lawrence seaway and power development. Before I go into that, let me say that additional letters from governors have just been handed to me. I should like to insert those in the RECORD before I come to the labor unions. More than 700 labor unions in the United States, from almost every State in the Union, including Louisiana, have endorsed the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Before I begin with that list, I should like to read additional letters from prominent citizens.

I hold in my hand a letter from Hon. Walter S. Goodland, Acting Governor of Wisconsin. I wrote to him asking his attitude. The first two letters which I read were written voluntarily, without solicitation. However, I wrote to several other governors asking what their position was. I read the letter from Acting Governor Goodland of Wisconsin:

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
MADISON, *October 10, 1944.*

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: I am in receipt of your letter of September 15, together with materials concerning the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

As you know, the record and history of Wisconsin with respect to the project has been favorable. The State, by legislative enactment and the appropriation of funds with which to promote acceptance of the project, is on record as being favorable.

A deep waterways commission was created by legislative enactment to cooperate with other States in promoting the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway. The commission, until recently, maintained a paid representative in Washington. Personally, I have always looked with favor on the movement to link the Great Lakes with the ocean.

In order that we here in Wisconsin may be better informed, I am taking steps to secure the services of a competent man to serve ex officio on the deep waterways commission as consultant, in addition to studies already made by the Department of Agriculture. I am asking that careful surveys be made of the possible future effect on Wisconsin industries and economy in order that we can act more intelligently on the matter.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER S. GOODLAND,
Acting Governor.

Mr. President, I now hold in my hand a letter from Hon. Sidney P. Osborn, Governor of Arizona, dated September 23, 1944. His letter reads as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE, STATEHOUSE,
Phoenix, Ariz., September 23, 1944.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: I wish to thank you for your letter of September 15 and for the material which you dispatched to me under separate cover dealing with the St. Lawrence project.

Geographic remoteness and relative unfamiliarity with the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project preclude my adding any useful comment to your coverage of the matter. I am, however, well aware that Arizona's senior Senator, CARL HAYDEN, has endorsed the project and I have every confidence in his judgment on the matter.

We in this State are notably interested in our own problems of water and power from the Colorado River. As you know, we have recently completed the contract with the Secretary of the Interior for the delivery of all the water from the Colorado available to us under the law and are informed that the United States Reclamation Service has made substantial progress in its surveys which will result in the setting up of projects to bring that water onto our desert acres. Arizona's future development is dependent upon the successful conclusion of these matters, although we are fully aware that prosperity, like peace, is indivisible, and consequently we are ever interested in such projects as that about which you write.

Thank you again for your letter and with every good wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY P. OSBORN,
Governor.

Mr. President, I think it is fine to receive a letter from the Governor of Arizona expressing appreciation of the fact that what concerns the welfare of the part of the United States farthest from his State also concerns the welfare of Arizona itself.

I now hold in my hand a letter from the Governor of Georgia, Hon. Ellis Arnall, dated September 19, 1944. It reads as follows:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Atlanta, September 19, 1944.

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: Acknowledgment is made with thanks for your good letter of September 15 relative to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

While I am not familiar with the details and plans of this project, information which I have received indicates to me that this is a very worth-while post-war project.

The T. V. A. in the South has certainly meant much to this section of the Union.

With highest regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ELLIS ARNALL,
Governor.

I now have before me a letter, which I mentioned previously, from the Governor of Nevada. It reads, in part, as follows:

THE STATE OF NEVADA,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Carson City, October 2, 1944.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter of September 15, together with a copy of S. 1385, introduced by you, authorizing the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power projects.

I am in accord with this legislation but there is one matter with which I am particularly concerned. I do not know whether this would come up in connection with your bill, but I am very anxious that no legislation be passed that would in any way affect the vested water rights of the Western States and the ownership of the water by the States. Of course, we do not have a great many navigable rivers, but by a recent United States Supreme Court decision it might be construed that any river that would float the smallest boat would be a navigable stream.

Further on in the letter he states, in discussing another matter:

I am sure that the St. Lawrence development would be of unlimited value to the Southern States, and I shall be pleased to help in connection with this matter if I am assured that the western water rights will not be affected in any way.

With my best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

E. P. CARVILLE,
Governor.

Mr. President, it seems to me that in the closing paragraph of Governor Carville's letter he means to refer to the fact that the St. Lawrence development will be of unlimited value to the Northern States. Perhaps the use of the words "Southern States" is a typographical error.

Let me say in connection with the letter that western water rights will not be affected in any way. I think western water rights have been satisfactorily protected under the provisions of the flood-control bill which the Senate has passed, and that they will be protected in the pending river and harbor bill.

I now come to a list of approximately 700 labor unions which have endorsed the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Some of them are international unions. Some are State organizations. Many of them are local labor unions. It is interesting to note that 62 labor unions in the city of Buffalo, which is supposed to be opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway, have endorsed it; 62 labor unions in that one city have endorsed the seaway.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note that, although the Chamber of Commerce of Schenectady, N. Y., has gone on record as being opposed to the seaway, the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers Union of Schenectady, with a membership of 22,000 workers—a very large percentage of the workingmen of Schenectady—and many other unions in Schenectady are on record as approving the seaway. There seems to be a difference of opinion between management and employees in that case, because I assume the members of the chamber of commerce are employers, to a great extent.

The following unions have endorsed the project between 1941 and the present time and, as I have said, they represent almost every State in the Union:

Name	Membership	Local	Affiliation
Aluminum Workers of America	1,500	26	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Chicago, Ill.
Do	7,500	2	Congress of Industrial Organizations, New Kensington, Pa.
Do		10	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Cincinnati, Ohio.
United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers		(1)	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Detroit, Mich.

[1] International.

As we all know, that is one of the largest unions in the United States, if not the largest. I do not know what its relative rank is.

I continue to read from the list:

Name	Membership	Local	Affiliation
United Auto Workers	40	864	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Medina, N. Y.
United Automobile Workers of America	200	364	American Federation of Labor, Milwaukee, Wis.
Awning, Canvas, and Display Decorators	150	34	American Federation of Labor, Detroit, Mich.
Bakery and Confectionery Workers (joint executive board of Greater New York and vicinity).	25,000	(1)	American Federation of Labor, New York City.

[1] 49 locals.

Incidentally, I should like to say, and I am sure the Senate will be interested in this matter, that the largest number of labor unions in any State which have endorsed the St. Lawrence seaway is found in the State of Massachusetts. Included in the list from which I am reading are the names of approximately 117 labor unions in the State of Massachusetts which have endorsed the St. Lawrence project. Somewhat less than 100 labor unions in New York and a similar number in Wisconsin have also endorsed the project. The other unions which have endorsed the project are scattered among the other States. Some of the unions, such as those in Colorado, Iowa, and Vermont, have endorsed it on a State-wide scale, not by locals.

I continue to read from the list:

Name	Membership	Local	Affiliation
Bakery and Confectionery Workers	1,500	348	American Federation of Labor, Cambridge, Mass.
Do	83	339	American Federation of Labor, Green Bay, Wis.
Do	400	165	American Federation of Labor, Paterson, N. J.
Barbers and Beauty Culturists		1	Congress of Industrial Organizations, New York City.
Barbers Union	200	894	American Federation of Labor, Chelsea, Mass.
Journeymen Barbers	55	331	American Federation of Labor, Fall River, Mass.
Do	225	224	American Federation of Labor, Providence, R. I.
Bartenders Union	63	114	American Federation of Labor, Pittsfield, Mass.
Do	32	275	American Federation of Labor, Gardner, Mass.
Do	31	463	American Federation of Labor, Hibbing, Minn.
Do	43	231	International Falls, Minn.
Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers and Helpers	26		American Federation of Labor, Duluth, Minn.
Blue Island Central Labor Union			
Boilermakers	200	304	American Federation of Labor, Boston, Mass.
Do	16		American Federation of Labor, Kaukauna, Wis.
Bookbinders	150	16	American Federation of Labor, Boston, Mass.
Do	75		American Federation of Labor, New Orleans, La.
Bindery Workers	500	20	American Federation of Labor, Detroit, Mich.
Brewery Workers	420	59	American Federation of Labor, New York City.
Bricklayers, Masons and Plasterers	30	11	American Federation of Labor, Sheboygan, Wis.
Bricklayers, Masons, Marble Masons	700	8	American Federation of Labor, Milwaukee, Wis.
Bricklayers, Masons, Tile Layers and Block Layers	75	3	American Federation of Labor, Duluth, Minn.
United Brick and Clay Workers	60	778	American Federation of Labor, Dearborn, Mich.
Do	25,000		American Federation of Labor, Chicago, Ill.
International Association of Bridge, Structural and Ornamental Iron Workers		455	American Federation of Labor, New York City.
Do	900	25	American Federation of Labor, Detroit, Mich.
Do	200	563	American Federation of Labor, Duluth, Minn.
Building Service Employees International Union	1,000	150	American Federation of Labor, Milwaukee, Wis.
Calumet Joint Labor Council			American Federation of Labor, Chicago, Ill.
Cambridge Central Labor Union		(1)	American Federation of Labor, Cambridge, Mass.
United Brotherhood of Carpenters	82	926	American Federation of Labor, Beloit, Wis.
Do	2,000	314	American Federation of Labor, Madison, Wis.
Do	16	2994	American Federation of Labor, Plymouth, Wis.
Do	2,800	55	American Federation of Labor, Denver, Colo.
Carpenters Union	730	787	American Federation of Labor, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Do	978	488	American Federation of Labor, New York City.
Carpenters and Joiners	436		American Federation of Labor, East Weymouth, Mass.
Do	260	1550	American Federation of Labor, South Weymouth, Mass.
Do	510	1433	American Federation of Labor, Detroit, Mich.
Do	27	2351	American Federation of Labor, Rhinelander, Wis.
Do	60	1246	American Federation of Labor, Marinette, Wis.
Do	799	1053	American Federation of Labor, Milwaukee, Wis.
Do	150	1488	American Federation of Labor, Merrill, Wis.
Do	275	1594	American Federation of Labor, Wausau, Wis.
Do	118	1521	American Federation of Labor, Algoma, Wis.
Do	275	1074	American Federation of Labor, Eau Claire, Wis.
Do	175	161	American Federation of Labor, Kenosha, Wis.
Do	306	1577	American Federation of Labor, West Allis, Wis.
Do	88	1900	American Federation of Labor, Kewaunee, Wis.
Do	160	657	American Federation of Labor, Sheboygan, Wis.
Do	160	1382	American Federation of Labor, Rochester, Minn.
Do	1,500	87	American Federation of Labor, St. Paul, Minn.
Carpenters, North Shore	1,500		American Federation of Labor, Salem, Mass.
Carpenters		885	American Federation of Labor, Woburn, Mass.
Do	275	778	American Federation of Labor, Fitchburg, Mass.
Do	1,500	176	American Federation of Labor, Newport, R. I.

[1] 54 locals.

The carpenters and builders unions are particularly interested in this development because they realize the tremendous need for new homes which would ensue. They realize that not only would there be town homes to be built where small industries would be maintained or increased, but that thousands upon thousands of homes would be built for persons who live in other States and who maintain summer homes up in the hills, as they very properly should be.

Name	Membership	Local	Affiliation
Shop Carpenters	33	1092	American Federation of Labor, Salem Depot, N. H.
Carpenters' District Council	4,000		American Federation of Labor, Milwaukee, Wis.
Cabinet Makers' and Millmen's Union	135	1284	American Federation of Labor, Duluth, Minn.
United Celotex Workers	2,000	1189	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Marrero, La.
United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Workers	158	177	American Federation of Labor, Bay Bridge, Ohio.
Do	95	174	American Federation of Labor, Louisville, Nebr.
Do	30,000	(1)	American Federation of Labor, Chicago, Ill.
Do	151	55	American Federation of Labor, West Conshohocken, Pa.
Do	263	19	American Federation of Labor, St. Louis, Mo.
Do	142	165	American Federation of Labor, Coldwater, Mich.
Do	450		American Federation of Labor, St. Louis, Mo.
Do	140	65	American Federation of Labor, Howes Cave, N. Y.
Do	162	25	American Federation of Labor, Concrete, Wash.
Do	423	92	American Federation of Labor, Bellefonte, Pa.
Do	105	101	American Federation of Labor, Devils Slide, Utah.
Do	262	5	American Federation of Labor, Dewey, Okla.
Do	550	8	American Federation of Labor, Bangor, Pa.
Do	728	115	American Federation of Labor, Northampton, Pa.
Do	280	17	American Federation of Labor, Nazareth, Pa.
Do	165	173	American Federation of Labor, Wampum, Pa.
Do	191	30	American Federation of Labor, Mitchell, Ind.
Do	449	107	American Federation of Labor, St. Louis, Mo.
Do	125	190	American Federation of Labor, Fort Collins, Colo.
Do	272	164	American Federation of Labor, Cape Girardeau, Mo.
Do	250	2	American Federation of Labor, Gardendale, Ala.
Do	94	75	American Federation of Labor, Fredonia, Kans.
Do	265	6	American Federation of Labor, Buffalo, Iowa.
Do	135	31	American Federation of Labor, Union Bridge, Md.
Do	165	179	American Federation of Labor, York, Pa.
Do	135	35	American Federation of Labor, Thomaston, Maine.
Central Labor Council of New Haven	15,000		American Federation of Labor, New Haven, Conn.
Central Labor Council of Fort Atkinson, Wis., and vicinity	1,100	(2)	American Federation of Labor, Fort Atkinson, Wis.
Central Labor Union of Wisconsin, Rapids, Wis	3,500		American Federation of Labor, Point Edwards, Wis.

[1] International.
[2] 11 locals.

Name	Membership	Local	Affiliation
Chasers Protective Union	50	17388	American Federation of Labor, New York City.
Chicago Federation of Labor			Chicago, Ill.
Chicago Heights Trades and Labor Assembly			Do.
South Chicago Trades and Labor Assembly			Do.
Citizens Lobby (Boston)		(3 4 5)	Boston, Mass.
City and County Public Service Union (Duluth)	600	66	American Federation of Labor, Duluth, Minn.
Retail Clerks	138	27	Superior, Wis.
Do	400	11150	American Federation of Labor, New York City.
Amalgamated Clothing	300,000	(1)	Congress of Industrial Organizations, New York City.
Do		169	Do.
Do	2,100	24	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Newark, N. J.
Do	10,000	(6)	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Boston, Mass.
Do	1,350	280	Congress of Industrial Organizations, New York City.
Do	4,500		Congress of Industrial Organizations, Passaic, N. J.
Do	600	186	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Kingston, N. Y.
International Ladies' Garment Workers Union	250,000	(1)	American Federation of Labor.
Do	425	101	American Federation of Labor, San Francisco, Calif.
Do	85,000	(7)	American Federation of Labor, New York City.
Do	27,000	22	Do.
Do		144	American Federation of Labor, Newark, N. J.
Do		150	American Federation of Labor, South River, N. J.
Do		(8)	American Federation of Labor, Boston, Mass.
Do		(9)	American Federation of Labor, Cleveland, Ohio.
Do		113	American Federation of Labor, Peoria, Ill.
Do		329	American Federation of Labor, St. Louis, Mo.
Do		20	American Federation of Labor, New York City.
Do		323	American Federation of Labor, Richmond, Mo.
Do	3,000	105	American Federation of Labor, New York City.
Do		23	Do.
Do	100	75	American Federation of Labor, Worcester, Mass.
Do	550		American Federation of Labor, Detroit, Mich.

[1] International.
[3] 25 American Federation of Labor unions.
[4] 35 Congress of Industrial Organizations unions.
[5] 60 civic organizations.
[6] Joint board.
[7] Joint board, 32 locals.
[8] Joint board, 7 locals.
[9] Joint board, 11 locals.

The St. Lawrence seaway project seems to be one thing upon which the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the International Ladies' Garment Workers appear to be absolutely agreed. I continue to read:

Name	Membership	Local	Affiliation
United Garment Workers	391	126	American Federation of Labor, Oshkosh, Wis.
Do	58	148	American Federation of Labor, Green Bay, Wis.
Colorado State Federation	60,000	(1)	American Federation of Labor, Denver, Colo.
American Communications Association	400	2	Congress of Industrial Organizations, New York City.
Riverside Consumers Cooperative			Buffalo, N. Y.
Brookline-Brighton Consumer League	30		Brookline, Mass.
United Construction Workers	798	91	Congress of Industrial Organizations, New York City.
Building and Construction Trades	10,000		American Federation of Labor, Kansas City, Mo.
Building and Construction Trades, Council, LaCrosse and vicinity, Wisconsin	1,000		LaCrosse, Wis.
Building and Construction Trades, Council, Minneapolis, Minn	10,000		American Federation of Labor, Minneapolis, Minn.
Dairy Workers	170	22139	American Federation of Labor, Detroit, Mich.
Dairy and Bakery Workers	335	87	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Saginaw, Mich.
Milk Drivers and Dairy Employees	105	511	American Federation of Labor, Kenosha, Wis.
United Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Employees			Congress of Industrial Organizations, New York City.
Do		104	Do.
Do	2,000	1250	Do.
Do	1,500	2	Do.
Do	400	4	Do.
Do	200	305	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Mount Vernon, N. Y.
Do		18	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Philadelphia, Pa.
Do	123	290	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Newark, N. J.
Do	800	15	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Chicago, Ill.
Do	4,000		Congress of Industrial Organizations, St. Louis, Mo.
Do	700	250	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Long Island City, N. Y.
Do	220	84	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Providence, R. I.
Do	1,000	543	Congress of Industrial Organizations, St. Louis, Mo.
Do	265	310	Do.
United Store Workers	25	152	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Ebensburg, Pa.
Retail Clothing Salesmen	75	1050	American Federation of Labor, Detroit, Mich.
Detroit and Wayne County Federation of Labor			Do.
Duluth school employees	126	956	American Federation of Labor, Duluth, Minn.
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers	11	1222	American Federation of Labor, Denver, Colo.
Do		3	American Federation of Labor, New York City.
Do		817	Do.
Do	70	B1026	American Federation of Labor, Malden, Mass.
Do	80	764	American Federation of Labor, Keene, N. H.
Do	65	294	American Federation of Labor, Hibbing, Minn.
Do	80	610	American Federation of Labor, Philadelphia, Pa.
Do	1,050	326	American Federation of Labor, Lawrence, Mass.
Do	28	B1046	American Federation of Labor, Bridgeport, Conn.
Do	554	B1063	American Federation of Labor, Detroit, Mich.
Do	160	B1050	Do.
Do	1,100	B160	American Federation of Labor, Minneapolis, Minn.
Do	54	696	American Federation of Labor, New Iberia, La.
Electrical Workers	142	B437	American Federation of Labor, Fall River, Mass.
Do	450	B130	American Federation of Labor, New Orleans, La.
Do	1,500	58	American Federation of Labor, Detroit, Mich.
United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers	22,000	301	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Schenectady, N. Y.
Do	6,500	1225	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Do	5,000	232	Congress of Industrial Organizations, New Britain, Conn.
Do	3,000	203	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Bridgeport, Conn.
Do	700	308	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Tonawanda, N. Y.
Do	1,000	316	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Buffalo, N. Y.
Do	450	307	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Jamestown, N. Y.
Do	10,000	475	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Brooklyn, N. Y.

[1] State federation.

Name	Membership	Local	Affiliation
International Union of Elevator Constructors	150	36	American Federation of Labor, Detroit, Mich.
Do	55	15	American Federation of Labor, Milwaukee, Wis.
International Union of Operating Engineers	40	352	American Federation of Labor, Lowell, Mass.
Do			American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C.
Do	65	100	American Federation of Labor, Providence, R. I.
Do	2,440	(2)	American Federation of Labor, Milwaukee, Wis.
Do	700	311, 311A	Do.
Do	4,000	150	American Federation of Labor, Chicago, Ill.
Do	300	327	American Federation of Labor, Detroit, Mich.
Do	1,500	15	American Federation of Labor, New York City.
Do	26	336	American Federation of Labor, Battle Creek, Mich.
Do	5,500	18	American Federation of Labor, Cleveland, Ohio.
Do	12	780	American Federation of Labor, Kenosha, Wis.
Do	1,500	49	American Federation of Labor, Minneapolis, Minn.
New York Regional Council of United Federal Workers	5,000	(3)	Congress of Industrial Organizations, New York City.
Federal Labor Union	16	22869	American Federation of Labor, Winona, Minn.
Do	361	18518	American Federation of Labor, Chicopee, Mass.
Do	165	20582	American Federation of Labor, Springfield, Mass.
Do	130	18545	American Federation of Labor, Sheboygan, Wis.
Do	325	20690	American Federation of Labor, Warsaw, Wis.
Uniform Firemen's Association	500	82	American Federation of Labor, Minneapolis, Minn.
International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers	85	937	International Falls, Minn.
Mankato Fire Fighters Association	18	579	American Federation of Labor, Mankato, Minn.
Winona Fire Fighters Association	33	575	Winona, Minn.
Red Wing Fire Fighters	11	599	Red Wing, Minn.
United Retail and Wholesale Food	28	315	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Atlanta, Ga.
Fur Dyers Union		80	Congress of Industrial Organizations, New York City.
Fancy Fur Dyers Union		88	Do.
Fur Floor and Shipping Clerks		125	Do.
Fur Merchants Employees		64	Do.
Fur and Leather (leather handlers)	75	308	American Federation of Labor, Boston, Mass.
Lamb and Rabbit Workers		85	Congress of Industrial Organizations, New York City.
Fur Workers	50	94	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Duluth, Minn.
International Fur and Leather Workers			Congress of Industrial Organizations, New York City.
Do	65	89	Congress of Industrial Organizations, St. Louis, Mo.
Do	65	240	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Emporium, Pa.
Do	1,100	201	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Wilmington, Del.
New Haven Fur Workers Union	50	84	Congress of Industrial Organizations, New Haven, Conn.
United Furniture Workers	2,000	154	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Gardner, Mass.
Upholsterers International Union of North America	50,000		American Federation of Labor, Philadelphia, Pa.
Garage Washers and Polishers	5,800	272	American Federation of Labor, New York City.
Glaziers Union	550	1087	Do.
American Federation of Grain Processors	250	19199	American Federation of Labor, Superior, Wis.
Do	1,700	19152	American Federation of Labor, Minneapolis, Minn.
Hat Workers Union	2,500	60	American Federation of Labor, Philadelphia, Pa.
United Hatters	150	29	American Federation of Labor, Fall River, Mass.
United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery	300	11	American Federation of Labor Danbury, Conn.
United Hatters	27	1	Do.
Do	80	100	American Federation of Labor, Michigan City, Ind.
International Hod Carriers and Common Laborers Union	400	363	American Federation of Labor, Minneapolis, Minn.
Do	80	1,107	American Federation of Labor, New London, Wis.
Do	400	317	American Federation of Labor, Eau Clair, Wis.
Do	604	29	American Federation of Labor, New York City.
Laborers District Council of Milwaukee and Vicinity	4,000	(4)	American Federation of Labor, Milwaukee, Wis.
International Laborers Local (Hod Carriers)	5,000	334	American Federation of Labor, Detroit, Mich.
Hotel and Restaurant Waiters and Waitresses Union		2	American Federation of Labor, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Hotel and Restaurant	300	164	American Federation of Labor, Hempstead, L. I.
Waiters Union	3,500	1	American Federation of Labor, New York City.
Chain Service Employees	3,000	42	Do.
Cooks, Countermen, Soda Dispensers	3,000	325	American Federation of Labor, Brooklyn, N. Y.

[2] Wisconsin State.
[3] 16 locals.
[4] District Council B39.

Unions representing practically every line of work in the whole United States have endorsed the seaway. Sometimes I think the members of the unions have a clearer vision of what is ahead of us and what our needs will be than have others who have been very eminently successful in life, and are perfectly satisfied to let things remain as they are. The list continues:

Name	Membership	Local	Affiliation
Culinary Workers	200		American Federation of Labor, Providence, R. I.
Beverage Dispensers		346	American Federation of Labor, Minneapolis, Minn.
Housewives League	100		Boston, Mass.
Bridgeport Industrial Union Council			Congress of Industrial Organizations, Bridgeport, Conn.
Capital District Industrial Union Council	50,000	(1)	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Schenectady, N. Y.
Greater Buffalo Industrial Union Council		(2)	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Buffalo, N. Y.
Minnesota State Industrial Union Council	35,000		Congress of Industrial Organizations, Minneapolis, Minn
Milwaukee County Industrial Union Council	70,000		Congress of Industrial Organizations, Milwaukee, Wis.
Greater Newark Industrial Union Council			Congress of Industrial Organizations, Newark, N. J.
New Jersey State Industrial Union Council	300,000		Congress of Industrial Organizations.
Los Angeles Industrial Union Council			Congress of Industrial Organizations, Los Angeles, Calif.
Rhode Island State Industrial Union Council	40,000		Congress of Industrial Organizations, Providence, R. I.
South Jersey Industrial Union Council	55,000		Congress of Industrial Organizations, Camden, N. J.
Des Moines Industrial Union Council	20,000		Congress of Industrial Organizations, Des Moines, Iowa.
New York State Industrial Union Council			Congress of Industrial Organizations, New York City.
Wisconsin State Industrial Union Council	100,000		Congress of Industrial Organizations, Milwaukee, Wis.
Industrial Insurance Agents Union	1,000	41	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Boston, Mass.
Iowa State Federation of Labor			American Federation of Labor, Des Moines, Iowa.
International Jewelry Workers		1	American Federation of Labor, New York City.
Do	10,000		Do.
Jewelry, Tool Makers, and Die Cutters	400	129	American Federation of Labor, Providence, R. I.
Joan of Arc Victory Committee	125		American Federation of Labor, New York City.
Labor's Non-Partisan League	40,000		Congress of Industrial Organizations, New Haven, Conn.
Lapel Makers and Pairers Union	600	161	Congress of Industrial Organizations, New York City.
Lake County (Independent) Central Labor Union			
United Laundry Workers Union	200	271	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Schenectady, N. Y.
Laundry Workers and Cleaners	1,000	183	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Minneapolis, Minn.
National Association of Letter Carriers	1,250	1	American Federation of Labor, Detroit, Mich.
Do	7	806	American Federation of Labor, Fergus Falls, Minn.
Do	392	28	American Federation of Labor, St. Paul, Minn.

[1] 22 unions.
[2] 60 unions.

Name	Membership	Local	Affiliation
United Leather Workers International Union	350	77	American Federation of Labor, Racine, Wis.
Amalgamated Lithographers of America	350	7	American Federation of Labor, Milwaukee, Wis.
Retail Wine and Liquor Clerks	534		American Federation of Labor, New York City.
International Longshoremen's Association	100	822	American Federation of Labor, East Boston, Mass.
Do	300	815	American Federation of Labor, Milwaukee, Wis.
Seafood Workers Union	1,100	2	American Federation of Labor, Boston, Mass.
United Locomotive Workers Union	6,000	2054	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Schenectady, N. Y.
Luggage and Novelty Workers	400	65	American Federation of Labor, Fall River, Mass.
Lumber and Sawmill Workers	72	2806	American Federation of Labor, Tigerton, Wis.
International Association of Machinists	721	34	American Federation of Labor, Kenosha, Wis.
Do	4,180	66	American Federation of Labor, Milwaukee, Wis.
Do	70	1037	American Federation of Labor, Hopkins, Minn.
Do	14	1198	American Federation of Labor, Mankato, Minn.
Riverside Lodge (machinists)	116	1,415	American Federation of Labor, Fond du Lac, Wis.
Auto Mechanics	75	697	American Federation of Labor, Manville, R. I.
Mailers Union	230	40	American Federation of Labor, Detroit, Mich.
National Maritime Union	400		Congress of Industrial Organizations, Buffalo, N. Y.
Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers		42	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Philadelphia, Pa.
Do			Congress of Industrial Organizations, Camden, N. J.
Union of Marine Draftsmen and Technicians	250	24	Congress of Industrial Organizations, New York City.
Massachusetts State Congress of Industrial Organizations			Congress of Industrial Organizations, Boston, Mass.
Minneapolis City and County Employees	630	9	American Federation of Labor, Oak Terrace, Minn.
Amalgamated Meat Cutters		623	American Federation of Labor, New York City.
Do	35	477	American Federation of Labor, Eveleth, Minn.
Do	1,050	653	American Federation of Labor, Minneapolis, Minn.
Millinery Workers Union	20,000	2, 24, 42, 90	American Federation of Labor, New York City.
Do	300	95	American Federation of Labor, Atlanta, Ga.
Do		41	American Federation of Labor, Los Angeles, Calif.
Do	280	50	American Federation of Labor, Milwaukee, Wis.
United Hatters, Cap and Millinery Workers		(3)	American Federation of Labor, New York City.
International Alliance of Theatrical, Stage and Moving Picture Machine Operators.	19	655	American Federation of Labor, Sheboygan, Wis.
Southbridge Musicians Association	40	494	American Federation of Labor, Southbridge, Mass.
Milwaukee Musicians Association	1,400	8	American Federation of Labor, Milwaukee, Wis.
St. Paul Musicians Association	1,001	30	American Federation of Labor, St. Paul, Minn.
American Federation of Musicians	200	173	American Federation of Labor, Fitchburg, Mass.
Metal Polishers, Buffers, Platers, and Helpers	20,000		American Federation of Labor, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Do		139	American Federation of Labor, Northampton, Mass.
Do	501	66	American Federation of Labor, Louisville, Ky.
Metal Polishers	1,400	1	American Federation of Labor, Detroit, Mich.
Sheet Metal Workers	27	158	American Federation of Labor, Sheboygan, Wis.
Do	250	76	American Federation of Labor, St. Paul, Minn.
Do	50	32	American Federation of Labor, Duluth, Minn.
Fabricated Metal Workers	655	19340	American Federation of Labor, Milwaukee, Wis.
United Office and Professional Workers	5,000	16	Congress of Industrial Organizations, New York City.
Do	1,500	109	Do.
Office Workers' Union	125	21276	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Duluth, Minn.
Do	300	16456	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Milwaukee, Wis.
United Optical Workers Union	2,500	208	Congress of Industrial Organizations, New York City.
United Packinghouse Workers	1,200	11	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Cambridge, Mass.
International Brotherhood of Papermakers	40	149	American Federation of Labor, Sartell, Minn.
Do	254	319	American Federation of Labor, Rothschild, Wis.
Do	186	227	American Federation of Labor, Peshtigo, Wis.
Do	102	159	American Federation of Labor, International Falls, Minn.
Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America	250	636	American Federation of Labor, Culver City, Calif.
Do	9,000	(4)	American Federation of Labor, New York City.
Do	2,000	(5)	American Federation of Labor, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Do	160,000		American Federation of Labor, Lafayette, Ind.
Do	92	108	American Federation of Labor, Racine, Wis.
Do	38	882	American Federation of Labor, Hibbing, Minn.
Do	60	797	American Federation of Labor, Fredericksburg, Va.
Do	21	667	American Federation of Labor, Titusville, Pa.
Do	10	295	American Federation of Labor, Westville, Ill.
Do	55	393	American Federation of Labor, Wichita Falls, Tex.
Do	40	1205	American Federation of Labor, Bristol, Va.
Do		616	American Federation of Labor, Tucumcari, N. Mex.
Do	65	431	American Federation of Labor, Marion, Ill.

[3] International. [4] 11 locals. [5] 6 locals.

The list gives the membership as 160,000 at Lafayette, Ind., and 2,000 at Brooklyn. I think those figures are reversed. The list continues:

Name	Membership	Local	Affiliation
Painters	130	48	American Federation of Labor, Worcester, Mass.
Do	42	247	American Federation of Labor, Salem, Mass.
Do	72	175	American Federation of Labor, Fitchburg, Mass.
Do	10	771	American Federation of Labor, Gardner, Mass.
Do	1,200	781	American Federation of Labor, Milwaukee, Wis.
Do	70	934	American Federation of Labor, Kenosha, Wis.
Do	65	1077	American Federation of Labor, Johnson City, Tenn.
Do		753	American Federation of Labor, Dothan, Ala.
Do	257	31	American Federation of Labor, Syracuse, N. Y.
Do	500	318	American Federation of Labor, Fort Worth, Tex.
Do	175	90	American Federation of Labor, Springfield, Ill.
Paperhangers	64	258	American Federation of Labor, Everett, Mass.
Plasterers Union	400	10	American Federation of Labor, Boston, Mass.
Do	300	850	American Federation of Labor, Detroit, Mich.
Operative Plasterers and Cement Finishers International Association	310	557	American Federation of Labor, Minneapolis, Minn.
Lynn Association Pattern Makers League	96		American Federation of Labor, West Lynn, Mass.
International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers	200	324	American Federation of Labor, Appleton, Wis.
Do	750	107	American Federation of Labor, New York City.
Do	465	158	American Federation of Labor, Cloquet, Minn.
United Association of Journeymen Plumbers and Steamfitters of United States and Canada.	46	589	American Federation of Labor, Hibbing, Minn.
Do	35	401	American Federation of Labor, Sheboygan, Wis.
National Association of Post Office Laborers	350	9	American Federation of Labor, Roxbury, Mass.
National Federation of Post Office Clerks	21	577	American Federation of Labor, Sheboygan, Wis.
Do	677	3	American Federation of Labor, Milwaukee, Wis.
American Federation of Government Employees	24	178	American Federation of Labor, Springfield, Mass.

Name	Membership	Local	Affiliation
Brockton Printing Pressmen	20	102	American Federation of Labor, Brockton, Mass.
Minneapolis Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union	500	20	American Federation of Labor, Minneapolis, Minn.
Pressmen's Union	36	237	American Federation of Labor, Winona, Minn.
Milwaukee Allied Printing Trades Council	1,500		American Federation of Labor, Milwaukee, Wis.
Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America	24	685	American Federation of Labor, Ashland, Wis.
Do	156	499	American Federation of Labor, West Allis, Wis.
Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway, and Motor Coach Employees,	36	1310	American Federation of Labor, Eau Claire, Wis.
Sheboygan Central Labor Council	85		American Federation of Labor, Sheboygan, Wis.
Boot and Shoe Workers Union	550	378	American Federation of Labor, Watertown, Wis.
Do	140	686	American Federation of Labor, Wausau, Wis.
Do	58	419	American Federation of Labor, St. Paul, Minn.
Do	160	197	American Federation of Labor, Sheboygan, Wis.
Lasters, Brotherhood of Shoe Allied Craftsmen	1,100		Independent, Brockton, Mass.
Heelers Local, Brotherhood of Shoe Allied Craftsmen	275		Do.
Webster Shoe Workers Independent Union	1,300		Independent, Webster, Mass.
United Shoe Workers of America	250	141	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Binghamton, N. Y.
Do	10,000	(1)	Congress of Industrial Organizations, New York City.
State, county, and municipal workers	(2)	(3)	Do.
Do		80	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Albany, N. Y.
Do	700		Congress of Industrial Organizations, Philadelphia, Pa.
American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees	30	426	American Federation of Labor, Milwaukee, Wis.
Do	50	47	Do.
Do	200	151	American Federation of Labor, St. Paul, Minn.
United Steel Workers of America	837	1809	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Worcester, Mass.
Do	250		Congress of Industrial Organizations, Providence, R. I.
Do	900	1561	Do.
Stone Masons and Marble Masons	100		American Federation of Labor, Boston, Mass.
Marble Cutters and Setters Union	800		American Federation of Labor, New York City.
Switchmen's Union	110	107	American Federation of Labor, Superior, Wis.
Work Projects Administration Teachers Union			Independent, New York City.
Teachers Union of the City of New York			Do.
New York College Teachers Union			Do.
Floodwood Federation of Teachers	18	506	American Federation of Labor, Floodwood, Minn.
American Federation of Teachers		567	American Federation of Labor, Pueblo, Colo.
International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers.	700	619	American Federation of Labor, Manitowoc, Wis.
Do			American Federation of Labor, Michigan.
Terrazzo Workers Helpers	36	37	American Federation of Labor, Roxbury, Mass.
Tile Layers Protective Union	41	5	American Federation of Labor, Milwaukee, Wis.
Roofers Local	250	65	Do.
Do	36	73	American Federation of Labor, Duluth, Minn.
United Textile Workers of America		1813	American Federation of Labor, Allston, Mass.
Do	45	2639	American Federation of Labor, Grafton, Wis.
Textile Workers Union of America	7,000	1 and 489	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Amsterdam, N. Y.
Do	25	98	Congress of Industrial Organizations, New York City.
Do			Congress of Industrial Organizations, Utica, N. Y.
Do	700	129	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Oswego, N. Y.
United Paper Novelty and Toy Workers International Union	1,800	61, 59	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Leominster, Mass.
Boston Women's Trade Union League			Consumer, Boston, Mass.
Neenah-Menasha Trades and Labor Council	3,500	(4)	American Federation of Labor, Menasha, Wis.
Federated Trades Council of Milwaukee			American Federation of Labor, Milwaukee, Wis.
Federated Trades Assembly	10,000		American Federation of Labor, Duluth, Minn.
Truck Drivers Union	1,200	653	American Federation of Labor, Brockton, Mass.
Transport Workers Union	90,000	(5)	Congress of Industrial Organizations, New York City.
Do	247	159	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Schenectady, N. Y.
New York Typographical Union		6	American Federation of Labor, New York City.
Canon City Typographical Union	9	425	American Federation of Labor, Canon City, Colo.
Utility Workers Organizing Committee			Congress of Industrial Organizations, New York City.
United Federated War Workers Union		101	Do.
Virginia State Federation of Labor			American Federation of Labor, Richmond, Va.
United Wallpaper Craftsmen	10	9	American Federation of Labor, Shrewsbury, Mass.
United Warehouse Employees	450	676	Congress of Industrial Organizations, St. Louis, Mo.
Wholesale and Warehouse Workers Union	16,000	65	Congress of Industrial Organizations, New York City.
United Wholesale, Warehouse, and Delivery Employees	500	363	Congress of Industrial Organizations, Toledo, Ohio.
Window Trimmers and Displaymen's Union			Congress of Industrial Organizations, New York City.
American Fordrinier Wire Finishers Association	21	21016	American Federation of Labor, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Wood, Wire and Metal Lathers	250	6	American Federation of Labor, Richmond Hill, New York City.
Do	75	10	American Federation of Labor, Milwaukee, Wis.

[1] Joint Council No. 13.
[2] 14,000 to 15,000.
[3] 25 locals.
[4] 24 locals.
[5] International.

I have just a few which have been received recently, within the last 2 or 3 months, as follows:

Building and Construction Trades Council, 85 West Western Avenue, Muskegon, Mich., Henry TerBorg, secretary; Carpenters Local No. 2060, Logansport, Ind., 434 Washington Street, Lambert Halsema, vice president; Basic Building Trades Council, 309 South Franklin Street, Syracuse, N. Y., Arthur Peil, secretary; Toledo Central Labor Union, 912 Adams Street, Toledo 2, Ohio, George J. Englert, executive secretary; Building and Construction Trades Council, 216⅓ East Monroe Street, Springfield, Ill., J. Earl Welch, recording secretary; Federation of Labor, Lancaster, Ohio, Ted Purcell, secretary; Dearborn County Central Labor Union, 408 Shipping Street, Lawrenceburg, Ind., Hobert Autterson, acting recording secretary; Central Labor Union, Marion, Ind., Margaret Barton, secretary; Central Trades and Labor Council, 16 State Street, Rochester 4, N. Y., Arthur Patrick Farren; Building and Construction Trades Council, 317 Cherry Street, Jamestown, N. Y., Murray F. Horn, recording secretary; Ithaca Central Labor Union, 134 East State Street, Ithaca, N. Y., Dorothy Marcuse, secretary; Twin City Federation of Labor, Champaign-Urbana, Ill., W. H. Thompson, secretary; Port Washington Trades and Labor Council, Port Washington, Wis., Edward Fay, secretary.

Building Trades Council, Fitchburg, Mass., Charles E. Hartford, corresponding secretary; Central Labor Union of Indianapolis, 136 East Market Street, Indianapolis, Ind., Clyde McCormack, business manager; Meadville Building and Construction Trades Council, Meadville, Pa., Merle E. Jannot; Federation of Labor, Park and Montcalm, Detroit 1, Mich., Frank X. Martell, president; Building and Construction Trades Council, 401½ Franklin Street, Michigan City, Ind., M. C. Meyn, recording secretary; Carpenters District Council, John G. Ross, secretary, 40 Waverley Street, Waverley 79, Mass.; Central Labor Council, Sheboygan, Wis., Andrews Beimel, secretary, 2206 North Eighteenth Street; Building and Construction Trades Council, 418 Auditorium Street, St. Paul, Minn., Frank J. Thill, secretary; Stamford Structural Building Trades Alliance, 67 Gay Street, Stamford, Conn., Louis H. Hardvall, secretary.

The State Federation of Labor of New York State has for the first time gone on record this year as favoring the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

The State Federation of Vermont and the State C. I. O. organizations of Vermont have both adopted resolutions favoring the seaway for the first time this year.

Mr. President, I appreciate the indulgence of the Senate in listening to this rather dry presentation of the supporters of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. As I have said, I understand that there are four Senators who

desire to speak tomorrow on the bill in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway and power development, so far as it affects the river and harbor program.

IMPOSITION OF PENALTIES AND PAYMENT OF DETENTION EXPENSES INCIDENT TO BRINGING ALIENS INTO THE UNITED STATES

During the delivery of Mr. AIKEN's address:

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Vermont would be generous enough to permit the Chair to lay down a message from the House of Representatives on a Senate bill which passed in September, in order that we may take action on certain amendments.

Mr. AIKEN. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 963) relating to the imposition of certain penalties and the payment of detention expenses incident to the bringing of certain aliens into the United States, which were:

1. Page 1, line 11, strike out all after "if" over to and including "and" in line 1 of page 2.
2. Page 2, line 2, after "13", insert "(a) (1) or (3)."
3. Page 2, line 14, strike out all after "if" down to and including "and" in line 16.
4. Page 2, line 17, after "13", insert "(a) (1) or (3)."
5. Page 3, line 8, strike out all after "embarkation" down to and including "issued" in line 11.
6. Page 3, strike out all of section 4.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate concur in House amendments 1 to 5, inclusive.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I now move that the Senate insist upon its position on amendment No. 6, and reject the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

INTERNAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily and that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 5029, Calendar 1323. I have discussed the matter with the acting majority leader, and I understand the minority leader has been consulted as well, and there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5029) to assist in the internal development of the Virgin Islands by the undertaking of useful projects therein, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I want to be sure I am correct in my understanding of the proposed legislation. It is my belief that it deals with school facilities, water facilities, sanitation districts, communication facilities, and other public works of that general character.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. It simply authorizes an appropriation for that purpose. The committee has amended the bill by giving preference to certain named projects which are to be undertaken first.

Mr. WHITE. I hope. Mr. President, that the bill will be passed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I understand the bill has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5029) to assist in the internal development of the Virgin Islands by the undertaking of useful projects therein, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 2, line 7, after the word "project", to insert *Provided further*, That items 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 14, 16, and 17 shall have priority over others of the projects on the islands of St. Thomas and St. John, and items 19, 20, 22, 27, and 29 shall have priority over others of the projects on the island of St. Croix: *Provided further*, That funds shall be available for the purposes specified in section 2 on other projects without regard to the priorties so established."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 20, after "$10,028,420", to strike out "to be immediately available and to remain available until expended", and insert "$2,028,420 to be available in 1945, and $2,000,000 in each of the following 4 years, each yearly sum to remain available until expended."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF STATE STETTINIUS ON THE SITUATION IN GREECE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this morning at his press conference the Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius, was asked this question:

Is there anything which you can tell us about the situation in Greece?

Mr. Stettinius' answer to the question was:

I was interested to note that in his statement on the subject on December 5, Prime Minister Churchill told the House of Commons the following: "Our own position, as I have said, is extremely clear. Whether the Greek people form themselves into a monarchy or republic is for their decision. Whether they form a government of the right or left is for their decision. These are entirely matters for them." With this statement, I am in full agreement. It is also our earnest hope that the people and authorities of Greece and our British allies will work together in rebuilding that ravished country.

Mr. President, I want to express my agreement with Secretary Stettinius. I am sure that the American people strongly feel that the people of Greece have the right to choose their own form of government without interference or dictation from any other government. Any such interference or dictation would be contrary to and in violation of one of the fundamental rights for which we are carrying on the present war.

BILLS AFFECTING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I want to ask permission to call up the bills on the calendar affecting the District of Columbia. I wish to say that they are largely House bills which have been on the calendar for some time. The Senate committee, after a thorough reading and understanding of them, has reported the bills unanimously.

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

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I talked with the Senator from Mississippi about these bills a few days ago. There are 17 of them on the calendar, as I recall.

Mr. BILBO. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Fourteen of them are House bills and three are Senate bills.

Mr. BILBO. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. I have made as careful a canvass as I could of the minority members of the Committee on the District of Columbia which reported the bills. I have found no objection on the part of the committee members to the consideration of or to the passage of these bills. I have not, however, had any opportunity to talk with the membership generally, and I hope the Senator from Mississippi, at this time, with simply a handful of Senators on the floor, will not ask for consideration of the bills, but that he will do so at some time during the earlier part of a day when there is present a substantial number of Senators, at which time I will give the Senator from Mississippi as much aid as I can in securing consideration and passage of the bills. I do not feel that we ought to attempt to take action on them now.

Mr. BILBO. I am in thorough sympathy with the feeling which the Senator from Maine has expressed, but I do not have any chance to call up the bills for consideration when there is a fuller attendance of Members. I have pleaded with my friend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] to request that the pending bill be laid aside so action can be had on the District of Columbia bills. Discussion of the bill now under consideration seems to have no end. The Senator from Louisiana suggested that I wait until the close of the day and then make my request. That is why I made the request now. I have no desire, however, to press unduly for the passage of the bills.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I repeat what I said, that in justice to Senators who are absent, I do not feel that I can now consent to the request made by the

Senator from Mississippi, but I hope that an appropriate time will soon be found for consideration of the District of Columbia bills.

Mr. BILBO. May I ask the Senator from Louisiana when he thinks we might have action on the bills?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I propound a unanimous-consent request, so as to put all Senators on notice, that tomorrow afternoon at the hour of 5 the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside in order that the District of Columbia bills may be brought up for consideration and passage, with the understanding that they will be disposed of entirely tomorrow.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Louisiana a question. Would it not serve his purpose just as well not to make the unanimous-consent request tonight, but rather to serve notice now that the request will be made at 5 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, or approximately that time? It might be that some very important matter will be under consideration at 5 o'clock tomorrow, and, if agreeable to the Senator's unanimous-consent request, the order were entered now, it would mean that when the hands of the clock came to 5 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, at exactly that hour the Chair would have to proceed to lay aside the then pending business, and permit the Senator from Mississippi to call up the District of Columbia bills. It seems to me, Mr. President, it would serve the purpose just as well if the Senator from Louisiana were now to give notice that it is his intention to yield tomorrow so the Senator from Mississippi may call up these bills, and that it is the intention of the Senator from Mississippi to call them up at about 5 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. OVERTON. That will be satisfactory, if it meets with the approval of the minority leader.

Mr. WHITE. That is agreeable to me. I simply wanted to have notice given to absent Senators that District of Columbia bills were coming up for consideration.

Mr. BILBO. That is perfectly satisfactory to me. Some of the bills are really emergency measures, and I should be glad to have them passed.

Mr. WHITE. I said a moment ago that I have talked with various minority Members. In particular I asked the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] to give them study, and he, with his usual painstaking care, has gone through each and every bill and, I understand, has indicated to me his approval of them. I think that is partially true, at least to some extent, of all the minority members of the District of Columbia Committee with whom I came in contact. I think there will be no opposition to the bills on this side of the Chamber. At least, I hope not.

Mr. BILBO. I know of no opposition, Mr. President, to any of these bills, either among the members of the committee or on the part of Members of the Senate outside the committee. The only measure concerning which there was very much controversy we promptly killed, so that measure is not before us.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, has the distinguished acting majority leader any idea when the calendar will be called?

Mr. HILL. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that we hope to call the calendar very shortly, at which time we hope to take up all unobjected-to bills on the calendar.

Mr. ELLENDER. My reason for asking that question is that the Committee on Claims has made a diligent effort to report all bills which have come before it, and unless something is done soon they may die on the calendar.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator from Louisiana that I do not know of a more diligent, a more conscientious, or a more devoted chairman of a committee than is the distinguished chairman of the Claims Committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. He has worked well and hard to have the bills reported from the committee. It is the intention to call the calendar just as soon as we can so as to have an opportunity to consider unobjected-to bills.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, may I inquire of the acting majority leader whether he contemplates that there shall be a session of the Senate on Saturday if we do not dispose of the pending bill by that time?

Mr. HILL. Of course, the desire is to finish the pending bill as soon as possible. I will say to the Senator that I shall be glad to confer with him tomorrow, when we see what progress we shall have made on the bill, as to the possibility of a session on Saturday. The idea is to make as much progress as possible on the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Finance:

Charles F. Murphy, of Jamaica Plain, Mass., to be comptroller of customs in customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass., to fill an existing vacancy; and

Victor Russell, of Port Arthur, Tex., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 21, with headquarters at Port Arthur, Tex. (reappointment).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Commodore Ellery W. Stone, United States Naval Reserve, to be a rear admiral in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Chief Commissioner of the Allied Mediterranean Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WEEKS in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alexander C. Kirk to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Italy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, December 8, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 7 (legislative day of November 21), 1944:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Alexander C. Kirk, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Italy.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be second lieutenants, Infantry

Douglas Monroe Benbrook
Joseph Anthony Bohnak
Edgar Nicholas Glotzbach
Leroy Arthur Guest
Wilford LeRoy Harrelson, Jr.
Jules Ord Hendricks
Dallas Wilkinson Hoadley
John Merlin Hunter
Clifford Joseph Kalista
Maurice Wesley Kendall
Jonathan Frederic Ladd
John Browder Longley
Ben Hugh Lowry
George Horace Ried
William Bruce Robertson
Edward Ellis Smith
Robert Orion Smythe
Thomas Elton Terry
James Vardaman Thompson
Frederick Alven Wells

To be second lieutenants, Cavalry

William Francis Callahan, Jr.
John Hamilton Irving, Jr.

To be second lieutenants, Field Artillery

Philip Myers Chamberlain, Jr.
Ralph William Deuster
William Jefferson Galloway
James Marion Kidd, Jr.
Charles Ledyard McCord
Billy Murray McCormac
William Charles McKamy
Robert Louis Perdue
Lawrence Harrison Rogers 2d

Carroll Hamilton Wood
E. T. York, Jr.

To be second lieutenants, Coast Artillery Corps

Aaron George Amacher
Spencer Roe Baen
Stanley Marlin Block
John William McConnell, Jr.
Frank Watt Rose, Jr.
Vernon Roberts Widerquist

To be second lieutenants, Corps of Engineers

Edsel Jay Burkhart
William George Donaldson
John Irwin Dye
Stephen Charles Kaffer

To be second lieutenants, Signal Corps

Daniel Overton
George Murrell Snead, Jr.

To be second lieutenants, Ordnance Department

George Henry Childers
Walter Edward Rafert

To be second lieutenant, Chemical Warfare Service

David Mortimer Falk

To be second lieutenants, Quartermaster Corps

William Wooldridge Dillard
Robert Bruce Stiles

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

William Karl Barton
Wayne Peter Beardsley
John Joseph Graff
Hal Bruce Jennings, Jr.
Voris Francis McFall
Wayne Creekmore Pittman
Joseph Gilbert Rogers
Carlton Willard Sargent
Walter Frank Smejkal

To be second lieutenant, Pharmacy Corps

Jack Williamson McNamara

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Catherine V. Andrews, Los Nietos.
Charles K. James, Robbins.
Perry M. Hawkins, Tionesta.

COLORADO

Floyd L. Templeton, Derby.

CONNECTICUT

James M. Abbott, Gales Ferry.
Marion B. Foster, South Glastonbury.

MARYLAND

James A. Hayman, Fruitland.
Gilbert F. Murphy, Laurel.

MISSISSIPPI

Horace H. McRae, Laurel.
Thomas S. Doty, Lucedale.
Carey G. Raborn, Magnolia.

MISSOURI

Roger M. Roy, Dora.
Paul Harrison Burns, Gobler.
Paul M. Blanchard, Warsaw.

NEBRASKA

Frances L. Mooberry, Dorchester.
John A. Graf, Talmage.

NORTH CAROLINA

Roland A. Brooks, Midland.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Lord and Saviour of us all, whether dim or clear, Thou art the way, the truth, and the life. We pray for an undefiled conscience, for lips never benumbed by silence when they should speak, nor ever violated by words that should not be spoken. We would follow the example and attitude of Jesus, who was far from hatred and hostility and never sought to please the clamor of the crowds, though assailed with cruel mockeries and false accusations. O God, let us learn with all our soul to do His will and walk in His way like a river set toward the boundless sea.

Grant that we may be able to blend humility with dignity, strength with gentleness, and passion with repose. In all our labors make us deeply sincere, removed from all guile. Enable us to join hands with all remedial forces—religious, social, and political—which are working for the preservation and salvation of our free, national life. We bless Thee for Thy compassion; behind its great heart is Thy forgiveness and love touched with pity: "I am among you as One who serves." Forgive us if we should wrap ourselves with slothful selfishness and bury ourselves in the cares of the moment, for whosoever shall seek to save his life shall lose it. Nourish us with all goodness and make us to love that which Thou dost command, and Thine shall be the praise. Amen.

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

RESIGNATION FROM THE SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

DECEMBER 7, 1944.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of Rhode Island my resignation as a Representative in the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States from the Second District of Rhode Island.

With assurance of my high esteem, I am,
Respectfully yours,
JOHN E. FOGARTY.

OLIVER N. KNIGHT

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1827) for the relief of Oliver N. Knight, with a House amendment thereto to which the Senate has disagreed, and request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MCGEHEE, KEOGH, and JENNINGS.

KATHERINE SCHERER

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3929) for the relief of Katherine Scherer, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

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

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,215" and insert "$2,200.85."

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONRAD H. CLARK

Mr. KEOGH. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 933) for the relief of Conrad H. Clark, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

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

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Conrad H. Clark and Rocco Cellette."

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two newspaper clippings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CONDITIONS OF AMERICAN INDIANS—PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee to Investigate Conditions of American Indians be permitted to file a report at any time during the present month of this year.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will there be more than one report from the committee?

Mr. O'CONNOR. No.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Just one?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Just one.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein proclamations issued by the Governor of Indiana and the mayor of Indianapolis proclaiming Hoosier Sons' and Daughters' Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a statement I made before the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a telegram sent to the President of the United States by the distinguished newspaper editor, Frank Gannett, of Rochester, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.)

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's table and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

INCREASE OF CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES AND CLERK HIRE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record as being opposed to the movement that is under way to increase the salaries of Members of Congress. I am also opposed to the proposal that is being made by the Committee on Accounts to provide additional clerk hire for Congressmen.

Should the Congress vote to raise the salaries of its own Members it would open the floodgates to an avalanche of demands from about 3,000,000 people on the Federal pay roll, not only to make permanent the temporary salaries provided them during the war emergency but to further raise them.

The Federal annual pay roll is already upward of $8,000,000,000 or somewhere around eight times more than the total annual cost of the Federal Government before World War No. 1.

By an almost unanimous vote the Congress of the United States commanded our young men to be sent to the four corners of the earth to bleed and die for their country. What sacrifices are Congressmen, as a whole, in their capacity as Representatives, making in this war? Practically none that I can see.

If I were to vote to increase my salary of $10,000 a year now, while the flower of our young manhood is making the supreme sacrifice for our homeland on the many battle fronts of the world—for $55 per month—I would be so ashamed of myself that I would never again wish to look into the face of any returning soldier.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the Resident Commissioner of the Philippines [Mr. ROMULO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

(At the request of Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. ROMULO was granted permission during the course of his address to proceed for 15 additional minutes.)

THE LIBERATION OF THE PHILIPPINES—A REPORT TO CONGRESS FROM THE FRONT LINES OF DEMOCRACY

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, I have come to make a report from the front lines of democracy. I have just returned from Leyte, Philippines.

More than 2 months have passed since I said au revoir to you upon this floor before rejoining Gen. Douglas MacArthur in the Southwest Pacific. Today it is my privilege to inform you that within that time I have seen the start of the liberation of my country, and I have returned to America and to this floor to bring to you, the American Congress, representing the American people, the gratitude of the people of the Philippines.

Within these past weeks we have stood upon Philippine soil; we have seen the American flag and the Filipino flag flying over that land again; we have talked with people who, since December 7, 1941, 3 full years, have fought, waited, and prayed with America. They are my people, and I speak to you now with their voice, and it is their story I have to tell.

It is a story not for America alone but for the entire world.

It is the story of a people's unwavering faith in America, unshaken by the bestiality of a brutal enemy during the long night of humiliation and defeat. It is the story of the redemption of a pledge in honor given by an American and in honor fulfilled in the truest American tradition. It is the story of Filipino civilian resistance that started without military leadership and grew from day to day and from island to island into one of the most spectacular underground movements in the world. It is the story of a government in exile returning to the homeland and taking over the civil government from the military without undergoing the throes of internecine warfare such as we see in many of the liberated countries in Europe today. It is the story of the blood brotherhood of two peoples of two different races and one human standard. It is the story of democracy at its best.

First of all, I want to report that we met with victory on Leyte and that our hold there is secure. It is our first step toward inevitable, final victory. Only one difference makes it unlike other victories.

That difference is Bataan.

Since Bataan, General MacArthur has been fighting for an idea. It was the American idea of freedom and democracy. He had seen his faith in the Filipino Nation upheld by Filipino loyalty to American ideals. His faith had been justified in the fox holes of Bataan. He was forced from the Philippines, but for 2½ years he held to that single purpose expressed in the pledge made then: "I will return."

He kept that pledge on Leyte Beach in words that are now part of our known history: "I have returned."

My story really begins with October 20 of this year, which for our forces was A-day, the day of our first attack on the Philippines, which will serve as our springboard to Manila. It is not for me to tell you now how A-day was advanced by General MacArthur, nor of the weeks chopped off our schedule and the American lives saved by that priceless salvage in time, nor of the concentrated power expressed that morning in the numbers of men and ships and planes. Our front lines are long in the Pacific, and the action is terrible and swift. I shall speak only of the comparatively small sector before my eyes that morning as the troopship *John Land* moved up on the strip of shore objective that was Leyte.

Around us in Leyte Bay were 600 other ships—troop carriers, battleships, destroyers, cruisers, rocket ships—a massed unit that at one time, on its way to this place had covered nearly a thousand miles of sea. The sky overhead was blanketed with American planes, pouring down hell over the Japanese installations. The naval bombardment was sonorous as an organ. It was one solid deafening roar, and the rocket ships were laying lines of explosions like embroidery along the shore, blasting everything in their way. There would be the roar of explosion and the puff of smoke and the fires starting in the Japanese fortifications and the coconut palms. Among the Japanese hiding in there were the Sixteenth Division, who had beaten us on Bataan. They had been responsible for the nightmare "March of Death" after Bataan fell.

All this time we were milling around on deck among swarms of the heartiest, finest men on earth, the American soldiers. Life or death was a split second away, but they were jostling and kidding and pushing around getting autographs on their short-snorter bills. Every man seemed to have a gun in one hand and a fountain pen in the other while moving up on Leyte in the concentrated might and fury of American vengeance written before us in smoke and in fire on earth and sea and sky. Never in my maddest dreams in Bataan could I have hoped for this—to see America on its way back—so surely armed with such indescribable power.

It was 10 o'clock in the morning, October 20, 1944.

The landing barges were on the water; the rope ladders were slapping against the ship's side; the boys began piling overboard. These were your boys—healthy, strong, clean, well equipped—everything to fight with, everything to protect them, everything to fight for. The last night on board I had addressed them over the loud speaker. I had told them to remember those who had died on Bataan. Now, going over the side, they grinned their clean, young grins and flipped thumbs up, and they said to me as I looked at them from the bridge, "Sir, for Bataan."

Wave after wave of them went ashore. We watched them through glasses and mine blurred because I knew that many of them would not come back. The waters of Leyte Bay were aswarm with barges. Some were hit by Japanese mortar shells and went under. From those barges which sank only a few of the boys made shore. We saw the first casualties, piled on barges, brought back to the ships. On land our boys were ready with flame throwers and tanks and every manner of armament—they had everything. Waves of men kept pressing on between the palms and flames and

blasted rubble that had been the Japanese barricades, and they were not being thrown back anywhere as far as our glasses could see. Only those were left on the beach and in the water who could not go on.

Red Beach, Palo, Leyte. Remember that landing place—the first step back; the first erasure against Corregidor and Bataan.

We waded ashore. Under my feet I felt the crunch of my land, my country again, the earth of the Philippines. After 2½ years of forced absence—my native land. The landscape around us was raging with fires set by our rockets and flame throwers, and the rubble of Japanese installations was before us, and all around us on the beach were our dead. But this was it. The answer to millions of anguished prayers. Once more, a portion of our soil set free. In that moment on the beach there flashed through my mind a picture I had vowed never to forget, the picture of our dead who had been piled to the water's edge on Bataan, and I thought to myself, how much easier they will rest tonight.

There were Japanese dead on Leyte, but while I felt no exultation over their strewn bodies I could not pity them. These were the men who had dealt out flame and death to our forces when we were helpless on Bataan. These were the bestial Japanese who had marched our naked and defenseless boys over those cruel miles and into the barbed-wire traps they called prisons. They had tied our men back to back and had bayoneted them. They had done unmentionable things. They had defiled an emblem never before dishonored. But not for long. Because the first thing I saw on Leyte was the American flag hoisted to a coconut tree, and beside it was our Filipino flag, both flying together again over the Philippines.

Under those united flags our soldiers were spread out in fox holes forming a wide guarding phalanx to protect General MacArthur and President Osmeña from the Japanese snipers. The crack of Japanese rifles answered by American guns interrupted all that followed. President Osmeña and General MacArthur sat down on a fallen tree trunk under a coconut palm and held the first conference on liberated Philippine soil, while all around them the soldiers watched from their fox holes, and beyond lay those who would not watch again.

It is the story of these men on Leyte beach that I have returned to tell you today, but it is also the story of other men who fought—in the beginning without uniforms or shoes or guns or food or hope. Their courage helped us on A-day at Leyte.

They are the Filipino guerrillas whose story can at last be told. The fall of Bataan has become a datemark: "Before Bataan fell," or "after Bataan fell." But an accuracy of date is a fallacy of fact. To the Filipinos Bataan never really fell. It spread. The Japanese hordes crushed it, then scattered the fragments, and like seeds sown afar, Bataan has spread throughout the Philippines, new crops in new earth. This was the civilian resistance against the enemy, that no Japanese terrorism could stop. This was the Filipino underground movement that inspired General MacArthur to issue a special release upon landing on Leyte, praising their loyalty to America, their valor, and their tenacity.

For 2½ years we had been obliged to conceal their living story. How I longed to tell it. How I wanted the American people and all people everywhere to know that a captive nation had united under bondage to fight in support of the Americans who had once been their conquerors. No longer can we look to the Philippines and say: "This is Philippine earth, or this American." It is Fil-America; it is the new world, the El Dorado of all those who throughout history have dreamed of freedom. It was founded by white and brown brothers who went cold and wet and hungry in tropic mud, who might have given up but did not, who joined forces and grew and survived against incredible opposition, thinking the same thoughts, sharing the same dreams, fighting for the same ideals—equality, fraternity, liberty. These have been fought for before, but never have we seen them so triumphant as we saw them that first day on Leyte.

America's forces and the secret Filipino forces joined for the first time on Leyte. While our armadas of the sea and land and sky were driving the Japanese back, the guerrillas were synchronizing their attacks from the rear, not only on this island but everywhere in the Philippines. Even on Luzon they are fighting now to meet us on our way.

This is no hit-and-miss crusade. It is planned victory. We have been in active communication with the Philippines ever since Bataan. The Filipino guerrillas, motivated by loyalty to America, gave up their homes, their families, and any security that might be left them to live in woods and caves like animals, fighting when they could, facing capture and Japanese atrocities. Many died by torture.

The Filipino guerrillas knew all that America was planning, and they aided and abetted all plans. They were ready to welcome President Osmeña and his civil government. The Free Philippines magazine, printed for the Filipinos by the Office of War Information, was taken by submarine to the Philippines, and every copy delivered there was passed from hand to hand. Thus, every Filipino knew that President Quezon had died in America, that President Osmeña had taken his place in exile, and that America was bringing President Osmeña back to the Philippines. With makeshift radio sets and electric energy generated by hours of effort, they listened to KGEI from San Francisco and the Philippine Hour in Brisbane. During this past year American submarines have landed on Philippine coasts with clothing, guns, ammunition, radio sets, cigarettes, and chewing gum for the guerrilla army until the desperate Japanese overlords were driven to declare the possession of a stick of chewing gum punishable by death. The reports of Tokyo propagandists were futile against the swift and sure communication between the Filipinos who were in captivity and the Americans who were on the way.

Mr. Speaker, consider Leyte beside the scenes that have taken place in Paris, in Rome, and now in Brussels and in Athens. In Europe we have disorders, riots, civil war. There were shaven heads and brandings and the mobs taking justice into their own hands. But the reestablishment of the Commonwealth Government of the Philippines on Philippine soil has been accomplished with a dignity that should make every American proud. Directly after occupying a town or city, General MacArthur, inspired by the spirit of liberalism that has guided American policy since the inception of American rule in the Philippines, turns the liberated city back to the Commonwealth Government.

How I wish the world could have witnessed the ceremony on the capitol steps in Tacloban when, in the presence of the Presidential and military staffs, just 2 days after it was freed from enemy control, General MacArthur delivered in Tacloban when, in the presence of of President Osmeña. In Osmeña's simple words of acknowledgment, the Commonwealth of the Philippines was reestablished on Philippine soil.

During the next days the schools were reopened and mass was said in the churches. Religion and knowledge, God and learning, two matters the Japanese forgot, returned to Leyte together with freedom. During that first week other towns were retaken, and the same procedure was followed.

The transition from military to civil government was as smooth as it was rapid. This smooth transition was due to three factors: First, General MacArthur, as a true American, has faithfully followed the liberal policy set by this Congress in dealing with the Philippines, a policy that has been reaffirmed time and again by that steadfast friend of the Filipino people, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt; second, President Osmeña had a master plan ready, and the blueprints, as prepared by him and his government, had been laid out in advance; and, third, because the Filipino people were prepared for the restoration of their constitutional rights and liberties. To them, Sergio Osmeña is the symbol of Filipino unity, and they rallied to his side when he sounded the clarion call of national oneness and responsibility. He said:

> Ours is a constitutional Government; ours is a community educated in the norms of a Christian civilization. Due respect for the law, rigid adherence to those principles established in civilized countries, complete obedience to the decisions of the courts—all these involve forms of character and high moral attributes that are the possession of enlightened countries like ours. On the threshold of occupying a sovereign place in the concert of free nations, we must live up to our responsibilities. We must prove our ability to maintain domestic peace and our capacity to mete out justice. Precisely when the eyes of the civilized world are focused on our country, we cannot allow acts of personal revenge and misguided zeal to cast a reflection on our civilization and our ability to maintain an orderly government. Ours is a Government by law: the splendor of its majesty must never be dimmed in our land.

This is the story I have come back from the Philippines to tell you. It is of General MacArthur and the idea he has lived and fought for since he left Bataan. It is of President Osmeña and his plan for the future of the Philippines—rehabilitation, relief, early independence—that has fitted together and worked along with all that was planned by America. It is the story of that great Filipino underground army that fought in heart-breaking secrecy for two and a half years and their final triumph in sharing our victory at Leyte. And it is, moreover, each and all of these, American feelings and Filipino feelings, different reasons and different earth, but all stirred by the same impulse that can be summed up in one word—Bataan.

I saw Bataan again on Leyte. Filipinos and Americans there shared understanding of one another, having shared the same hunger for liberty, the same sacrifices and death and glories, and the same God. From this American Congress we obtained political equality; in Bataan we won social equality. That is why it is impossible to encompass in communiqués the way the American G. I. feels toward the Filipino who fought alongside his fellow American in the same fox holes in Bataan and later inside the barricade as his ally and friend; impossible to compress in print the way the Filipino feels toward G. I. Joe, his comrade-in-arms and liberator. This is democracy as we saw it on Bataan. It is on Leyte, set like a torch between East and West.

Between these two places within a space of two and a half years, we have compressed the greatest story in all freedom's history. It did not begin at Leyte, however, or even in Bataan. The first words were written within this Chamber with the passage of the Jones Act in 1916. To it can be dedicated this sacrifice and brotherhood between men of two races and a single human standard. Bataan was the first chapter written in the mingled blood of Filipinos and Americans, and Leyte and every recovered Philippine mile are others, all leading to the final shared exaltation at the fall of imperial Tokyo.

This is democracy's story written by your sons and mine, a story for all the world. I have returned temporarily from the fighting front to bring it to you and to bring you renewed assurance of the pledged gratitude and loyalty of the people of the Philippines.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute in order to make a request by direction of the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL CLERK HIRE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous vote of the members of the Committee on Accounts, I am directed to report H. R. 5590, which is a bill that contains the language of the amendment that I offered yesterday relating to clerical hire for the Members of the House. The Committee on Appropriations likewise held a meeting this morning and unanimously agreed that the House act favorably on this bill.

Mr. TARVER. The last statement made by the gentleman with reference to the unanimity of the action of the Committee on Appropriations is inaccurate.

Mr. COCHRAN. The Committee on Appropriations met this morning. I am advised by the chairman that if the House passes this bill, the committee will accept an amendment to the deficiency bill.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 5590.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, may we have the bill reported?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. The report was filed this morning.

Mr. RANKIN. We would like to know what the bill is.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That effective January 1, 1945, the clerk hire of each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner shall be at the rate of $9,500 per annum, and such officials and chairmen of standing committees (other than the Committee on Appropriations, which is governed by other law) may rearrange or change the schedules or salaries and the number of employees in their respective offices or committees: *Provided*, That no salary shall be fixed hereunder at a rate in excess of $5,000 per annum, and no action shall be taken to reduce any salary which is specifically fixed by law at a rate higher than $5,000 per annum: *Provided further*, That such changes as may be made in consequence hereof shall not increase the aggregate of the salaries provided for such offices or committees for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, or thereafter, beyond the additional amount herein authorized for clerk hire for Representatives, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and an amount equivalent to the difference between the aggregate amount appropriated for salaries of a standing committee for the fiscal year 1945 and the amount required to increase the compensation rate prevailing on December 6, 1944 (in case of a vacancy, the rate last paid), to the clerk of a standing committee to a rate not in excess of $5,000 per annum: *Provided further*, That no compensation rate shall be established in pursuance hereof which is not a multiple of five: *Provided further*, That Representatives, Delegates, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and committee chairmen, on or before the 10th day of the month in which rearrangements or changes of salary schedules are to become effective, shall certify in writing such rearrangements or changes to the disbursing office, which shall thereafter pay such employees in accordance with such rearrangements or changes: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall supersede any law in conflict therewith.

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1945, for committee employees, to be available solely for expenditure for additional compensation for clerks to standing committees, as authorized in the preceding paragraph, $42,630.

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1945, for clerk hire, Members and Delegates, $657,000.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I know of no reason why I should object to the consideration by the House of any matter which it desires to consider, and I apprehend that a very large majority of the membership of the House does desire to consider the bill to which the gentleman has referred, provided provision may be made for adequate expression of the views of those who are opposed, as I am, to the enactment of this legislation.

What does the gentleman's request envision as to debate and as to the division of time?

The SPEAKER. The Chair can answer that question. If unanimous consent is granted, consideration will be had under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. TARVER. And there will be no general debate, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The bill will be considered under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. TARVER. There would be no time for general debate, as I understand the statement of the Speaker?

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not think anybody will cut any one off who desires to be heard. I know I will not.

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

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Was this a request that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. COCHRAN. I asked for recognition to consider it immediately.

Mr. TABER. I think the proper procedure would be to go into the Committee with it, if it is to be done, and have debate on it so that those who are for it and those who are against it may have an opportunity to express their views.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am sure the Speaker will recognize anybody who wants to strike out the last word and make a statement. I know I shall not attempt in any way to cut anyone off from debate.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, would it not be in order to ask unanimous consent that there be general debate on the matter for 1 hour or an hour and a half or 2 hours, if any gentlemen desire to speak on it?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain any such request.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee objects to the immediate consideration of the bill.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. 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. 5587) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, and to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Rules if he could call a meeting of that committee this afternoon to consider a rule on the clerk salary bill?

Mr. SABATH. If it is the desire, and it seems to me it is the desire of a vast majority of the Members, that that be done, naturally the chairman of the Committee on Rules will comply, as he always has, and will call a meeting for 2:30 this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

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. 5587, with Mr. BONNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the committee for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Instead of holding the meeting at 2:30, the Committee on Rules will meet immediately. The members of that committee are requested to come up to the committee room right away.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the paragraph of the bill to which I yesterday made a point of order which was sustained may be reinstated in the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1945, for salaries and expenses, $34,000, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1945.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I have been greatly concerned in the past months with the reports that have emanated from the War Production Board, indicating the tremendous shortage in the production of necessary and vital war materials. The statements issued by the present Director of the War Production Board have been supplemented by communications from General Eisenhower and communications from the various Pacific fronts. These reports all indicate a tremendous manpower shortage in the country in vital war production, so vital in fact, that the War Production Board was compelled to cancel the authority for resumption of consumer production in many areas of the country. The War Manpower Commission has been striving night and day to force men and women into war-production activities. As a matter of fact, the word has gone out from General Somervell, just day before yesterday, that they will be here before the Congress, asking for compulsory drafting of civilian employees unless the bottleneck of production is solved and men and women get into active war production. Now, I am interested because in looking through this bill I am utterly amazed to find that we are appropriating money for a large number of activities that are going to require the services of thousands upon thousands of citizens of this country. I do not care whether it is said that they are to be principally women or not. We are going to be engaged in a lot of activities under this appropriation bill which will operate in direct competition with the war industries of this country, for which the Army, Navy and Air Corps are clamoring for help.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Yesterday we struck out some of those provisions on a point of order. We hope that a few more may be taken out today. If the gentleman has some suggestions for further taking out, either by amendment or a point of order, I hope he will point them out as the debate proceeds.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand that, and I am very familiar with what took place yesterday. You struck out the first one on page 18 of the bill, providing $830,000 for consumer expenditures and savings study, and the next paragraph providing for consumer income study, $210,000. Then on page 20 of the bill, under the item for the Bureau of the Census we find, census of manufacturers for 1945 and 1946, $2,400,000. The next item is compiling census reports, $990,000.

Consumers' income study, 1945 and 1946, $3,500,000.

Census of agriculture, $5,500,000.

Sample census of business, $1,200,000.

Then we go over into the Labor Department and we find consumers' expenditures and savings study, 1945, $1,532,000.

I have gone through the hearings to find out how many people it will be necessary to place on the pay rolls of this Government in order to carry on all these various studies that are proposed in these various appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I find on an examination of the hearings on this bill that it is going to run into thousands, and here we are, taking men and women out of essential production and proposing to put them to work on consumers' saving and expenditure studies all over the United States. The justification for every one of these studies, outside of the fact that organic law passed years ago provides for some of these census activities, is that it is going to be valuable information sometime for business for labor, and agriculture in the post-war period. Every one of these activities is predicated upon the assumption that this war is about over, and yet, night after night the voices of people in America who are in a position to know are telling the American people that the war is not over, and that a long, dreary road lies ahead that may take years and years. In the face of this gigantic war effort we are asking the American people to tax themselves millions and millions of dollars to put thousands upon thousands of people on the pay roll to make studies which 2 years from now may be utterly worthless and utterly useless, as have been many of the studies that have been made in the past 4 or 5 years. I want to voice my protest against this procedure, and as these items are reached, if they do not go out on points of order, I propose to offer amendments to strike those items from the bill, as they are in direct interference with the proper and urgent prosecution of this war.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I was going to say to the gentleman that I would like to vote for every one of those motions to strike, and I call attention to the fact that there is a farm census being taken now that is unnecessary.

Mr. KEEFE. It seems to me that this is just another proposal to put thousands upon thousands of people on the pay roll, put them to work in activities in direct competition with the necessary war effort in this country. It is no answer for those people to come here and say "Oh, we are going to use women instead of men, generally." Of necessity, there will be thousands upon thousands of men engaged in these activities who should be engaged in essential war work. That will be disclosed by the hearings.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish to commend the gentleman upon his approach to this particular issue, and to join with him in his effort. In my opinion, the inclusion of many of these items is doing nothing but damage to our war effort at this time.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say further that with respect to some of these items testimony was taken before the regular subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and the regular subcommittee refused to go along and make the appropriation. Yet, as inevitably as the day follows the night, we find that where the regular subcommittee has given consideration to some of these items and when the regular subcommittee has refused to recommend the appropriation, the deficiency committee hears the request and very frequently recommends the same. I cannot see anything in the nature of a deficiency where you are setting up a new activity to engage in an entirely new study under the auspices of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, or set up some new statistical information under the Bureau of the Census. Such appropriations, it seems to me, properly should be presented to the regular subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that is charged with appropriating for that particular department, and not slide them in here under the guise of deficiencies when there is nothing of a deficiency character about

them. They propose to set up entirely new activities. I want the Members of the House to know that, as far as I am concerned, I do not, in the face of the emergency facing this country today, propose to vote to put thousands of people on the pay roll of this country in direct competition with the work of the War Manpower Commission which is trying to get the help to carry on this war effort.

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, just a few minutes ago we heard a very moving, very dramatic story, the true picture of our re-entry into the Philippines, the landing on Leyte, delivered by General ROMULO. I wish it might be printed and that every schoolroom all over this great land of ours would have it framed and hung on the wall.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin that we should eliminate all items which would take away labor from the needed war production. I remember when I was in England and France and Belgium and Italy only last September and October I was told that there was a shortage of war munitions and that war munitions were not being distributed properly and I said there was no excuse for that shortage, that it should be investigated. That our country would produce all needed war munitions for our troops if told the truth. On my return I was told that someone in the United States said that I was a busybody because I made that statement. I wish, Mr. Chairman, there had been more busybodies, so-called, active at that time. No public appeal by the administration was made generally for war munitions, added supplies, added trucks, the needed material of war. There should have been. Now there is general appeal made from General Eisenhower down for supplies. My statement is more than corroborated today.

I am delighted that Mr. Byrnes has appointed Gen. Lucius Clay one of his assistants in speeding up war production. He is able and can do it if he is allowed to. But, Mr. Chairman, we must have the truth and nothing but the truth as to the conditions surrounding the manufacture of war material. I hope that Mr. Byrnes, General Clay, and others will tell us the whole truth, not half the truth. I believe they will. We have already lost many lives because we did not have the supplies in Europe, and because we did not have the supplies in the Pacific. From now on there can be no possible excuse for not telling us the truth. Our enemies, Japan and Germany, have known what our situation was and they have taken advantage of it. General Somervell is now making speeches everywhere as to the need for war material. He did at Boston, he did in New York. I shared that view. It was apparent to him even last summer. He stated that war production should come first. The War Production Board, Mr. Nelson at its head, was talking reconversion but General Somervell stated war production should come first. It must, otherwise the loss of life will be on our souls.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, Rural Electrification Administration, fiscal year 1945, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1945, $696,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the item on page 20, beginning in line 7, I was wondering if the Clerk is using the latest print of the numbered bill because I did not hear him read all that is in the latest print. If he did, it is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman from New York that the Clerk does have the latest print.

The Clerk read as follows:

Census of manufactures for 1944: For all expenses of the Bureau of the Census necessary to collect, compile, analyze, and publish a census of manufactures for 1944, including the employment by the Director, at rates to be fixed by him, of personnel at the seat of government and elsewhere without regard to the Classification Act; purchase of books of reference, periodicals, maps, and newspapers; construction of tabulating machines; printing and binding; travel expenses, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the collection of statistics when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Commerce; reimbursement for actual cost of ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls; and reimbursement at not to exceed 3 cents per mile of employees for expenses of travel performed by them in privately owned automobiles while engaged in census enumeration within the limits of their official stations; fiscal year 1945, $2,400,000, to remain available until June 30, 1946.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order against the paragraph just read on the ground it contains legislation and is not authorized in an appropriation bill. The paragraph is one of those cited in the report as embodying legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] desire to be heard?

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman concedes the point of order and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Compiling census reports, etc.: For an additional amount for compiling census reports, etc., fiscal year 1945, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1945, and including expenses incident to preparation for sample surveys throughout the United States for the purpose of estimating the size, characteristics, and distribution of the Nation's population, $990,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is not authorized by law, it is legislation on an appropriation bill, and I make the same statement made before, namely, it is cited in the report.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] desire to be heard?

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman concedes the point of order, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Consumer income study: For all expenses of the Bureau of the Census necessary to collect, compile, and analyze statistics with respect to the consumer income, and to publish the results thereof, including the employment by the Director, at rates to be fixed by him, of personnel at the seat of government and elsewhere without regard to the Classification Act; purchase of books of reference, periodicals, maps, and newspapers; construction of tabulating machines; printing and binding; travel expenses, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the collection of statistics when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Commerce; reimbursement for actual cost of ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls; and reimbursement at not to exceed 3 cents per mile of employees for expenses of travel performed by them in privately owned automobiles while engaged in census enumeration within the limits of their official stations; fiscal year 1945, $3,500,000, to remain available until June 30, 1946.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SNYDER. I concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Census of agriculture: For an additional amount for census of agriculture, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1945, $5,500,000, to remain available until December 31, 1946.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph and call attention to the language on page 23, line 3, "$5,500,000 to remain available until December 31, 1946," as not being authorized by law and being legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SNYDER. The title of the bill provides for just what the gentleman states. This work is under way, and this is just an additional amount to carry on.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania hold that this amount is authorized?

Mr. SNYDER. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman cite the authorization?

Mr. SNYDER. The authorization is the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the current fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin further contend that the amount is not authorized?

Mr. KEEFE. I contend, Mr. Chairman, that the provision making the amount available until December 31, 1946, makes it objectionable, as it carries it beyond any authorization.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania wish to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. SNYDER. Nothing further, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: Page 22, line 24, insert:

"Census of agriculture: For an additional amount for census of agriculture, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1945, $5,500,000, to remain available until June 30, 1946."

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

Mr. Chairman, this is the first opportunity to pass directly on the question of whether or not this Congress is going to take a step which, in my humble judgment, can have no other effect than to interfere seriously with the manpower situation that confronts the country. It is true that arguments will be made in connection with this situation, as they were made before the deficiency subcommittee, that this $5,500,000 to be spent by the Department of Agriculture over a period which under the amendment will end June 30, 1946, will not have any particular effect on the manpower situation, because those employed will be principally women and principally people that perhaps could not otherwise be used in the war effort.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that all through the country districts—and I know the gentleman has a great agricultural territory himself—women are in great demand to do such things as picking beans and peas and canning them, and all that sort of thing?

Mr. KEEFE. Of course.

The whole situation resolves itself into this, that that contention on the part of the proponents of this proposed appropriation just will not hold water. The point is, are we going to employ thousands of people scattered throughout this country and spend $5,500,000 on a project that has no relation whatever to the war effort except to gather a lot of statistics that, by the time they are gathered, will be worthless and useless? Are we going now, today, to vote to do that very thing, and put the Department of Agriculture in competition with vital war industries in the effort to recruit the people necessary to carry out the project, when those charged with the war effort say the situation is so vital and critical that they are compelled to threaten a labor draft unless it is immediately relieved?

I do not want my vote cast in the face of the critical character of the war effort as it stands today to put to work on this project thousands of people who ought to be in the vital war effort, whether in the canning industry, in the war industries, on the farms, or in the shops. I do not want by my vote to take those people off their necessary jobs and interfere with the war effort by putting them to work on this piddling job of gathering statistics that will not have any value to your constituents or to mine and that will not make any contribution worth while to the war effort.

I think this program can be postponed and I think it ought to be postponed. I think it is contrary to every statement that has emanated from the administration and those in charge of our war effort that we must do nothing to interfere with this manpower and womanpower situation that is so vital in connection with our war industries.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman state specifically what this $5,500,000 is for? What kind of statistics are they going to gather?

Mr. KEEFE. They are going to gather statistics specified under the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act of 1945. I suppose, according to the information given in the hearings, they are going to gather the same type of information they have always gathered heretofore, and then are going to compile it, and by the time they get it gathered and compiled, and it is covered with dust, the information, except for a few, will be useless and valueless.

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

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. In my district, which adjoins the district of the gentleman from Wisconsin, 4,500 employees have had to be imported from Jamaica and the Barbados; as well as German war prisoners being used to take care of the canning industry. In addition to that, the Hercules Powder Plant is calling for 12,000 employees, including women as well as men. They do not discriminate between them, they can use both men and women. There is no sense to this.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the gentleman has pointed that out. Here Congress is in the position of appropriating money in this very bill to import labor from foreign countries; Mexico, and the islands of Barbados, Jamaica, and so forth, and utilizing every German war prisoner we can, and still we are appropriating money to take our own people out of necessary productive activity in the war effort and putting them out to gather statistics because it is said that some Congress in the past, authorized the census to be taken. Yes, we have authorized it. But there is nothing in the law which says because it is authorized we must make the appropriation to implement that authorization and make it effective. I think the Members of this Congress will be sending a heartening word out to the people of this country if we say we are going to put a stop to this useless activity now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which I have offered. The amendment which I offered and which at present is being considered by the Committee of the Whole is simply to restore the language carried in the bill when reported by the full Committee on Appropriations, with the change made necessary as to the last date of availability of the appropriation by the ruling made by the Chair on the point of order. The arguments advanced by the gentleman from Wisconsin would have been very appropriate upon the passage of the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1945. In fact, those arguments were advanced in connection with the making of the original appropriation for the quinquennial farm census by the passage of that act through the House of Representatives. We thrashed that out, that is, all of these subject matters to which the gentleman from Wisconsin has made reference, at that time. It was said then that notwithstanding the fact that Congress had authorized and directed the taking of a census of agriculture every 5 years, that it was not mandatory upon the Congress to provide the funds with which to make that authorization effective, and yet you did provide the funds.

You have already appropriated in the Department of Commerce appropriation act for the fiscal year 1945, $7,250,000. A part of that money has been spent, the remainder of it will be spent. The only question now is, whether or not having put your hand to the plow and directed the taking of this census and having provided $7,250,000 for expenditure in that connection, you now propose to deny the remainder of the amount which will be necessary to complete it in an efficient manner. It is not material, as I see it, now, whether or not the taking of the farm census, is essential to agriculture. I conceive it to be essential. The Congress conceived it to be essential when it provided for it originally and you, the Members of this House, conceived it to be essential, or a majority of you did, when you passed the Department of Commerce appropriation bill for the present fiscal year and provided funds for it. So it seems to me to be an entirely unreasonable position to say that because, in the opinion of some Member or Members, you should not have started this thing and that you should not have made the initial appropriation that now you should deny the funds to complete the work, already undertaken by the Bureau of the Census.

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

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. As a matter of fact, this provision of the law calling for a census was passed many years ago and has been taken time and time again, and machinery has been set up to complete this census.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is exactly correct. Of course, I do not insist

that the mere fact that an authorization was made many years ago for the taking of a census would make it mandatory upon the Congress to appropriate the funds and implement that authorization, but I say that you, the Members of this House, have appropriated the major portion of necessary funds.

You have already appropriated $7,250,000, a part of which has been spent, and the machinery which you authorized has been in large part set up. The question presented to you now is, Are you going to abandon the work which you have not only authorized but appropriated funds to implement?

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

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Did not the House by its action last spring, when it passed the original appropriation, say that the collection of agricultural information was indispensable, not only to the war effort but that we might be able to plan the war effort in the future? We had to know what the supply of food would be, how much there would be, and where it would be.

Mr. TARVER. The reasons which actuated individual Members of the House in voting for this appropriation I would not undertake to discuss. I am not in position to speak for them, but I do know that a majority of them voted for this appropriation of $7,250,000 to start this work. Having done so, I do not see how they can take the position now that the work ought to be abandoned and not carried through to consummation for reasons which, if valid at all, should have had more weight when the first appropriation was made.

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

Mr. TARVER. Yes; I yield to my colleague.

Mr. KEEFE. Does not the gentleman feel that in view of the very critical character of our manpower problem and our war effort, which has developed since the Congress took that action, very definitely developed since then——

Mr. TARVER. No; I cannot agree with the gentleman.

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

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. I take decided issue with the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin that the shortage of labor has developed since the Congress, in the summer of this year, passed the Department of Commerce appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1945. There has been, during the entire period of the emergency, a very acute shortage of labor, particularly of farm labor. If you will examine the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the very argument which the gentleman from Wisconsin makes today was advanced upon the passage of the Department of Commerce appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1945, against this appropriation.

It was said then that the personnel needed in the collection of these statistics could be better used otherwise, in other activities. The very insistences made by the gentleman then were overruled by the House, because you did make the appropriation, notwithstanding the advancement of those arguments.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Has the machinery been set up, and supervisors appointed to take care of this census?

Mr. TARVER. The machinery has been set up and the supervisors have been appointed and selected in all districts of the United States where the census is to be taken. Training has been accorded those who are to participate in the taking of the census. We are a long way down the road toward the completion of the job.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Have we not gone so far that we cannot back out now?

Mr. TARVER. Certainly. A large part of the funds have already been used that were made available by this Congress.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. And if this appropriation is not made, the millions that have been spent in setting up this organization would be wasted?

Mr. TARVER. Absolutely wasted, and we would have reversed our judgment by so doing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the parliamentary situation before the Committee is that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] has offered an amendment which would restore to the bill that particular paragraph just stricken on a point of order. I hope that the Members present today, who feel that every possible ounce of our energy should be given to the war effort and to the war effort alone, will oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

I believe it will be admitted that no man has supported agricultural legislation any more faithfully on this floor during the past 6 years than I have, but the further expenditure of $5,500,000 at this time, proposing to keep from 27,000 to 30,000 people in the field taking an agricultural census, is not in keeping with the idea that we do everything we can to back up the boys at the front.

Allow me to call to your attention the testimony on page 194 of the hearings:

> Mr. LUDLOW. What will be the over-all number of employees required to take the census?
>
> Mr. CAPT. Between 27,000, 29,000, and 30,000, including all employees in the field.

Remember that we have already given to this organization $7,200,000 to conduct this census, yet through the extravagance of its operation they come back to us and ask for an additional five and one-half millions to carry on this supposedly necessary work. If any Member can stand up here and prove that the war effort will suffer in the slightest if we knock this work out at the present time, I will be glad to withdraw my opposition to this particular amendment.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact that last fall, shortly before the election, many promises were made in agricultural sections as to who would take this political census?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I would rather the gentleman answer that question himself.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will say that it happened in my district. It was passed out as purely political patronage not on the basis of the value to agriculture but purely on the basis of whether they were good party members.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Personally I do not care who gets the jobs, but I do not believe these jobs should be made available while your sons are over there in the trenches suffering from lack of heavy shells, as General Eisenhower says, necessary properly to prosecute this war.

The proposed consumers' studies, embodying the proposed employment of thousands of people, seem ridiculous to me at a time like this. Mr. Chairman, if there is anything urgent whatsoever about these studies in relation to consumers' income, why did not the Labor Department, for instance, come before our particular subcommittee and discuss the problem with us, just as the Office of Education recently has done in another matter? There certainly is nothing urgent about it, and I certainly hope and trust that superfluous items of this nature will be put into the discard and kept there. Man-hours today are far too precious to be frittered away in projects of this nature, let alone the millions of dollars required.

Mr. DONDERO and Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina rose.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Is there anything to show that as the result of the expenditure of this money and the taking of these people out of war employment it will produce an extra pound of cotton or an extra bushel of wheat?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Michigan has put his finger right on the spot. What we need on the farms, what I need back on my farm in Minnesota, is an extra man to help put the grain into the ground. That is what every farmer needs this spring and we do not know where we can find these additional men. Yet here it is proposed to have up to near 30,000 Federal employees compiling statistics as to what we have not done on the farms because we have not had the labor available to do so.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. If the gentleman had not already done so I suggest that he point out the effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia as to making available twice as much money for this function.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I have already done that, I may say to the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr MORRISON of North Carolina. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina object to the gentleman from Minnesota revising his remarks?

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. It is a unanimous-consent request, and I object.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been referred to as a political census. I thought they took a political census on November 7 and that it is all over.

I want to disabuse the minds of some of my good friends over here. This is not primarily an agricultural bill. It is a bill to assemble agricultural statistics of production throughout the United States and the justification for this is found on page 193 of the hearings of last spring when the appropriation was provided for the year 1945. I desire to quote the justification given by the Director of the Bureau of the Census. Remember, this is not for the Department of Agriculture, this is for the Department of Commerce, and I quote the purpose of this census and grounds upon which the appropriation was made. The Director said in support of his estimate:

> Production and supplying of food have assumed great importance in the prosecution of the war equal to that of guns and shells.

I repeat, "production of foodsuffs is equal to that of guns and shells." Do we know whether we are now producing enough foodstuffs to meet the demands of our armed forces? Do you know whether or not we have been producing enough guns and shells? Certainly we know. It would be tragic if we did not. If we have not been producing enough food we want to know it. This war is not over yet and it will not be over within the next few days or few months, and it is not too soon to find out what is available for our boys this next year. This census will be taken in January.

Let me read further what the Director says:

> The availability of food may be an important determining factor in the future course of the war, especially as the number of men in the armed forces overseas increases, and as more occupied territories are taken over by the United Nations, which, of course, must be supplied with foodstuffs. Accurate and timely statistics on food supplies on hand and of future production possibilities in the United States are necessary for efficient programing and more effective operations in meeting the needs of our armed forces, our civilian population and our allies. Agricultural statistics will be of fundamental importance also in planning the conversion from a war to a peacetime economy, particularly in measuring farm markets, for the guidance of manufacturers and sellers of both durable and consumer goods.

Does anyone here this afternoon want to stand up and vote against a small appropriation which is designed primarily for the prosecution of our war effort and to see that our young men are supplied with food and clothing?

Let me go a little further.

The question was raised as to whether or not the employment of these people would interfere with the production program in industry and in agriculture. Listen to what the Director said:

> We are particularly determined that it be not permitted to interfere insofar as we are able. We have issued instructions to our field force, which is in a formative state at the moment, that we must first look to people who would normally not be available for regular jobs and not take people from the normal labor force.

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given 1 additional minute.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to finish reading this paragraph, that is all. The gentleman from South Caroline [Mr. HARE] was just reading the paragraph at the bottom of page 193 when his time expired.

> We have issued instructions to our field force, which is in a formative state at the moment, that we must first look to people who would normally not be available for regular jobs and not take people from the normal labor force under any circumstances, giving first preference to honorably discharged veterans who are able to do our work, to members of their families, and the families of men still in the services.

There are approximately sufficient men back home who have been rehabilitated, who had slight wounds, to fill these offices, and I think it would be a grand thing if we could give them work of this nature when they come back.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, in up-State New York they have had to bring in a lot of migrant laborers in the past few years to pick peas and beans. They have imported them from points as remote as Jamaica. I am certainly not going to vote $5,000,000 for a census when nobody is worried about how we are going to get those peas and beans picked in up-State New York. Instead of money being appropriated for these purposes, I would like to see a little concentration on the part of those in authority to bring about the harvesting of food for victory. Why not assist the dairy farmers in up-State New York in the production of milk? Heaven only knows there has been little enough done to foster a constructive and tangible occupation such as dairy farming in New York State.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is aware that the Department of Agriculture is constantly fathering information through the mail boxes, by putting posters in every farmer's mail box, is he not?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is aware of this much, that there has been a dearth of farm labor in up-State New York. Anybody who is eligible to take a census around these farming areas is certainly able to do some work on the farm.

Mr. GROSS. Is this information that is constantly being gathered and put out monthly to all of the farmers of no value? Why do they not use it? What value will they make of the information they get from this $5,000,000 appropriation?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. No value whatsoever, because all they have to do is to go to up-State New York and see the difficulties that the farmers have been laboring under up there. I will guarantee that unless they wake up to the labor shortage in that region there is going to be a terrible food shortage throughout the entire Nation. They are not going to be able to supply our armed forces unless they realize what we are undergoing up there.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. In addition to what the gentleman has said, in my own State of Michigan peaches by the tens of thousands of bushels rotted on the trees this year because there was no labor to harvest them. They brought in labor from Jamaica, from Haiti, and from the West Indies to harvest the cherry crop in my State. How would this census in any way change that picture?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The census will not help the situation, it will hinder it, because it will take up a lot of labor which should go to the production and harvesting of crops.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I will tell the gentleman why they are getting no assistance in the dairy regions. It is because they are so busy displacing the dairy products with oleomargarine that they are not interested in anything else.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is right. He and I both come from districts where there are labor shortages. We are not interested in recruiting a lot of people to take an agricultural census. We know how short we

are on labor, we know how short we are on farm help. We know how the farm entrepreneurs are suffering in upstate New York and throughout other portions of the Northeast. What we want today is action and plenty of it on the part of those in the Department of Agriculture and the other agencies of the Government, so that we can get some relief in order that individual farming can survive, because it is well on the way toward its demise.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I am in opposition to this amendment and hope something more constructive than this will be proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, when I objected to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] a while ago, I was merely resenting his refusal to yield to me. I thought he had asked to proceed for 2 additional minutes, and I objected more for mischief than for anything else. I should like to withdraw my objection. I am perfectly willing for him to extend his remarks all he desires to.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I renew my request to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I am more or less familiar with the statute which originally provided for this census. It was passed in 1925, when the Republicans controlled the Congress. At that time they thought it was a great measure, and I think the Democrats concurred with them in that supposition. We have been taking this census every 5 years ever since. It is a census which is most helpful to the business of this country—everybody concedes that. I doubt that anyone who today opposes the continuation of this census will insist that it is not very valuable to the farmers and the businessmen of the country. It gives them statistics with reference to farm products and farm life, and these figures enable the businessmen of the country to determine their business activities sometimes for more than a year ahead and sometimes for as much as 5 years. That is the purpose of this census. The Republicans in 1925, I am sure, thought it was a very beneficial act. I cannot understand why they oppose the continuation of this census today and oppose this amendment to complete the carrying out of a census they themselves inaugurated some years ago.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Does my distinguished friend believe that in view of the critical situation facing the country in its war effort we should rely upon the slogan "Business as usual" in order to sustain this proposed amendment?

Mr. KERR. It will not affect the war activity in any way. That is my opinion about it, and I am sincere in believing that this proposed measure will not interfere with the war activity in any way whatsoever. We have already set up the machinery and have selected most of the enumerators to do the work. I cannot understand why distinguished gentlemen of this House should propose practically throwing away the $7,000,000, a great part of which has already been spent in the organization and equipment for this farm census, for the want of the $5,000,000 necessary to complete a good job through a law that has been on the statute books of this country for more than 40 years and has been so beneficial to the business life of our Nation.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I wonder if the gentleman realizes that this census will take at least 2 hours of every farmer's time and there are 6,000,000 farmers. That means 12,000,000 hours of farm labor lost. I think this is a bad time to spend 12,000,000 hours of farm labor, taking a census which could be taken by the farm extension agent in every county, which would cost nothing except the price of a few stamps and which will be just as accurate as any census that could be taken under this plan.

Mr. KERR. The gentleman is raising a point which I think is inconsequential and which he need not be apprehensive about.

Mr. JENSEN. Certainly, the gentleman will admit that wartime is a bad time to spend 12,000,000 hours of farm labor to take a census.

Mr. KERR. I think the gentleman is mistaken in assuming that that much manpower time would be consumed in this work. I know the Department has set up machinery to take this census and I think it would be unwise and a very foolish thing not to let it complete it in view of the fact that it has already begun this important work.

Mr. JENSEN. But it will take up 2 hours of the time of every farmer.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I cannot yield to the gentleman further.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. 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. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill, H. R. 5587, the first supplemental appropriation bill, 1945, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ESTABLISHMENT OF GRADE OF FLEET ADMIRAL IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 671, Rept. No. 2034) on the bill (S. 2019) to establish the grade of Fleet Admiral of the United States Navy and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That 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 the bill (S. 2019) to establish the grade of Fleet Admiral of the United States Navy, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order as a substitute amendment for the Senate bill the provisions contained in H. R. 5576. 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.

CLERK HIRE OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. SABATH from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 672, Rept. No. 2035) on the bill (H. R. 5590) to increase clerk hire and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That 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 the bill (H. R. 5590) to increase clerk hire, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Accounts, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill 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.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this rule was reported a few minutes ago, but there is no report with it and no hearing on it. Can it be brought up with less than a two-thirds roll-call vote?

The SPEAKER. The question is whether or not the House will consider the resolution.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; but that requires a two-thirds vote.

The SPEAKER. Yes; that requires a two-thirds vote, either by voice, a standing vote, or a roll-call vote.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MICHENER) there were—yeas 106, nays 32.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum 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—yeas 208; nays 90; not voting 130, as follows:

[Roll No. 121]

YEAS—208

Allen, La.
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, N. Mex.
Andresen, August H.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Y.
Angell
Arends
Arnold
Barrett
Bates, Ky.
Bates, Mass.
Beall
Beckworth
Bell
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Bennett, Mo.
Bishop
Bland
Bloom
Bonner
Boren
Boykin
Bradley, Mich.
Bradley, Pa.
Brehm
Buck
Burchill, N. Y.
Butler
Byrne
Cannon, Mo.
Carson, Ohio
Carter
Case
Celler
Chiperfield
Cochran
Coffee
Cole, Mo.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Cox
Cravens
Crawford
Crosser
Curley
Dawson
Day
Dilweg
Dingell
Dirksen
Dondero
Drewry
Eberharter
Elliott
Ellis
Ellison, Md.
Ellsworth
Engel, Mich.
Engle, Calif.
Feighan
Fellows
Fernandez
Fish
Flannagan
Folger
Forand
Fuller
Gale
Gamble
Gathings
Gerlach
Gibson
Gifford
Gillespie
Goodwin
Gordon
Gorski
Grant, Ala.
Gregory
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Hancock
Harless, Ariz.
Harris
Hart
Hays
Hébert
Herter
Hess
Hill
Hobbs
Hoch
Hoffman
Holmes, Mass.
Holmes, Wash.
Howell
Hull
Izac
Jackson
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Anton J.
Johnson, Calvin D.
Johnson, Ind.
Johnson, Okla.
Kearney
Kee
Keefe
Kefauver
Kelley
Keogh
Kerr
King
Kirwan
Kleberg
Klein
Landis
Lane
Larcade
Lea
LeFevre
Lesinski
Lewis
Lynch
McCormack
McKenzie
McMillan, S. C.
McMillen, Ill.
Madden
Manasco
Marcantonio
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
May
Merrow
Mills
Monroney
Morrison, La.
Morrison, N. C.
Mundt
Murdock
Myers
Norton
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Connor
O'Hara
O'Konski
O'Toole
Peterson, Fla.
Pittenger
Plumley
Poage
Priest
Rabaut
Randolph
Rankin
Reed, Ill.
Richards
Rivers
Robinson, Utah
Robsion, Ky.
Rogers, Mass.
Rolph
Sabath
Sadowski
Scrivner
Sheppard
Slaughter
Smith, Wis.
Snyder
Somers, N. Y.
Spence
Stanley
Starnes, Ala.
Stevenson
Stewart
Stigler
Sullivan
Sumners, Tex.
Taile
Thomas, Tex.
Torrens
Vincent, Ky.
Vinson, Ga.
Voorhis, Calif.
Wadsworth
Walter
Wasielewski
Weaver
Weichel, Ohio
Welch
West
White
Whitten
Wickersham
Wigglesworth
Winter
Wolcott
Woodruff, Mich.
Worley
Wright

NAYS—90

Abernethy
Andersen, H. Carl
Bolton
Brown, Ga.
Brumbaugh
Bryson
Burch, Va.
Burdick
Camp
Carlson, Kans.
Carrier
Chapman
Church
Clason
Clevenger
Compton
Cooper
Cunningham
Curtis
D'Alesandro
Disney
Doughton, N. C.
Durham
Dworshak
Elmer
Gavin
Gilchrist
Gillette
Gillie
Gossett
Graham
Gross
Gwynne
Hare
Heidinger
Hoeven
Hope
Jenkins
Johnson, J. Leroy
Johnson, Luther A.
Jones
Jonkman
Kinzer
Knutson
Kunkel
Lanham
LeCompte
Lemke
Ludlow
McConnell
Mahon
Mason
Michener
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Mo.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, Pa.
Murray, Tenn.
Murray, Wis.
Norman
Norrell
O'Neal
Peterson, Ga.
Pratt, Joseph M.
Ramey
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Rockwell
Rodgers, Pa.
Rohrbough
Rowe
Sauthoff
Schwabe
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Va.
Springer
Sumner, Ill.
Taber
Tarver
Thomason
Tibbott
Troutman
Vorys, Ohio
Vursell
Whittington
Willey
Wilson
Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—130

Allen, Ill.
Auchincloss
Baldwin, Md.
Baldwin, N. Y.
Barden
Barry
Blackney
Brooks
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Buffett
Bulwinkle
Burgin
Busbey
Canfield
Cannon, Fla.
Capozzoli
Chenoweth
Clark
Cooley
Costello
Courtney
Daughton, Va.
Davis
Delaney
Dewey
Dickstein
Dies
Domengeaux
Douglas
Eaton
Elston, Ohio
Fay
Fenton
Fisher
Fitzpatrick
Ford
Fulbright
Fulmer
Furlong
Gallagher
Gearhart
Granger
Grant, Ind.
Griffiths
Halleck
Harness, Ind.
Hartley
Heffernan
Hendricks
Hinshaw
Holifield
Horan
Jeffrey
Johnson, Lyndon B.
Johnson, Ward
Judd
Kean
Kennedy
Kilburn
Kilday
LaFollette
Lambertson
Luce
McCord
McCowen
McGehee
McGregor
McLean
McMurray
McWilliams
Maas
Magnuson
Maloney
Mansfield, Mont.
Mansfield, Tex.
Merritt
Monkiewicz
Mott
Mruk
Murphy
Newsome
Outland
Pace
Patman
Patton
Pfeifer
Philbin
Phillips
Ploeser
Poulson
Powers
Pracht, C. Frederick
Price
Ramspeck
Reece, Tenn.
Rizley
Robertson
Rooney
Rowan
Russell
Sasscer
Satterfield
Scanlon
Schiffler
Scott
Shafer
Sheridan
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Maine
Smith, W. Va.
Sparkman
Stearns, N. H.
Stefan
Stockman
Sundstrom
Talbot
Taylor
Thomas, N. J.
Tolan
Towe
Treadway
Ward
Weiss
Wene
Wheichel, Ga.
Winstead
Wolfenden, Pa.
Wolverton, N. J.
Woodrum, Va.

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the House decided to consider the resolution.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Ramspeck with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Outland with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. Winstead with Mr. Jeffrey.
Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Merritt with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Elston of Ohio.
Mr. Courtney with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Weiss with Mr. Stefan.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Talbot.
Mr. Sasscer with Mrs. Smith of Maine.
Mr. Mansfield of Montana with Mr. Ploeser.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Kilday with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Robertson with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Rizley.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Daughton of Virginia with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Grant of Indiana.
Mr. Rooney with Mr. Harness of Indiana.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is recognized.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, having observed that a vast majority of the Members desired action, having requested that the Rules Committee be called to grant a rule to make in order the bill H. R. 5590, the Rules Committee complied with the express wishes of the majority, held a meeting and reported the resolution which you have now made in order by a record vote of 208 to 90.

In that connection I wish to say the resolution which the Committee on Rules has reported is an open rule. It provides for 1 hour general debate, after which the privilege of amendment is provided.

Mr. Speaker, having served longer than any other Member present, finishing my thirty-eighth year, I may enlighten those, especially the new Members, as to the need for this additional clerk hire. When I entered the House, I venture to say we received daily three to six letters and sometimes a telegram. Up to about 34 years ago and before the first office building was constructed and ready for occupancy, Members had desks in the House Chamber, as are still in use in the Senate, and we were obliged to do most of our work in the cloakrooms, in the Members' lobby, and at our hotel rooms or living quarters. Today we receive hundreds of letters and telegrams, resolutions, and demands that were not dreamed of 38 years ago.

I fully appreciate the time that it requires to comply with the many requests of the mothers, fathers, sisters, and brothers of those millions now in the armed forces, to whom we all desire to be of service. This ever-increasing service takes a great deal of time and requires additional help.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a mandatory law. It will not compel any Member to accept the additional allowance. There may be some Members who will not need this additional help. If so, I am sure they will not take advantage of this law, simply to put on additional help in order to spend the money provided for.

My experience goes back many years when we increased the salaries of Members from $5,000 to $7,500. I recall that there were two or three Members who refused to vote for it and who stated they would not accept the additional compensation, but later on they reconsidered and consented, without a great deal of prodding, to take the money.

That happened when we increased the congressional salary from $7,500 to $10,000. Right in this connection, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I believe the salary of $5,000 a year 38 years ago provided better care of Members than the $10,000 they receive now. Due to the

continuous sessions and the extreme additional cost of living in Washington very few Members can get along unless they are extremely careful of their budget. What applies to us with respect to the high cost of living in Washington applies to our secretaries, committee clerks, and stenographers who find their living costs and expenses nearly double that of 4 or 5 years ago. No increases have been provided for them as was accorded other Government employees. I appreciate that there are a large number of underpaid men and women in the United States. You have heard me call attention to them. I refer to the white-collar workers. I have pleaded and urged many times that something should be done for them and I hope this will be an incentive for us to take affirmative and positive action to bring relief to these underpaid men and women who are deserving of our aid and cooperation. With this additional help given to the Members they will be able to devote more time to the study of the needs of these underpaid white-collar workers and something worked out for their relief.

Some Members have told me that this bill would cost a great deal of money. My answer is "Yes" and "No." It will cost $657,000 if all of the Members of the House actually use this additional clerk hire. I was surprised that objection to the consideration of this bill should be raised by one of the Members who appeared before the Committee on Rules yesterday asking for a rule on a bill granting an increase of $400 a year to the postal employees. That rule was granted. It will cost the Government $132,000,000 a year if the bill is passed.

Mr. ROWE rose.

Mr. SABATH. It was not the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. I wish to ask the gentleman if he will yield for a correction.

Mr. SABATH. For a correction? Always.

Mr. ROWE. The gentleman understands that the $132,000,000 figure is the total cost. If it is held to the present $300 it will cost less than $30,000,000.

Mr. SABATH. Just a minute. The other was a temporary proposition, I realize. What the gentleman from Ohio wants to say is that the increase from $300 to $400 makes a difference of only about $36,000,000. That is right, yes; but the appropriation necessary to take care of it, if it is made permanent law, will cost the Government $132,000,000 annually.

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

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the Rules Committee voted out the rule on the bill granting an increase to postal workers?

Mr. SABATH. We have granted the rule.

Mr. BENDER. I commend the gentleman for taking that action.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman. I always feel, however, the fact that we have been unable to aid others is not always a valid reason why we should restrict ourselves and fail to help those who are also in need of assistance.

In other words, I do not think two wrongs make a right and because we have not been able as yet to act upon relief for the white-collar workers does not indicate we should not relieve our underpaid secretarial and committee clerical forces. It is most difficult for Members to obtain clerks for the salaries that we formerly or at present are paying them. We were able formerly to get a stenographer for $125 or $150, but today you cannot get help for that salary. You cannot get a man who knows anything at all for less than $200, $250, or $300 a month and a good man with legislative experience or college education commands from $400 to $500 a month. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have come to the conclusion that the country is entitled to the very best services that the Members can render and that the constituency of the various Members is entitled to the aid and to the assistance and to the service which the Members cannot give with inefficient clerical help or with clerks who cannot perform the work and give the service that you feel and that I feel the people at home are entitled to.

Mr. Speaker, I have therefore upon the request of the Members of the House reported this rule. It has been my policy and the policy of the Committee on Rules to bring to the floor for consideration legislation recommended by the proper committees or upon the urgent request of a majority of the Members of the House. That is the reason I have consented to the immediate call of the Committee on Rules in order to bring in this rule.

The rule is an open one and permits an opportunity to vote for or against the bill. You may reduce the amount provided therein or you may increase it, but I hope that no one will endeavor to increase it, because I believe an additional amount of $3,000 is sufficient to take care of our needs.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that we have not been able also to take care of help for many of the important committees of the House. However, I hope that the committee which we are creating to study and investigate the reorganization of the Congress will make an investigation and report and that relief will be forthcoming to those committees that have been handicapped in the past on account of lack of clerical, stenographic, or other help that they may be in need of, experienced help which they may require to aid the committees in performing their duties upon important legislation they are called upon from time to time to consider and report to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I hope I have made myself clear. I trust the Members will follow their own views and vote according to their good judgment upon this rule. In my opinion, the additional amount is necessary and I hope it will be voted for.

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

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman has me a little confused about the measure. I thought it was merely an increase in the amount of clerk hire or secretarial aid that a Member could employ to the extent of $3,000.

Mr. SABATH. It applies temporarily to committee help as well as to secretarial assistance.

Mr. MAY. May I ask, does it apply to every Member and does it not affect at all the committee work?

Mr. SABATH. It does to a small extent in allowing an increase of about $500 to the clerks of committees for the balance of the fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, having explained to the best of my ability the provisions of the bill, and having complied with the wishes of the vast majority of the Members on both sides of the House, I shall leave to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Accounts and to the members of that committee a more detailed explanation of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I wish to point out that the general publicity given to the Maloney-Monroney resolutions to provide for a study and investigation of the reorganization of the Congress, together with the evidence presented today to the Committee on Rules by some of the best-informed men and economists of the country, has made clear that it is absolutely necessary to afford salary increases to our secretarial forces as well as to the personnel of standing committees of the House. The testimony and evidence has also plainly indicated that the salaries of Members of Congress are inadequate in view of the increased cost of living and by reason of the expenditures which are necessary in the maintenance of two homes or living quarters—one in their district and one in Washington—which they are required to maintain the year around. It has been pointed out that Congress for the past 12 years has been continuously in session, unlike in former years when the so-called long session would last 7 months and the so-called short session a period of 3 months, and Members' living expenses have doubled during that time.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the salary question of Members of Congress will receive due consideration by the joint committee to be named under Senate Concurrent Resolution 23, which was favorably reported by the Committee on Rules and will be filed by me before the adjournment of the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this rule waives points of order but permits amendments that are germane to the bill. There has been a hue and cry throughout the United States that the Congress should be streamlined and that there should be more efficiency in the formulation of legislation. Those who have been writing these articles and speaking over the radio have insisted that the Congress be provided with more research clerks and investigators. I believe that this proposal is in line with what the people want back home—to provide the Members of the Congress with additional clerk hire so that they may be

better staffed. If the Members want to give that increase to the clerks that they now have, to some who have been working overtime, of course, that is perfectly all right. If they want to get an additional clerk to do research work or to investigate, I think that would be in accord with public opinion.

Therefore, although none of this money, of course, will come to my clerks as a "lame duck" Member of the Congress, I am in favor of the proposal. Much can be said on the other side, but I think it is more or less a tempest in a teapot, and the public back home will not resent an increase for proper clerk hire in the House of Representatives. When the war is over and the G. I. Joes and and the G. I. Janes come home there will be thousands of cases arising out of the war that will have to be handled in every congressional office, and they will expect prompt and efficient service. That is their right. The war veterans are entitled to expeditious handling of their cases by Members of Congress.

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

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COMPTON. Does not the gentleman think it would be better to have a comprehensive plan of streamlining Congress than try to do it piecemeal as this attempts to do?

Mr. FISH. The Committee on Rules did report out today a resolution for that purpose, to create a special committee to consider this very proposal, including many others, but as long as it is before the Congress it is a very simple issue and should be considered and adopted. The Members of Congress themselves must know whether they need more clerk hire to conduct the functions of their office efficiently for the public interest and the interest of their constituents. I am informed that the mail has doubled in the last few years for every Member of Congress. Most districts are larger in population than they were 10 years ago. We are now in the midst of the greatest war in history, that will be followed by all kinds of veteran cases and loans and employment that will require additional clerk hire for a number of years.

Mr. Speaker, there is one matter very close to my heart that has been referred to by the chairman of the Committee on Rules. If for no other reason than that I would support the pending bill. I believe if the Members of Congress by their votes vote for an increase in clerk hire, that they will have a moral duty to vote legislation for the benefit of the white-collar class, for those 20,000,000 underpaid men and women in America, who are struggling every day against the high cost of living, yet an employer of labor cannot increase their pay without going to the National War Labor Board if it is above 50 cents an hour.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Did we not on the 19th of June have that very bill here, when we had the Andresen amendment up for consideration?

Mr. FISH. It was defeated by a very small vote, under a time limitation where it was impossible to present the facts to the Congress. I had an amendment similar to the Andresen amendment, and I should like to recall, if I may now, that it was the Andresen-Fish amendment, because the amendments were identical, and because I deferred to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] so he could present his amendment first. He had 5 or 6 minutes to speak on it and I had only 2 or 3 minutes.

I believe that if we had had an opportunity to present the merits of that proposition to Congress it would have gone through by an overwhelming vote. I believe that if we could offer an amendment to this bill so that an employer of labor could increase the pay of his employees up to 75 cents an hour, or $36 a week, without the necessity of going to the National War Labor Board to get permission to do so, it would be adopted overwhelmingly. Now the Board can give permission for only a 15-percent increase up to 50 cents an hour. The amendment I recently proposed would permit an increase to 75 cents an hour or $36 a week, which an employer of labor might award an efficient and hardworking employee without applying to the War Labor Board.

We must all know those facts. We know the little, humble, white-collar workers, clerks in stores, poorly paid factory workers have no lobby, have no spokesmen to come before Congress to plead their case, yet every day millions of these people in the factories and in the stores, both in peace and war, including stenographers and clerical help, are so underpaid that they cannot compete with the withholding taxes and high cost of living and at the same time live according to decent American standards.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman feel that possibly that amendment should be raised to the same amount this bill provides for a clerk, $70 a week?

Mr. FISH. No; I do not think it has any direct connection. I think it is a moral issue. If we can do something for our own clerks, at least we of the Congress of the United States can do something that is meritorious and almost necessary for 20,000,000 Americans, who in the midst of plenty and abundance are living on virtually starvation wages. This proposal will not in any way upset the Little Steel formula as that applies to higher wage scale groups.

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

Mr. FISH. I yield. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. I do not understand that this bill advances the pay of clerks to $70 a week, but that it allows $3,000 as the maximum, for a Member to divide among his entire staff of clerks.

Mr. FISH. But he may also give the entire $3,000 to a research man. There is no reason why he should not. He may divide it among his entire staff. But if he needs a research man, or an additional clerk, he can give the entire $3,000 to that man or divide it among his secretary and clerks.

Mr. DONDERO. That may be true.

Mr. FISH. It has nothing to do with this question of $70 a week. The gentleman is perfectly correct. I am raising another issue, a moral issue. I am raising it as one who is about to leave the Congress. I am appealing to Democrats and Republicans in the next Congress, in view of the fact that you are going to vote for this bill, at least you should do something, after you have done that, for those 20,000,000 wage earners who are being underpaid and whom the employers of labor want to help, but are helpless; who want to reward their employees for their efficient labor and who are not able to do so. That issue, at least, ought to be one which is nonpartisan. It is one that should appeal to every American. It applies to every congressional district. Therefore, as a concluding word by one who is going to vote for this bill, I do so, believing there is a moral obligation upon you to look after the 20,000,000 Americans who are unable to help themselves, and in the next Congress to pass legislation permitting employers of labor to pay their employees 75 cents an hour without permission of the War Labor Board.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Do I understand that if the $3,000 additional is voted to the Members that the 15 percent, now allowed, will be wiped out; or will that 15 percent still remain in effect, over and above the basic pay?

Mr. FISH. As I understand it, that is included. The 15 percent is included in the proposal.

Mr. DONDERO. Is it included in the $3,000?

Mr. FISH. So I understand.

Mr. DONDERO. So that the $3,000 is not entirely an increase, but it is $3,000, less the 15 percent that the clerks now receive?

Mr. FISH. I think the gentleman has brought up a very good point, and I think he is correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], a member of the committee.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I shall not discuss the merits of whether or not Members have all the clerical help they need at this time. I think the question asked by the gentleman from Connecticut a moment ago, just touched the spot. No, this is not the time.

The gentleman from New York said there is a hue and cry throughout the country in behalf of streamlining Congress, making it more workable, consolidating it, and economizing, and expanding where necessary, for the good of the institution. I agree with that. The country wants a real job done. This is piecemeal and may retard the over-all task

Following this philosophy, the Committee on Rules today reported out the Monroney resolution, the very purpose of which is to do that thing and report back to the Congress as to what should be done to accomplish that purpose. A composite picture is to be prepared. Intelligent action can then be taken. That resolution provides that the committee must report by April 1 of next year. It seems to me that we are getting the cart before the horse. We are coming in here today in this unusual way and without adequate consideration; but because, as suggested by the gentleman from New York, there is a "hue and cry" on the floor of the House, among some of our Members to pass this bill immediately, and to rush this through without any consideration.

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

Mr. MICHENER. No; I am sorry I cannot yield now.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman just made a misstatement.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not yield now. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] came to the floor with an amendment which I dare say, not more than 10 men in the House had ever seen.

The House, following the rules of the House, refused to permit the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri to be considered. So this morning he came back with the same amendment in the form of a bill and asked unanimous consent that the bill might be considered, without any further debate, to be read under the 5-minute rule. As soon as the gentleman from Missouri was denied the right to bring the bill up by unanimous consent, the chairman of the Rules Committee forthwith called a meeting of the Rules Committee. Inside of possibly 10 minutes we who are members of that committee were up in the committee room to pass upon this matter. Some of us wanted hearings. Some of us wanted somebody to at least read the bill to us, and explain its implications. There was not any Rules Committee consideration. The bill was just voted out. Within the next few minutes the chairman of the Rules Committee came on the floor and called up this bill, right in the midst of the consideration of a great deficiency appropriation bill, and here we are asked to vote on this rule now.

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

Mr. MICHENER. I do not yield. I do not have the time.

Now, it seems to me if we are setting up a committee to study this whole matter, that committee should report before we take action. Undoubtedly there are Members of Congress who need more clerical help.

Undoubtedly there are Members of Congress who have more clerical help than they now need. But it is said, "Oh, you need not take the money." I am going to vote against this until I know more about it; but if it goes through I am going to take the money for my office help, and I am not going to demagog about it. I believe every Member here will do the same thing. All this speed and excitement is not warranted. It does not inspire confidence in the Congress. This is the wrong time and this is the wrong place to vote additional expense without more information. Our people want us properly staffed. Our people want our offices properly cared for. The chairman of the Rules Committee suggested that this would be an incentive to violate the Little Steel formula. He indicated this would be the opening wedge, in substance; this will be an example to the people of the country. I do not want to commence by breaking the 15-percent formula so far as Congress only is affected. Then the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] went further. I understood him to say if he had his way he would include an amendment in this bill changing the Little Steel formula, raising the wages of 20,000,000 people in the country, and I take it, without committee consideration. The very fact that this innovation comes in the closing days of the session is not helpful. Haste often makes waste. Why this hurry? Why not follow regular procedure and let the country know that this legislation is being considered?

I close by saying this: If this is a wise thing, let us do it. Let every man's conscience be his guide. Let us answer on roll call and vote "yes" or "no." Maybe I am wrong but that is the way I feel about this matter.

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan who has just spoken put words into my mouth. I never mentioned the Little Steel formula. The proposal I made did not in any way interfere with the Little Steel formula because the underpaid employees about whom I spoke receive wages far below the Little Steel formula. I want to make that very clear.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. If I were in the place of the gentleman from Michigan, after the speech he made, I would let my conscience be my guide; I would vote against this bill and then I would not accept the money. But he says he is going to vote against the bill and then is going to take the money.

My purpose in taking the floor for these 2 minutes is to tell this House that the gentleman from Michigan does not know what he is talking about when he says this matter received no consideration. It has been before the Committee on Accounts for 2 years. The Accounts Committee considered this matter not once but many times. It appointed a special subcommittee headed by the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT], which made a complete survey. They recommended additional clerk hire and increases for committee clerks. They went before the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Appropriations refused to put it in a deficiency bill or in the legislative appropriation bill. So what I want to do now is to make it plain the gentleman from Michigan does not know what has happened when he says this matter has been rushed and has received no consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I voted against reporting this resolution from the Committee on Rules. I voted against its consideration this morning because I thought it was an unwise thing to consider it. I do not think we ought to be stampeded into this proposal, and that is exactly what is happening here today. This bill, whatever the gentleman from Missouri may say about its consideration by his committee, was introduced on yesterday and reported today. A special meeting of the Rules Committee was called for the purpose of reporting it out and we have then done the very unusual thing of suspending the orderly procedure of the House for the consideration of this measure.

We have also reported out of the Rules Committee a joint resolution to investigate the reorganization and streamlining of Congress. The way this thing is going to look to the people now is that instead of streamlining Congress we are cutting Congressmen a generous slice of cake and letting it go at that. I do not think there is that much haste about this matter. I think it would be much better policy on the part of Congress, it would be much better received by the public if we would just postpone this matter long enough to give it consideration in connection with the Monroney resolution which has been reported out today and which doubtless will be passed by the House tomorrow.

There are a great many things that ought to be done and I am not here to say that we ought not to have a greater amount allotted for clerical expense if the need for it exists. Some Members need it more than others. I think probably I need it more than any because of my close proximity to Washington.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If the gentleman will give me 1 additional minute I will. I know he will anyway, so I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Does not the gentleman believe that if we act now and the Members know they will have the additional funds for clerk hire that while they are home during Christmas and New Year's they can perhaps find suitable people to engage to do this much-needed work?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know. I cannot find any suitable idle people to do anything down in my part of the country. The gentleman may be better off in Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say further in connection with this proposal that no one has shown more sympathy for the downtrodden white-collar worker than the gentleman from Illinois, chairman

of the Committee on Rules. I do not think we are acting in very good grace if we take care of our own employees on this matter and leave the little folks out who are getting $1,200, $1,500, or $1,800 a year, starvation wages. I am going to propose an amendment to this bill which I know will have the enthusiastic support of the gentleman from Illinois. I shall offer a further proviso in the bill when it comes up for consideration that notwithstanding any other law or any other Executive order, or rule, or regulation of any department, nothing shall prevent an employer from voluntarily paying to his employees a wage not in excess of 75 cents an hour.

Mr. SABATH. I assure the gentleman I will support him.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I knew the gentleman would be enthusiastically for it. If we do that we will have done something for the 20,000,000 who are the white-collared workers about which the gentleman from New York has spoken.

Let me give you an example. I am sure a lot of you know about it already.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we have this situation with respect to the white-collar workers: If you employ clerks in your bank or in your store and you know they are underpaid, they know they are underpaid, you may know they are on starvation wages, yet the situation is such that you cannot raise them a single nickel unless you ask the War Manpower Commission or the War Labor Board. I have had the experience. The result is you try your best, you put up the very best case you can, you fill out questionnaires until your head grows bald; but the answer is always, "No, you cannot raise this man's wages." That is not right. Why should we have to go through with all that when these people actually need the money and they need it worse than our clerks do?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I hope the gentleman introduces his amendment because I believe the House will approve such an amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I shall offer the amendment, although I question whether it is germane to this bill, but I hope that those who are big-hearted about this will not raise a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia does not need to worry at all about anyone being stampeded into voting for this bill. The need back of this thing has been dammed up for a good many years by the refusal of the Members to consider the issue. There is not a Member of the Congress here who has not known from the day he came here and assumed his duties and tried to perform them, whether he needed or did not need an additional clerk in order that better service might be given his constituents. Not all of us possess the intelligence, wealth, and experience of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], who has been here a long, long time. He tells us his conscience will not let him vote for the bill, and with his next breath he says if the appropriation is made he will accept the money. I just do not understand his argument, which is that the passage of this is wrong; we should not do it; but, nevertheless, if a majority does adopt it, he intends to profit by our mistake and by our wrongdoing and give his secretary the additional allowance. That is what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] said, though I do not know whether it will appear in the RECORD of today. Either he does not pay his clerk enough or he gives his clerk adequate pay. I gather from what he says that he assigns an adequate sum for that purpose. Yet he says he is going to take this money which we mistakenly, in his opinion, make available and turn it over to those in his office. I have no objection to that and that is none of my business, but I cannot figure out his course of reasoning. Maybe he is just talking for home consumption. I do not know from what he said just what point he was trying to make except that he personally did not need additional assistance. We are not all so fortunate.

Then the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] talks about having the courage to stand up and be counted. I am one of a minority of six who, more than once, stood up to be counted. So the challenge to stand up and be counted does not mean anything to me. I have never in my life gone out into the cloakroom when a roll call was about to be had, and I have never gone out when there was a voice vote or a rising vote coming up on any matter. I am sure the gentleman is not talking about me. The gentleman says he is opposed to the bill. If I were merely against this bill, if I thought it was wrong to adopt it, I would not take the money if the bill passed, but that is only my thought. As the gentleman said, each Member must be guided by his own conscience. Let it go at that. I am not criticizing anyone. I know my people need the additional service. I do not need it for my own convenience. My people need the extra service, and while I have voted against billions of dollars being sent across the seas to buy silk stockings and handkerchiefs for some Hottentot, I am going to vote in the interest of the people of my district, and do it right now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] 5 minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I do not find myself in accord with the majority of the House on this proposition. I think it is wrong. Why do I say so? Of course, I only have my own office to base my opinion upon. I dare say that we receive as many letters at Room 1111, New House Office Building, as the average Member of Congress, and we have plenty of clerk hire to handle the work.

May I say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] that if this allowance is made, I shall not accept it, and I am not playing politics. With a national debt that is rapidly approaching $230,000,000,000, with the war going as it is, and with all the other considerations, we should ponder well before we act. I do not feel that I am justified in casting my vote for the resolution. I implore the House that if you are going to vote this extra clerk hire, you add an amendment to it that will provide that no clerk hire will be made to a Member except upon written application which must be accompanied by an affidavit that it will be spent for clerk hire. We have had a lot of disagreeable things said over the country about Congress in years gone by about nepotism and one thing or another in connection with clerk hire. It is unfortunate, most unfortunate, as I see it, that we should have stopped right in the middle of our deliberations of the supplemental appropriation bill that carries $458,000,000 to consider a peanut proposition like this. The way some Members are acting, one would think that somebody was going to grab the Treasury and run away with it before we come back in January.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] 3 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is rather interesting that the poise of this House can be so disturbed by an item that will probably aggregate $150,000, and within a few hours from now we will pass a deficiency bill, perhaps without a record vote, for $438,000,000. I do not understand the skittishness and the fear that somehow creeps into the soul of Congress when it undertakes to make proper provision for itself. If I had my choice, I would have followed the recommendation that was made to consider this as a part of the reorganization studies under the Maloney-Monroney resolution which was reported today by the Committee on Rules.

We are not responsible for its being here. It is here before us now because the Committee on Rules brought it in here, and I am not going to dodge the issue and send it back to the Committee on Rules and let the country feel that I am afraid to make proper provision for my office and for the discharge of the responsibilities that are incident to a constituency of 300,000 people. It is about time that we have just a little more faith in the people back home.

As to this business of talking about "cutting a hunk of pie," if I did not feel that I could sell this to my constituency back home, I would not ask them to send me back to Congress. They expect one to do a job. The fathers and mothers expect one to do a job on casualties. The G. I. Joes are expecting us to do a job in connection with veterans' loans on homes, businesses, and farms. They will expect that, with expedition and dispatch, one will discharge his duties here. It is a matter of individual conscience. Nobody has to implore this body for me

as to what I am going to do. I know the needs of my office. You could have hearings from now until doomsday and it would not add one iota to the information I now have as to the case load of work in my office and what I need. So it is a matter of individual conscience with which we are all familiar in our own offices. If you need the help, vote for it. If you do not need it, you do not need to vote for it. But it is a permissive bill. It says that the rate shall not exceed $9,500. You can vote for it, but no man has to take the money or put on any more clerks than he needs. That is as simple as the issue is today.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day on this third anniversary of the disaster of Pearl Harbor we were privileged to listen to the Resident Commissioner from the Philippines, General ROMULO, as he gave to us an eyewitness story of the landing of the American soldiers on Leyte Island on October 20, 1944. I have heard no more eloquent and informative address delivered during the several years of my service here than was delivered by General ROMULO. I am sure the hearts of all of us were moved when we heard his description of the heroism displayed on that occasion and the sufferings and the hardships which were undergone by those many thousands of American boys who performed those deeds of valor on October 20 and on subsequent days. Most of those boys were fighting on a wage scale of $55 per month.

But perhaps the effect on us was not lasting, because soon after he concluded his address we rose from our duties in the Committee of the Whole, where we were deciding whether or not to appropriate approximately half a billion dollars of the people's money, a large part of which is intended for use by activities relating to the armed services, and decided to suspend action on that bill until we should determine whether or not we should increase our own perquisites by $3,000 each.

I do not want to say anything to give offense to any Member of the House. I think my office is just as busy an office as that of any other Member of the House of Representatives. I know the hardships that are undergone by our clerks in endeavoring to get along on the salary allowances and with the personnel available for each office under present conditions, but if they will start a little earlier in the morning and work a little later in the afternoon, as most of them do and as most of us do, they will be able to do the job. Surely there ought to be some in this country willing to make some little sacrifice in overtime work and in enduring some slight hardships, when we take into consideration the fact that we have about 12,000,000 American boys, a great many of whom are on the firing lines, most of whom on the firing lines are serving at $50 per month plus 10 percent for their service overseas, while our clerks get far larger compensation with no risk involved and no real hardships endured.

This is only a part and parcel of a far greater movement than would appear from a casual consideration of this bill. This morning the Appropriations Committee raised the salaries of all of our clerks in amounts up to increases of $1,400 each. The Post Office Committee has reported a bill here to raise the salaries of all the postal employees in the country by, I think, about $400 each, which will be followed by bills to further increase all Federal salaries. Agitation is going on in the House to increase the salaries of Members of Congress to as much as $15,000 or $20,000 apiece. You do one of these things and it may seem to be a small thing when you do it, but you do one thing and you open a regular Pandora's box that you cannot shut up after you have opened it. Some of these claims for increases are more deserving than others. Perhaps all of them would be justified in normal times. But these are not normal times. We have a national debt of $233,000,000,000 and it is growing like a Chinese baby. Most of us have told our constituents we will try to hold down nonwar expenditures but by this sort of legislation we will vastly increase them, not by this bill alone, but by other bills that will follow.

How can you ask laboring people not to seek higher wages when you are providing greater benefits out of the Public Treasury for yourselves and your employees? The danger of unrestrained inflation in this country is very real. Measures like this will speed the day when all restraint upon that catastrophe will be swept away, both in Government and in the business and commercial world.

I know of no surer way by which you might set aside the Little Steel formula and make it impossible to hold down wages in private industry, than by the enactment of legislation of this kind, giving additional privileges and money for the use of Members of the House of Representatives or their employees. So I hope that in the interest of the national welfare, no matter how much you may feel your clerks are entitled to more money, or that you are entitled to additional personnel for the operation of your offices, you may be willing to undergo, or have your office force undergo some hardship, in view of the existing conditions, and in view of the fact that, after all, few of us in this country have endured any hardships except those who have actually been engaged on the firing line on the battlefields all over the world. Surely, if it requires that you go to your office an hour earlier in the morning or that your clerks go to your office an hour earlier in the morning or stay a half-hour later in the afternoon, in order to discharge your and their duties in this period of emergency, that is not too much of a sacrifice for you and them to make. You get $10,000 a year salary and you already have $6,500 a year for clerk's hire, which has been increased 15 percent, for the salaries of your clerks by recent legislation, so far as salaries up to $2,900 a year are concerned. You ought to be able to struggle along and not stop the consideration, as has been done, of an important appropriation bill, which is material to the welfare of the armed services of the country in some of its provisions, in order to take up a whole afternoon in determining whether you will award yourselves and your offices additional financial benefits.

I hope you will not do it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds. I hope no Member of the House will make a point of order against the proposed amendment of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] to take care of 20,000,000 American wage earners.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the Member who has just addressed the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], indicated that this bill provided an increase for us. This is not a correct statement. This is an authorization providing for additional clerk hire and nothing else. I am sure that our constituents will appreciate the better service which will be provided for them with this authorization. The volume of work in a congressional office is constantly increasing, and every constituent who calls on his Congressman for service is entitled to get the best. I could enumerate many of the things that we are called upon to do today that we were not required to take care of a few years back. One item, for example, is the serviceman and his family. This will be an ever-increasing problem.

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

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. As time goes on, that burden will increase so far as the widows and orphans and the boys and girls who need help and services are concerned.

Mr. BENDER. You are absolutely correct. This job of being a Congressman is just a little more difficult than it was 6 or 8 years ago and the duties of the average Member are vastly greater than they were at that time. Frankly I am not the least bit hesitant about voting for the bill reported out unanimously by the Accounts Committee because I feel that my constituents are entitled to the best possible service that my office can provide. Of course, this legislation is not in the same category as the so-called congressional pension bill. We are discussing it in the light of day. There is no subterfuge about it. I trust that it will receive a unanimous vote.

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

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. 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. 5590) to increase clerk hire, 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 consideration of the bill H. R. 5590, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] is entitled to recognition for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] is entitled to recognition for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill comes from the Committee on Accounts. As I said a few minutes ago, the committee has been considering matters of this character for 2 years. The rules cover the jurisdiction of our various committees. The Committee on Accounts has jurisdiction over the contingent fund of the House and over the expenses of the House of Representatives. It has no other jurisdiction.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] may think he is going to embarrass me when he says he is going to offer his amendment to this bill. When the bill was before the House providing for $37.50 for white-collar workers, the record will show that I not only voted for it, but I spoke for it. I come from a great industrial center, St. Louis. There is no type of people in this country that has been more forgotten than the white-collar workers. Bring in a bill from the proper committee which has jurisdiction, that will do something for the white-collar workers, and I will not only vote for it, but I will speak for it and will do everything I can to have it passed.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Not now. I will yield later.

Now, when it comes to doing something for those in the low brackets, the man and woman down below, I will put my record against the record of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] at any time he desires. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is author of the most outstanding antilabor law that was ever placed upon the statute books of this country. He is the coauthor of the Smith-Connally bill, the law that was condemned by both political parties in the last election and both candidates for President. Yes; since I referred to the gentleman by name, I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the gentleman from Missouri finds it necessary to make a personal attack upon me. It certainly is not warranted by anything I have said. I have debated the question of the Connally-Smith bill, and it passed this House by a vote of 2 to 1.

Mr. COCHRAN. Do not make a speech.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. All right; will the gentleman let me proceed for just one-half minute?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. And I also debated the so-called Smith bill which passed this House by a vote of 2 to 1. So if my action in that respect was reprehensible the gentleman should also indict two-thirds of the Members of the House.

What I wanted to say to the gentleman when he said I was embarrassing him is to assure him that I never considered him in any way, shape, or form about the proposed amendment and certainly I have no desire to embarrass him now or at any other time.

Mr. COCHRAN. I have been around here a little too long not to know what some men have in their minds. I can analyze an amendment and I can analyze a bill.

The gentleman knew that I was chairman of this committee. He knew that the man to make the point of order, if he offered the amendment, was the chairman of the committee, myself; and I will tell him now that when he offers his amendment I will not shirk my duty. I will make the point of order for the reasons I have stated, because if there is one thing I want to do as long as I am a Member of the House, it is to preserve the integrity of the rules of the House.

I was asked yesterday by any number of Members to appeal from the decision of the Chair when the Chair held that my amendment was not germane and sustained the point of order. I told them no, that I would rather sacrifice the legislation than try to destroy the rules of the House when I knew that the amendment was subject to a point of order. As I said a moment ago, I will make a point of order against any amendment offered to the bill that is not germane.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation results from the appeal of men on both sides of the aisle, a great majority of the Members of the House who have complained to me and complained to the members of the committee that they just could not get along without going down into their own pockets and employing additional help to meet the demands of their constituents. The suggestion was made that if this legislation were brought in at this time and it became a law that when the Members were home for the holidays they could take up the question of an additional clerk. I was asked to have this legislation considered. I was asked by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations on Friday. The gentleman wanted to know whether or not the committee would pass a resolution. I said I could not speak for the committee, but would find out. I got busy and in an hour's time the committee approved the resolution. I then told him and asked him to put it on the appropriation bill. I wrote him a letter and gave him all the information as to what occurred in the committee when it considered the matter. To my surprise he said he thought it should be brought into the House in the form of a resolution rather than be put on an appropriation bill as an amendment. He told me he wanted to get the bill to the Printing Office on Saturday because the Printing Office was closed on Sunday.

If he had that in mind I certainly figured he wanted to put it in the deficiency bill, but that was not the result. It was suggested that if the House would pass this bill the committee would accept the amendment. So, I introduced the bill last night and this morning we had a meeting of the committee. The members of that committee unanimously ordered me to report the bill and at 12 o'clock I brought in the report.

I notified Members of the House last night that if anybody wanted to appear before the committee in opposition to the bill they would be welcome. Two Members appeared before the committee in opposition, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]. Any other Member who desired could have been heard if they had come before the committee. No other witnesses were there. The committee voted unanimously to report the bill and when an attempt was made to get the bill up for consideration this morning by unanimous consent an objection was made. Thereupon the Rules Committee met and brought in a rule and as chairman of the Committee on Accounts it is my duty to handle the bill on the floor of the House. That is what I intend to do.

Mr. Chairman, each and every Member of the House knows what is in the bill, each and every Member of the House knows whether or not he should vote for this bill. There is no need debating it. Everyone present has made up his mind. If the Members who have come to the Committee on Accounts know what they are talking about, then there is need for this legislation.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. It is true, is it not, that this proposal cannot become effective until it passes the Senate and has been signed into law by the President?

Mr. COCHRAN. That is true.

Mr. KEEFE. And it cannot be made effective until the Appropriations Committee furnishes the money?

Mr. COCHRAN. No. The gentleman is wrong, because this bill is so drawn, and it was drawn purposely, I may say to the gentleman—probably it has not been discovered, but it is in there—so that it is an appropriation, as well as an authorization. That is the reason I asked the Rules Committee when it brought in the rule to provide for waiver of points of order.

Mr. KEEFE. Then if that is the case I think the House should be advised that the gentleman is tying the whole bundle up in one operation. The gentleman is not only providing the authorization, but he is making an appropriation under a rule which waives points of order that might otherwise be raised against it?

Mr. COCHRAN. Which has been done here time and time again, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. KEEFE. By doing it that way the gentleman has prevented the possibility of making a point of order in case an amendment is offered to the deficiency appropriation bill; is that true?

Mr. COCHRAN. No. That is not necessary if this passes. The chairman of the committee tells me if the House passes this bill that committee will not make a point of order.

Mr. KEEFE. I am very happy to learn that because I think most Members of the House were in complete ignorance of that fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

It has always been the policy of the two bodies, if one body passes legislation desired by that body, the other body will pass it. There is no doubt about action by the Senate in due time. That is a foregone conclusion. The Senate will act and I am sure the President will sign it.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it usual to have an authorization measure also contain provision for making an appropriation?

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say to the gentleman it is not unusual. It has been done by the Appropriations Committee itself. You have direct appropriations in the supplemental bill pending which contains legislation or authorizations that have never been made.

Mr. KEEFE. They are being knocked out by points of order.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman may pick up the report and he will find a dozen of them if he wants to read the report. If he wants to make a point of order, as a member of the committee he may do it. I am not going to do it because that committee says they are essential for war purposes. For that reason I would not make a point of order against it.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the Members of the House should approach this matter in such a way that will leave out some of the stuff that we call demagogery. I am not going to call anybody a demagog, although I would be within the rules of the House if I did, because I remember a decision of the present Speaker when he took the big dictionary and gave the definition of a demagog, which was a political leader. Some of these gentlemen who are today making these speeches are not demagogs; they are political leaders.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Do I understand from a reading of this bill that an amendment would be in order providing for a smaller amount than that stated in the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. That is true.

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I do not think this is a good time to be raising the salaries of congressional help. I think this is a good time for Congress to help, rather than hinder, the feeble efforts of the administration, hold the line on wartime wages and salaries. All of these clerks are beneficiaries of the so-called cost-of-living increases we have voted for all Federal employees for the duration. Many of them are doubtless worth more than they are now receiving. We should appeal to their patriotism to serve through the war on the present basis, rather than grant them wartime permanent increases while we are asking private employers and employees to hold the line.

Under this bill we are going to increase the numbers in our offices while we urge other Government departments and private employers to get along with less. I do not believe this is setting a very good example.

I have heard Members since the election saying they could not render adequate service to their districts with their present staffs and present pay allowances. I did not hear any such claims during the recent election when we were all fighting to get back here. It is futile to argue that no Member needs to use the increases now being voted. Human nature, being what it is, the maximum pay for a class of employees soon becomes the minimum. I sympathize with those who say they and their staffs are overworked and underpaid. I have a busy office myself. I urge them to urge their constituents, who just reelected them, to bear with their present condition, rather than to vote these blanket increases with so little investigation, in this unusual bill. We ought to determine whether we are really streamlining Congress, or merely feathering our own official nests. I am opposed to this bill.

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, legislation to provide additional allowances for our own membership, for our own offices, should not be brought to the House in this manner. It just does not look so good for the House to stop in the middle of the consideration of an appropriation bill involving hundreds of millions of dollars, and at the last days of the session, and take up legislation for our own benefit without prior notice, and then proceed to vote on it. I just do not see the emergency of it. Mind you, I am only expressing my own views. I have the highest respect for the opinion of those who want this legislation passed immediately.

Mr. Chairman, I am informed legislation is to be considered within the next day or two to study our legislative procedure with a view of streamlining its processes. Why not, at least, let this legislation go over and give it study at the same time?

I realize, Mr. Chairman, the work and the responsibilities in congressional offices are greater than a few years ago. Incidently, I represent one of the larger districts in this country. The growth and expansion of governmental agencies have increased the duties of the Members of Congress. But, let us not forget, the duties and responsibilities of men and women everywhere have also increased tremendously. Look around at the folks in your own community. It is true of those who are carrying on their business affairs, their farm operations. With shortage of help they work harder and for longer hours in order to carry on.

Mr. Chairman, the functions of this Government will not be impaired if this legislation is not passed immediately. It authorizes the additional expenditure of more than a million dollars a year for this House. If, later on, the demand for more assistance becomes greater, we can give consideration to this problem. But now when there is a shortage of manpower, when there is so much discussion of wage stabilization, and when salaries of millions of workers are frozen, I believe we should turn this legislation down and at least go along until such time when the spending of this money and need for additional help is more urgent than it is right now.

I am sure, as other Members have stated, that later on as demobilization takes place and members of the armed forces return to their homes, there will be greater demand upon the services of the Members of Congress. Of course, we are now, and will then, give every assistance possible. If it takes more help in our offices to get it done we will see it is provided.

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have not been here as long as the Chairman of this Committee but I have been here long enough to catch on to some of the things that happen here on the floor of the House. I remember all the stories we heard about Guam, until it kind of blew up in somebody's face. Then I noticed what happened on the Congressmen's pensions, which seemed to blow up in everybody's face. I saw the soldiers' vote bill, wherein according to my humble judgment the soldiers were not given a chance, only a third of their franchise. I then saw people running all over the country pointing fingers at others and claiming they did not want the soldiers to vote.

Anyone, of course, can do as he wants to on this piece of legislation. I represent a district probably a little below average incomes than the average of the United States; just about the average, maybe. I think this is a very inopportune time to bring this legislation in on the floor of the House. It should have been brought in shortly before election. I think we would have had a much different discussion. We went out to our people and told them many things during the last few months, but I doubt if any Member told them he wanted more bureaucrats in Washington or wanted to put anyone else on the pay roll. I doubt if a single Member has done that.

I do not see how in the midst of war anyone who has any respect for the Little Steel formula can vote for this legislation. We cannot vote to give our office help a 46-percent increase in salary at the same time that we tell the rest of the world that they can only have a 15-percent increase. In my district I have thousands of people who are frozen to a 40 or 50 cents hourly wage. In view of that, I shall not say to them, "I voted a 46-percent increase to handle my office in order to write you a letter once in a while."

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

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I refuse to yield. I do not want to be personal with anyone. That is the reason I did not yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There was nothing personal about my remarks.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I say to you here today that this is the most inopportune time to do this. As I said, I do not want to be personal, but I know a pretty good way to get work done in an office. At least, I have been able to get along fairly well with the plan in the last 6 years. That is to be in the office. I have found that helps a lot toward tending to your constituents and tending to your mail, if you will just kind of be there.

I have not figured out any schemes for getting on junket trips or running around looking at the world. I saw quite a bit of the world before I got here. I did not figure that Uncle Sam should send me out to look the rest of the world over, because I was sure that, after being a Congressman, I would have the time to get out and look over the rest of the world.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield so I can admit he is a model Congressman?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will admit it, so the gentleman will not need to admit it. Think of the legislation we have had here on the floor of the House. Men who may vote for this bill have stood up here and gone through all the agonies in the world because the farmers were going to get 3 or 4 cents more a bushel for their corn. You would think that that would cause every day to be black and the sun was never going to shine again.

When we had the Andresen amendment up here to allow people to get $37.50 a week without taking it up with the War Labor Board, who opposed it here on this floor? I read a column the other day. I am supposed to be a reactionary Republican from Wisconsin. If I am, and if I am supposed to be looking after the common people, as that article said, I should start to work on the majority side. I have to start working with those boys because the leadership here got up on this floor and said that we could not have the $37.50 per week because it would cause inflation. The common people of this country could not be allowed to make $37.50 a week. Then they bring in a bill like this providing for our own offices and raising the expenses of our secretarial staff 46 percent. That is not in keeping with common sense. I hope it will be voted down.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill and intend to vote for it. I think it is about time we gave consideration to this matter. As has been said here so well today, any person who does not want to get this additional help in his office, certainly can vote against it. I believe if the Members really vote the way they feel, and the way they would like to vote, it would be a unanimous vote from this committee. There has been a lot of talk about demagoguery. I am not going to criticize people who are demagogs. That is something that is up to their own conscience, and if they can get away with it, well, that is their business. The debate today brings to my mind the debate on the so-called pension bill before the House a few years ago. I was told by the chairman of the committee having jurisdiction of that legislation that many Members had requested him to bring in that bill. Yet we know what happened and how few supported him in the final vote. When a few people on the outside, who did not really understand the bill, criticized it, many Members seemed to lose their courage and voted against the very thing that they really wanted done. I hope that this is not going to be the case with this bill. As a woman, keeping house here in the District, I find that my bills have increased more than 50 percent in the last few years. These clerks of ours, and mostly they are girls in our offices, are finding it very difficult to get along and pay their bills and live decently in the District, where everything is higher, probably, than it is in any other part of the country. I am hoping that we will be able to give our faithful employees in our offices an advance in salary. They need it very badly. I know girls who find it impossible to go home for a whole year. Many of them find it impossible to go home for Christmas because they really cannot afford to pay the price of the railway ticket. Now, let us be honest with ourselves and kind to them when the vote is taken. They need an advance in salary and we need more help in our offices. I know in my office my work has practically doubled since we have been in the war. I am sure that is true in perhaps the same ratio with all the Members of the House. I sincerely hope, now that we have this opportunity to do a really good deed, advance the salaries of faithful employees, and give more efficient service to our districts, we shall not hesitate to do so because of fear of criticism.

I predict that the people of the country will approve our actions. The bill should be approved unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, let us see what we are talking about, and what it is we are proposing to do. We are proposing to allow each Member who considers that he needs clerk hire to employ such help to the extent of an additional sum of $3,000. The burden of the opposition seems to be that this will wreck the economy of the country. Everyone knows that there is almost a universal call and demand on Congress for additional service. They talk about streamlining Congress—and I think that is a catch phrase that may mean much or little; but let us see what it means now in terms of dollars and cents to afford this additional compensation to congressional secretaries or the employment of additional help. I represent a district that now has a population of around 450,000 people. Let us put it on the basis of 400,000 people. If I should decide to hire $3,000 additional clerk help, that would cost each resident of my district three-quarters of a cent a year, or if I did it for 2 years, then each resident of my district would have to pay an extra three-quarters of a cent per year, or a cent and a half for the next 2 years.

My people write me. I get letters from men and women in every walk of life—from bankers, from operators of mines, from miners, from manufacturing establishments, from their employees, from mercantile establishments, from their help—from farmers, from soldiers, from the dependents of veterans, from the fathers and mothers of members of our armed forces, and we are going to get these calls for help and these requests for assistance not in increasing numbers by the score, but by the hundreds and thousands. My people are not a penurious people. They are not penny-pinchers. They are not little folk, nor are yours. They are entitled to the best service we can give them as Members of this House. I have always subscribed to the doctrine that God hates a coward. A coward dies a thousand deaths before he finally "kicks the bucket." Let us just do what is right—go back and face the people and tell them what we have done. My folks believe me, because up to this good moment, I have not ducked or dodged any issue, and I have made it a habit to tell them the truth.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman infer that anyone who opposes this bill is a coward?

Mr. JENNINGS. Oh, no. Far be it from me to impute cowardice to anybody, and let me say to my good friend from Wisconsin that I regard him as one of the ablest and most useful Members of this House. He is always alert to the best interests of his constituents and fearless and sincere in his advocacy of what he thinks is to the best interests of the country as a whole.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, I was elected to this Congress to represent the 911,000 people of the Eighth Congressional District of the State of New York. They sent me here because they had faith in me. They placed into my mouth the authority to speak for them on all matters governing the welfare of this country both for the present and for the future. They invested me with the right to decide for myself what is essential for the welfare of this land, and when they gave me such broad powers they certainly gave me the right to decide whether I need additional help in my office.

There is no one in my district, and these words will not be stricken from the RECORD, who knows the problems of my office except myself, and I will decide whether I need additional help or not. When the time comes to vote and I cast my vote for the $3,000 additional clerical hire I will apologize to no man or woman in my district.

I was shocked a few moments ago to hear a statement uttered by the gentleman from Minnesota. This gentleman has sat for many years in this House, and for him to say that he would require an affidavit of need from Members of the House before they could take on additional help and take advantage of this resolution was indeed a slap in the face to every Member of Congress. If we who hold the third highest position in this Government and who have been duly elected by the people cannot be trusted to that extent then we are not fit or qualified to write the laws or to govern this country. By the very nature of the position that each Member occupies in this House, I have implicit faith in him regardless of which side of the aisle he sits on. Never in my legislative career do I ever expect to ask any Member of Congress to place either his word or his needs in affidavit form.

Mr. Chairman, this body has been too timid—and that is the word—too timid in the past in those matters affecting ourselves. I saw this body march up the hill on the pension bill and then I saw it march down again within a few weeks. We did not gain the trust or the admiration of the people of this Nation by tactics of that kind. We did not give courage to the Nation itself. If the people are to have courage, they must have faith in us.

To me, the crux of this situation is that each Member, and each Member alone, has the right to answer in this body about the clerk hire that is necessary for his office. No other Member can answer for him. To do otherwise, as many are trying to do today, is sheer demagoguery of the worst type. If the Members know they need additional clerks in their offices, they should vote for this bill and thus extend the services that they can give to their constituency. If they do not need them, then they are not compelled by law or for any other reason to take the money appropriated. But if the people are to be served and they are short of help, it is then a matter of conscience that they vote for this bill.

Regardless of whether we need it or not, let us not put up falacious arguments. Let us face the situation as men. Let us face it in the manner that our constituents desire us to face all questions—courageously.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this is a necessary measure for more than 60 percent of the Members of this body, and I do not propose to be frightened by demagoguery or the thought of future elections.

Mr. Chairman, I will yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York yields back 1 minute.

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, it is scarcely necessary to belabor this issue, because I apprehend that every Member has already determined how he is going to respond on the roll call. Probably there are some facts that ought to be adduced if there is to be a foundation that will justify an affirmative vote, if that is of interest to you. First, let us look at the growth of government.

When Washington was presiding over this Nation, the executive branch consisted of 300 people. When Abraham Lincoln was serving as Commander in Chief, there were 49,200 people on the civilian pay roll. When the armistice was signed on November 11, 1918, there were 917,000. There are today, according to the report on the very deficiency bill which will follow this measure, 2,880,000 civilians on the pay roll. The measure of pay-roll growth is also the measure of the growth of the Government in terms of functions; and in proportion as government grows so our business grows. Obviously you cannot discharge these responsibilities if you proceed on the basis of the days of Daniel Webster, 140 years ago, when there were only 203 Members of this body. It is a truism that as government grows so congressional business grows.

Secondly, look at the need for research. I caused the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to make a little study of the amount of money we appropriate for research in the executive branch. Probably there is not a soul in this body, other than the members of the Rules Committee, who heard me testify the other day, who can determine what it is. I will tell you. For all exploratory and research purposes we are appropriating about $120,000,000 a year for the executive agencies.

Would we be so niggardly then and so out of line to provide additional clerk hire for ourselves? The element of the Little Steel formula comes up. You do not have to violate the Little Steel formula if you do not want to. You are not bound by the Little Steel formula to begin with.

This is a permissive bill. It says "Not to exceed $5,000" may be paid to any individual clerk. You can do as you like about it. You do not have to put on any additional clerks. You may do as you like about that. It is absolutely permissive. So it is your own conscience that determines the matter, your own conscience plus the faith that is evinced in you by the people back home and your faith in them.

Mr. Chairman, I sometimes think we should be a little ashamed of ourselves for the way we let fear cause us to run out on things when the country expects us to do the best kind of a job we know how. Has it ever occurred to you that the clerks to Members of Congress have a wholly insecure position? Their job is dependent upon a fortuity and that fortuity is whether you are reelected or not. I had that situation arise in my office this year. I was about to lose my whole office force. One of my young men came to me and said that he had a chance to get a civil-service rating in one of the agencies of the Government and stated, "I cannot tell how long you are going to be here; so there is a contingency for which I must prepare." He took the job and then I was at pains to persuade him to come back with the promise that I would do better if I could arrange it. After all there is something to be said on that side and on the matter of the insecurity that goes with these clerkships.

Mind you, the average laboring man has the benefit of collective bargaining; the average laboring man has the benefit of seniority; the average laboring man has the benefit of a collective-bargaining agreement and a maintenance-of-membership clause. Look what we have done for them and for the men who are in the armed services today. We set 40 days and later extended it to 90 days, as the time for a veteran to go back and apply for his old job and get it.

I know clerks who are with defeated Members and those clerks are looking for jobs today. Some of them are old. Make no mistake about that. There is a good deal that can be said on their side. So, Mr. Chairman, I am for this resolution. The work load in my office must be the factor for determining whether additional clerks are needed in my office and if so, I want to do what any progressive and well-managed industry would do, and that is to hire such help as is needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 7 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, a question arose here about diligence and about serving longer hours in your office. I do not believe it is necessary, in all modesty, and I speak impersonally, for me to apologize about my office hours. I used to scare the guards once in a while by showing up at 7 o'clock in the morning. My office force works long and hard. They show up at 8 o'clock in the morning and you can test it out, if you like, by phoning my office. They work late. As a matter of fact, I bought one of my office men a portable typewriter that he could take home so that he could work at home. He works at home on Sundays, and his wife helps him. He is one of these precious fellows in whom I have a tremendous pride and interest. He is thinking about his own security because he is a young man. So I want to do the best by him I know how, and I know my people will want to do likewise. I know when a mother receives one of those grim pieces of yellow paper that says, "We regret to inform you," she wants somebody on this end who can call the War Department and see if there is any shred of information that will bring a little comfort and sustain a slender hope that though he has been reported missing, maybe he is still alive.

Earlier this afternoon it was suggested that since this is the third anniversary

of Pearl Harbor, we should not be thinking about extra clerk hire when the young men of America are sloshing through tropical heat and mud in the cause of freedom. Frankly, I believe that the very thought of what the young men of America are doing sustains the argument in behalf of this measure. They are parts of a highly efficient military force—the best in the world. They want their Government to be equally efficient. They want their Congress to be equally efficient. When they return, they will want service, and it is our responsibility to see that they get it.

The Government of the United States is the biggest corporation on the face of the earth. A new budget is being prepared and we are advised in advance it may a hundred thousand million dollars for the fiscal year 1946. Money is translated into terms of functions that constantly flow across your own desk.

The demands of business as they get into difficulties with O. P. A., O. D. T., and O. W. I. and all the rest; the problems of the farmers as they come under the Soil Conservation Act and as they participate in all these activities that are set out in the Department of Agriculture; the laboring men who more and more think now in terms of the center of government here in Washington and what the Congress and the executive branch can do by way of security in the days that lie ahead—all those are expressed in terms of functions that constantly flow across your desk, so we have to be staffed for it. You cannot be overworking your people constantly, and I confess publicly here and now that I have done just exactly that thing. I have had them come back to the office on Sundays. The first 4 years, or maybe the first 6 years, that I served in this body, I do not believe there were as many as two Sundays a year when I was not in my office on Sunday. I see the lights burning in congressional offices after nightfall. We need not apologize for the hours we keep. They will compare with the hours of the busiest men in the country. This is the age of efficiency. The people have a right to expect it. They want answers to their letters. They want devotion to the public business. They expect a person to grow in his job as a legislator and public servant. They want the offices where public business is done operated on an efficient basis. After all, we are the liaison officers between hundreds of thousands of people back home and this great labyrinthine structure that we know as the Government of the United States. So it is up to us. Let your own conscience be your guide. You can vote for it and not use the money. You do not have to raise your clerks if you do not want to. I do not do anything in my office that will not stand the light of day. I am willing to go out and tell my people about it.

A question came up here about retirement for Congressmen and about pensions that invoked for us a movement that they called bundles for Congress, when they sent a lot of these worry birds and other things to our offices. I went out home and justified it. I went out and defended it, and I am for it now. When the agitation for retirement pay was at its height a few years ago I went to the Civil Service Commission and said, "How much will this retirement plan cost?" They figured it out and put it on paper for me. In my own case, the provisions of the bill which was passed called for $4,400 in cash and then $500 a year for 17 years, and then I would be the recipient of a munificent retirement pay of $137.50 a month. There is not an old-line life-insurance company in the United States that could not do better than that. The trouble is that we were just too niggardly for ourselves and failed to bring the matter out into the open and to have full and free debate on it so that the whole country might have been apprised of the provisions of that proposal. We are thinking now in terms of more social security, of annual wages for labor, and I am in favor of moving ahead in that field. I am also in favor of telling our story openly and wholeheartedly to the people and say, "Here is the circumstance." Do we take them into our confidence? Do we say, "Look, here is $10,000 a year; it seems like a princely sum that we receive, but here is how it is expended." My telephone bills have often been a hundred dollars a month. I believe in calling people out home when there is a matter that needs expeditious treatment. They withhold $1,900 from your pay check right over here in the Sergeant at Arms office. Living expenses here in Washington are quite high, and I have to keep my home in Illinois. Put it all together, and where are you? There are millions of men carrying dinner buckets today who are infinitely better off than Members of the Congress, and probably the only thing we have to show for it is the exhilaration that goes with public life and the dignity that goes with the title.

Let us go back and tell our constituents: "I want to be a better public servant, and I am going to support those proposals which provide the tools with which to work."

To do less than that and to fail to provide the help and the equipment that is need to dispatch the public business is a derliction to the very cause of efficient Government. I intend to support the bill which is before us.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the statements made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE], and others, have set the issue forth so clearly that obviously there is no need for further comment. I asked for this time primarily to make some comments upon the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Accounts, and the fact that he has received information that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] intends to propose an amendment to the bill which on its face would appear to be in the interest of the white-collared workers whose wage scale is in the lower brackets.

I do not question the sincerity of the gentleman from Virginia. Under the rules of the House I could not do that, and I will not. But I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri, as everyone knows, that he must make a point of order on this amendment, and everyone understands his position clearly.

I think we have the right to be apprehensive when the gentleman from Virginia introduces an amendment of this kind, when we recall his vigorous opposition to the wage-and-hour law, his introduction of numerous amendments to emasculate that act, and his rigid opposition continually to everything in the interest of the wage earner. So we do not need to go to a crystal gazer for a determination concerning any amendment he might offer. We need not the services of a soothsayer with respect to his proposals. We know where he stands. We know what the record is. We know that every time a bill comes before the House he comes forward with some complicating amendment. He did it on the G. I. bill, with an amendment that was designed to do nothing for the servicemen but would have complicated the passage of that legislation.

Should someone introduce a bill to provide milk bottles for the starving infants of some State or Territory, certainly we can anticipate that the gentleman from Virginia will propose an amendment designed in some way to get at the glassblowers' union. Should someone present a bill for the protection of the deer up in Alaska, I would expect that the gentleman from Virginia might show up with something designed to take a crack at the teamsters' union.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri needs to make no explanation to this House or to the people of his district. His record has been outstanding with respect to supporting legislation for the wage earner. We have the right to be apprehensive when the gentleman from Virginia suddenly appears sponsoring something which makes him appear as a benefactor of the underprivileged. The point of order not only is necessary, there is no other course for the gentleman from Missouri to take, and everyone in this House and everyone in the country will understand that.

The gentleman from Virginia will have ample opportunity in the next Congress, after January 3, when we can depend on more votes for liberal legislation to support many measures in the interest of those in the lower wage scales. He will have the opportunity to vote for legislation to raise the minimum standards of the wage-and-hour law. We will give him, time and time again, the opportunity to vote for white-collar workers and for all others who are in the low-salary scales. So, the gentleman from Missouri can go ahead with his duty without fear that anyone will misunderstand the position in which he has been placed by any amendment the gentleman from Virginia may offer.

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is very frequent that I address this body, but as I sat here this afternoon I kept thinking about the splendid men and women who are serving the

Members of this Congress as our secretaries. I have a young man working for me. He has been with me for 10 years, a college-bred man. He was graduated years ago from one of the finest schools in America. He was a young newspaper man. He has been here for 10 years. He has worked with no question about when the clock started or when it stopped. Many and many a time when things have been before this House that have been of importance to the people of America, that young man has been over there in that office burning the light long after sundown. Many and many a night he has worked over there until midnight. He has never yet asked me for overtime. I remember during my first term as a Member of this body, I was conducting an important investigation. I think almost every night for a year he was over there. Today, after years of training as a college man and after 10 years of experience on the Hill, all that I am permitted to pay him under the law is a pitiful $3,900 a year. As I sat there a little while ago, I was thinking of another young man whom I have known throughout the years. He lives down in Missouri. He is a fine young man. He went as far as the third grade in school but decided he did not want to go to school any further. He began his career as a farm hand. He worked for quite a number of years. He is a good worker, a fine young man, but when the war broke out he was getting $40 a month and he told me he felt he was doing very well. He was saving some of it. The war came and he went to his employer and said, "I am going to have to quit you. I have been with you a number of years. I love to work with you. You have been kind to me. I have enjoyed my work with you, but I can go over to the munitions plant and I can get $100 a week instead of $40 per month." That young man who can hardly read or write is drawing $100 a week, practically $5,000 a year. In other words, he is getting from $1,000 to $1,200 more per year than the secretaries upon this Hill. Now, some will say, "That is all right. The educated man ought not to get any more than the man who is barely able to read or write." But you do not take into consideration the long years the man on the Hill, who has acted as your secretary, spent in school, earning his living perhaps, by doing chores at night and on Saturdays and Sundays, trying to go through college. You do not take into consideration, the years when he was not laying anything aside and could not earn anything because he was going to college, nor do you consider the years the farm hand was earning his $40 a month, while your secretary was preparing himself to serve you on the Hill.

I think the people of America have a stake in this bill. I have 300,000 people in my district, demanding services. They are daily being faced with problems which tear their hearts in their efforts to know how to solve them. A day never passes but when I get letters, sometimes by the dozens and sometimes by the hundreds, from mothers and fathers who are seeking information about their boys who are fighting the battles of this country, on the far-flung battlefields of this globe. Now, these questions may seem little to some of you folks up here but these problems that are facing your constituents back home, are problems of tremendous importance to them. They are problems of life and death to those people. It is a problem of life and death to that poor gray-haired mother out in Missouri, and out there in Illinois, and down there in Alabama, who wants to find out where her boy is, who has been reported missing in action. Yet some of us would be so niggardly that we will not cast a vote to give a decent salary to the man who spends long hours, digging into the records here in Washington, to get these bits of information to the people back home who need that information so badly. Gentlemen, let us be brave today. You all know that if you do your duty as Members of this House, you have no time to do that important clerical work. Do not get so badly scared for fear that some constituent will vote against you because you are paying your clerk a living wage in Washington. I can remember when I first came to this town 10 years ago, the cost of living was just about 33⅓ percent of what it is today. You gentlemen know that the cost of living has gone up. There is not a man in this body, when you consider the taxes paid to the United States Government and the taxes you pay to your own State, travel back and forth to your district and the rent that you pay here in addition to your house at home and the telegraph and telephone bills, that are purely incidental to your office, there is not a man in this room today, who is making net, more than $2,000 a year. Now, the same things are affecting your secretaries that have affected you. There is not a secretary on this hill that is making a living wage. Let us be fair and decent to our help this once.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I do not approach this topic with any emotionalism, because I feel it is something that should be considered on its basic equity and that alone. After listening to some of the addresses here this afternoon, I think I am more happy and more responsive to the majority that my constituency gave me in the recent election. I am particularly appreciative of that splendid majority because it was based upon the following philosophy: My opponent, a very splendid gentleman, criticized me, upon the basis of my being a member of the Appropriations Committee and chairman of a subcommittee which presented an appropriation bill to the House for $33,000,000,000 for our Navy. Yet, after all of the vituperous attacks by my opponent, the people of my district had enough confidence in me to send me back here to this body with a splendid majority. I am grateful for that. In fact, I have a very responsive constituency. I have always told them what conditions were as they pertain to my office, and I have consistently tried to render to that constituency a service that has justified confidence. We do not handle our mail in my office as if it were file No. 13, and throw it into the wastebasket, but we answer the mail if it is only a plain postal card written with a stub lead pencil, because to the person who sent that card his or her interest in the matter under consideration is just as great as is the interest of anyone else. Last year it cost me $1,850 of my personal funds to pay for extra help in my office. The year prior to that, it cost me $1,242 to pay for extra help in my office. Much correspondence comes into my office as a result of the chairmanship that I presently occupy, which does not emanate from my congressional district. I have no extra secretarial help to take care of that work.

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. MAY. I would like to have the gentleman come around and take a look at the mail that comes into the office of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of course, I have no knowledge of the gentleman's mail, but if he has so much that the regular force cannot take care of it, then I anticipate he will support this legislation.

Mr. MAY. That he will do.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Some gentlemen have brought up the subject of infringing upon the Little Steel formula. I think it might be well if they would read that formula a little more carefully with relation to the proposition under consideration. This legislation, which will give $3,000 of additional clerk hire in an individual office, is no infringement on the Little Steel formula under the existing regulations.

There has been some comment this afternoon about the expediency with which this bill has been presented to the House and the lack of opportunity to survey what this bill means. I, of course, have no way of knowing how my colleagues may analyze their problems, but after several years here I can say to you frankly I do not need any 6 months or any time to analyze the clerical necessities of my office. I need more help, and I am going to support this legislation because I think it is a proper proposal. Furthermore, I am not going to offer any apology to the people of my district, because they would not respect me as their Representative if I were to offer one. My people write to me and ask me if I cannot assist them in getting truck priorities, if I cannot help them by going down to many divisions of Government and assist them to acquire some things they think they need. From 28 to 35 percent of my time is spent in direct contact with different departments of the Government in an effort to assist my constituency in the problems they are presently confronted with. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned I have no criticism to offer to anyone who is adverse to this bill, but I am supporting it unreservedly and wholeheartedly solely upon my concept of better service to my constituency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That effective January 1, 1945, the clerk hire of each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner shall be at the rate of $9,500 per annum, and such officials and chairmen of standing committees (other than the Committee on Appropriations, which is governed by other law) may rearrange or change the schedules or salaries and the number of employees in their respective offices or committees: *Provided*, That no salary shall be fixed hereunder at a rate in excess of $5,000 per annum, and no action shall be taken to reduce any salary which is specifically fixed by law at a rate higher than $5,000 per annum: *Provided further*, That such changes as may be made in consequence hereof shall not increase the aggregate of the salaries provided for such offices or committees for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, or thereafter, beyond the additional amount herein authorized for clerk hire for Representatives, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and an amount equivalent to the difference between the aggregate amount appropriated for salaries of a standing committee for the fiscal year 1945 and the amount required to increase the compensation rate prevailing on December 6, 1944 (in case of a vacancy, the rate last paid), to the clerk of a standing committee to a rate not in excess of $5,000 per annum: *Provided further*, That no compensation rate shall be established in pursuance hereof which is not a multiple of five: *Provided further*, That Representatives, Delegates, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and committee chairmen, on or before the 10th day of the month in which rearrangements or changes of salary schedules are to become effective, shall certify in writing such rearrangements or changes to the disbursing office, which shall thereafter pay such employees in accordance with such rearrangements or changes: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall supersede any law in conflict therewith.

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1945, for committee employees, to be available solely for expenditure for additional compensation for clerks to standing committees, as authorized in the preceding paragraph, $42,630.

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1945, for clerk hire, Members and Delegates, $657,000.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], author of the pending bill, a question: What is the increase in compensation of the clerks of committees of the House as provided in this bill? I ask that particularly with respect to the language on page 2, commencing in line 8, reading as follows:

An amount equivalent to the difference between the aggregate amount appropriated for salaries of a standing committee for the fiscal year 1945 and the amount required to increase the compensation rate prevailing on December 6, 1944.

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that section 7 of the Ramspeck Act, so-called, provides a limitation of $4,500 in the payment to any clerk of a committee or to a clerk of a Member. This bill provides for an increase of the limitation of the clerk of $500 or up to $500 provided that the committee chairman wants to pay him that. The same with the $3,000. The Member can raise salaries or hire a new employee.

We wanted to do the same thing for the committee clerks where it is possible for the committee chairman to so arrange the money allowed to his committee. If the clerk is paid $4,500 now he would have the right to pay him $5,000. Of course, the gentleman from Mississippi cannot do it because as I know and the gentleman knows the clerk to his outstanding committee only receives $2,750 under the basic law.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Let us take that case as an illustration. My question is this: What automatic increase in the salary of that clerk is contained in this bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. Five hundred dollars under the first paragraph, page 3. It amounts to $500 for each committee or $46,000 plus.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Without further legislation could the Committee on Appropriations provide for a larger amount so as to increase the salaries of those clerks who now receive $3,000 or $3,500?

Mr. COCHRAN. It would be subject to a point of order unless authorized. That is the reason you are considering this bill today.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Unquestionably. Here is my question: Is an increase in excess of $500 authorized by this legislation?

Mr. COCHRAN. No; if the man is receiving $4,500.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Then we would have to have further authorization to increase it?

Mr. COCHRAN. That is coming in under what we call the Monroney-Maloney resolution which is expected to go into the various committees of this House and do something for the able clerks of the committees of the House.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I appreciate that, but I confine my question to this bill purely as a matter of information because frankly I have not been able to ascertain the answer. I am asking now, is there any additional clerk hire authorized in this bill except $500 to each of the clerks of the committees?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; $3,000 for each Member.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Oh, no. I said "clerks to committees."

Mr. COCHRAN. No. Only $500.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is there any additional compensation except $500 contemplated for clerks of committees?

Mr. COCHRAN. Not in this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Does this apply to messengers as well as clerks?

Mr. COCHRAN. Whatever the chairman of the committee desires to do with it he can do it under the Ramspeck Act, which is not touched by this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. You do not affect that at all at the present time?

Mr. COCHRAN. No.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In the legislative appropriation bill an amount is specified for each clerk, each messenger or janitor.

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. This does not affect that except it provides an increase of $500 for the clerk?

Mr. COCHRAN. We are not bothering the Ramspeck Act at all.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the $500 be applied on the clerk is an increase authorized under this bill for the messenger or janitor?

Mr. COCHRAN. Not if he uses the $500 for the clerk. You would not have anything left for the messenger or janitor.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. This $500 is for every committee?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And nothing for an assistant clerk or janitor?

Mr. COCHRAN. No; unless you want to do it that way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KNUTSON: Page 1, strike out lines 4 and 5 and insert "ber, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner who files with the Clerk of the House a statement, verified by his oath or affirmation, that—

"(1) The total amount now provided for clerk hire in his office is being paid to persons regularly employed in his office in the performance of necessary office work;

"(2) The work of his office is of such volume or difficulty that it cannot be efficiently performed by the persons so employed; and

"(3) All of the amounts allowed him for clerk hire, including the additional amounts herein provided, will be paid to persons regularly employed in his office in the performance of necessary office work;

"shall thereafter be at the rate of $9,500 per annum. Effective January 1, 1945, Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners, and chairmen of."

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I freely concede that there are many Members in this body whose volume of work in their offices is of such magnitude that the present clerk hire is not sufficient. But we all know of Members who only have one clerk in the office at the present time, and surely where they only have one, there is no justification for an increase.

This measure merely provides that each Member who files an application for the increase, supported by an affidavit that it is necessary, and that it will be spent for clerk hire, will be given the increase proposed under the bill.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is the gentleman aware that many of us employ special help temporarily for a week or 2 weeks at a time?

Mr. KNUTSON. Under this provision you would employ regular help.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; you would call in some extra help for a week or two.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, that is the same old thing that we have heard every time there has been a proposal before this body.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Has the gentleman never done that himself?

Mr. KNUTSON. I used to do it back when we were only allowed $1,500, but I have not had occasion to do it since. You do not want to lose sight of the fact that this would be the fourth increase taking place since World War No. 1. When I first came to Congress we were allowed $1,500, which was wholly inadequate. That was increased to $3,200. Later it was further increased to $4,500, and then to $5,000, and then to $6,500. Now you propose to increase it to $9,500. It is all right where you need it, but it is a raid on the Treasury if you do not need it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, we have reached the acme. I have heard speeches made here today that, being a lover of this institution known as the House of Representatives, have made me feel very badly. The Members of this House who have been here for years have inferentially convicted this House and its membership of dishonesty. If you are going to adopt amendments like this, you ought to throw this bill out of the window. I am everlastingly tired—and if I speak with some feeling I hope you will pardon me—of some of the statements made here today. You have done me a great honor by making me the head of this House and I am proud of it and proud of you. But if the people of this country thought of me and you as some of our colleagues today have indicated they think of us, I would not be very proud of myself or very proud of you. The people on the outside of Congress who know nothing about the workings of the Congress say enough about us, without our adopting amendments like this and hearing speeches like those just made.

I hope that now, without further debate, you will do with this amendment what ought to be done with it.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 2, line 24, after the semicolon, insert *"Provided further*, That nothing in this act or in any Executive order or rule or regulation promulgated by any agency of the United States Government shall prohibit any employer from paying to any employee a wage or salary equivalent to 75 cents per hour, based on a 48-hour week."

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, for the reasons previously mentioned, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. COCHRAN. I reserve the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from Missouri and his kindness in permitting me to speak on this amendment when he might have insisted on the point of order. I reiterate what I said a while ago, that I have no quarrel with the gentleman from Missouri. When I proposed this amendment I had no idea in the world that it could be regarded by him as embarrassing; as a matter of fact I thought it was going to help him. I thought it would help him to do those things for the working classes of the people that he has so strenuously and ardently and sincerely and honestly fought for all these years. When I hear these speeches urging we must not do it now, we must wait for another time, I say that now is the time to do it if you want to do something for the white-collar workers. You can do it now; why not do it now?

It is said that it is irregular to put it on this bill. Is anything more irregular than this bill itself? Have any of you ever seen anything that came in here under more irregular conditions than the bill which we are today considering? Yet the gentleman says, "No, this is not the right time to do it, we will do it some other time."

Let us do it now. I will cooperate with the gentlemen. They will not cooperate with me. I am just trying to go along with them, yet they jump up here and make all these speeches in the nature of personal attacks on me.

The religion I was raised under said that notwithstanding that a fellow might sin, "as long as the light holds out to burn the vilest sinner might return." I have come to their rescue and tried to help them in this matter. When I do, the gentleman with the bleeding heart from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] comes here and rants about what I have done.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not yield.

I repeat again for the record that I have introduced three labor measures, and everyone of those three which has been voted on by this House has been passed by a roll-call vote of 2 to 1, and on one occasion of 3 to 1 in this House. When the bleeding-hearted gentleman from Pennsylvania and my good friend from Missouri attack me on the floor of the House on those bills, I want them and the House to know that they are indicting two-thirds of the Members of this House. If they want to let it go at that, they are welcome to do so.

As to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, his heart bleeds when any measure comes up here affecting the highly organized workingmen who can protect themselves and who can protect him in his seat in Congress. They are organized. Oh, the gentleman's heart bleeds copiously for them. But when you bring up the poor little devil who has no organization to support him, who is depending just as a citizen upon the big heart of his Representative in Congress to take care of him and protect him, does the heart of the gentleman from Pennsylvania bleed for that unprotected, helpless citizen who has no great organization back of him with the great finances of the C. I. O.-P. A. C.? Oh, no. That bleeding heart dries up when that poor little fellow comes here.

Is his heart bleeding this evening for those people here in Washington working for wages of $1,200 to $1,500 a year, and trying to raise a family and feed them and support them and educate them under the conditions which you all know and which the bleeding-hearted gentleman from Pennsylvania knows prevail in this city with its high cost of living? Does his heart bleed for those people who need his assistance and his charity? Oh, no; not for them. He will not even join with me in an effort to help those poor citizens. He will not even join with me in an effort to help citizens of like character in his own district when all I ask is that employees may have their wages increased to at least 75 cents per hour, without having to secure Government permission. But my friends, just let the Political Action Committee come forward with some proposal in this House, and then the heart of the gentleman from Pennsylvania bleeds copiously again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to be heard?

Mr. COCHRAN. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from Virginia has offered an amendment which has been reported, to which the gentleman from Missouri has made a point of order on the ground that the amendment is not germane to the pending bill. The Chair invites attention to clause 7 of rule 16 which provides—

And no motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

The Chair likewise invites attention to page 193 of Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, which states under the subject of germaneness:

One individual proposition may not be amended by another individual proposition even though the two may belong to the same class.

The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment presented is clearly in violation of the rule cited by the Chair, and the precedent which has likewise been cited, under which numerous decisions have been made by occupants of the Chair throughout the years of the past. Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the committee, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the 5 minutes. It is getting late, but I assume I do owe some thanks to my dear friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I was thinking while he was talking, and I recalled my vigorous opposition to many attempts he has made in connection with antilabor legislation on this floor. The reason I feel I owe him some thanks is

because I am quite sure that that vigorous opposition of mine to that legislation was indeed partly responsible for the fact that my Republican opponent withdrew in the election and thus I did not have any opposition at all.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF] rise?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to state it is the policy of the Chair to alternate recognition on either side.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAUTHOFF: On page 3, line 6, strike out the period, insert a colon and add the following: "*Provided*, That none of these funds shall be used as compensation for clerks who are employed by Members and Delegates to whom they are related."

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I just want to smoke out some of the woodchucks that I think are hiding in the woodpile of this legislation. I am not going to indulge in a lot of emotionalism, and it strikes me that this is not the place for it. What I want to see done and done as speedily as possible is that every office have an adequate staff, but that it be not loaded down with Members of a Congressman's family. That has been an evil practice to which I have always been opposed, and I am still opposed, and I would like to see it done away with. The amendment speaks for itself. It just moves out of anybody's office someone who is related to him. Let the employees of that office be those who are entitled to the positions by virtue of their ability, and not be put on the job as absentee receivers of checks.

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

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Yes.

Mr. RAMEY. Has anybody done that except Mr. TRUMAN'S wife?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I do not know anything about her, or anything about the matter the gentleman refers to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I think I can speak impersonally about this amendment, because I have never assumed to put any relative on the pay roll. I think I have bent over backward to keep brothers from getting into any kind of public service, so that the voice of suspicion might not be raised nor the motives impugned. Let us see what the effect would be if this amendment should be passed. We had a very gracious character in this House a few years ago, Governor Pierce, of Oregon. His office was in the same corridor with mine. He was born in Illinois and went to Oregon at a tender age. He held the office of governor of that State with distinction and then was elected to this body. He had a very gracious, gentle wife, who had served as State librarian of the State of Oregon, and without whom he would have had real difficulty in discharging the duties and the responsibilities of his office. If ever there was a kindly, sweet, gracious soul, it was Heneritta Pierce. The Governor was of advanced age. He depended upon her. If we pass this amendment, of course, you would stop that practice. Certainly there have been abuses, but everyone has to be measured by his own conscience, and are we going around impugning each other's motives? If you want to put your kinsfolk on the pay roll, that is your responsibility and your job, and not mine. You must answer for them, and if one of the columnists sometimes carries an item stating that you have a relative on the pay roll when he thinks you ought not to have there, you are the one who is going to suffer. There are cases like the one I cited, and probably others where there is a degree of relationship, but I am not going to be a party to any amendment that will serve as an inflexible restriction because it might in some cases operate most unjustly. It is not for me to sit in judgment.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr SAUTHOFF. Let me ask the gentleman if it is not possible for any Member's wife to go to his office and help him if she wants to, but there is no reason that the taxpayer has to be charged for her?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The point is that I am not going to make it my responsibility to pass on the other fellow, whether he wants to have his wife on the pay roll or not. I do not have my wife or any other relative on the rolls, but you may put your own wife on the pay roll if you want to. I say to you, follow your own conscience in that.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I agree with what the gentleman from Illinois said and I say to you right now that for the past 2 years my wife has worked in my office on the pay roll. I wish I had another worker just as good.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am only going to say one word. I am in the same position as the gentleman from Illinois. No member of my family, since I have been here, in any manner, shape, or form, has ever benefited financially as a result of my service. But the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will not accomplish what he seeks, for it applies only to the money in this bill. Therefore, if a Member desires to place a relative on the pay roll, he can take it out of the other money and not out of this money. It is easy to see that the amendment does not accomplish what the gentleman desires.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two lines.

Mr. Chairman, what reason is there for a Member of the House of Representatives to deny himself the power of appointment of subordinates that would not apply to any other appointive power in this Republic? Why let a Congressman debase himself by saying that he could not exercise the same power that is exercised by the President of the United States and every officer beneath him clothed with the power to appoint official assistants?

The CHAIRMAN. The question in on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SAUTHOFF) there were—ayes 11, noes 142.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I seldom take the floor to occupy your time but on this occasion I would feel derelict to friendships of 16 years or more were I not to rise and lend my voice in support of this bill. It so happens that it was my happy privilege and pleasure to serve as a secretary in this Congress for 16 years to a gentleman of whom I was very fond and who I know was very fond of me. Our friendship grew into something stronger than mere friendship. During that time I made the acquaintance of secretaries of many of the Members of this House. They were people whom I appreciate deeply, whom I know to be competent, strong, fine men and women who have served here at a financial loss, at a loss that prohibited them from living in the many comforts and luxuries they might have lived in had they never come to Washington. They have served faithfully, they have served long, they have carried out every trust imposed on them; and I hope that the many things that have been said here today may be forgotten and that reconsideration will be given by those who seem to oppose this bill.

I can tell you from personal experience that the funds here requested are needed. Tell me, why should we not have as competent office assistants, assistants who are worthy of their hire, as those who sit in the executive offices up Pennsylvania Avenue.

Here is what happened to me since I have been in Congress. Probably I brought too good an office staff to Washington. My office staff has been offered larger compensation by agencies of the Government. My office staff has remained with me because I have tried to be as kind and considerate as I could of their feelings, and I have made every possible effort to permit them to return home whenever possible. I know that they need this increase in compensation. I know my secretary is about to leave me because another branch of the Government offers him $600 a year more. He is really worth $1,500 a year more. He is worth a great deal to me and I hate to lose his service. He has a wife and two small children to take care of. I appreciate the compliment paid my office staff in the various offers—I consider it a compliment to my district and me that my secretary has received an offer to serve in the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this will be seriously considered today because the people who serve in the offices of the various Members if they are fit to serve at all are entitled to this larger compensation.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I may say to the gentleman that the one who is now addressing him also had a similar experience. Part of his staff has already been lost to industry because they offered many hundreds of dollars more than the Government would pay.

Mr. BONNER. And I may say to the gentleman that he was just as much entitled to that service and his district was just as much entitled to that service as the industry that found a way to pay more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I voted against consideration of this proposition. It is not often that debate changes my mind very much. But I have had a little personal experience. I know what this Congress is going to face. I was here immediately after the last war and in those days I think I was about as strong physically as any man in this House. I remember the strain that was put upon me and my office staff and Dr. Calver can verify this because he was called to my office on one of his first calls after he became physician to Members of the House. He worked over me for 2 hours and it was nothing else but physical and mental exhaustion. It was a case of working night and day, and sometimes I did work all night long.

A person has got to have help. I have never had a member of my family on the pay roll in 26 years except as some smear artist might pick up the fact that I have a nephew who draws a salary as tail-gunner on a plane in Italy, another nephew who is a junior officer in the merchant marine, and a son of mine who is in the Navy. That ought to be sufficient foundation for a good smear article on having relatives on the pay roll.

The Government is not the only one taking trained clerks. I have had a clerk with me, one of the grandest, finest, and most loyal men who ever lived. He came to me as a boy and has been with me 24 years. The limit that I can pay him, of course, you all know under the law. He has had it. No man ever rendered a greater, finer service to my district and to me than he has. Many of you Members know him. He is a remarkable young man. He studied law since he has been my secretary and he is a good lawyer.

Along comes an association in New York which pays him five or six times anything that the law would allow me to pay him. My district has had the benefit of that young man's ability. He will receive now from $12,000 to $24,000 a year. He is not the only secretary I have trained that has gone to a higher position that I have lost. I say to you without fear, as you will remember, that I voted for the pension for Congressmen, and I so declared on the floor of this House. I make no excuses for it. Since I have heard this debate and what I know from past experience, let me say that if I have a relative in my district who can do this job better than anybody else in my office can do it for me, so help me God, I propose to hire him or her.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to request the attention of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. If I understood the gentleman from Missouri correctly, in debate earlier this afternoon he took the position that the language on page 3 of the bill constitutes an actual appropriation of the funds necessary to carry out the purposes of the bill, and that further action by the Committee on Appropriations or by the Congress in an appropriation bill will be unnecessary; is that correct?

Mr. COCHRAN. It is my understanding that if this bill passes in its present form, the members of the Committee on Appropriations will not make a point of order if it is offered on the deficiency bill tomorrow.

Mr. TARVER. Then the gentleman does not take the position that this is an actual appropriation of funds?

Mr. COCHRAN. No.

Mr. TARVER. I am very glad to have that additional explanation from the gentleman, because there is no appropriating language used in connection with the two paragraphs on page 3 of the bill and there is no appropriation made by the bill. No funds will be made available by the bill unless further action is taken in connection with an appropriation bill. I was anxious that that fact be made clear for the RECORD.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to consume 5 minutes, but I cannot leave unanswered in the RECORD the statement of the gentleman from Virginia that he is the champion of the unorganized workers of this country. The wages-and-hours law was designed to benefit the unorganized workers. Those who were in the unions did not need it. There was no more vigorous opponent of that law than the gentleman from Virginia, as every record in this House that had to do with labor legislation will disclose.

I am for the gentleman's amendment. Even though I am a little bit concerned about Greeks bearing gifts, I shall vote for it if it can be brought to a vote. The gentleman from Virginia is one of the best parliamentarians in this House. He is a member of the Committee on Rules and has strangled more progressive legislation in the interest of the unorganized workers of the country than any other Member of this body. He knew before he offered the amendment that it was subject to a point of order, and that it could not be voted upon, so I leave you to draw your own conclusions as to his purpose.

With respect to my bleeding heart, of which he spoke sarcastically at least 10 times, I will say that when that organ of mine does bleed, at least the substance that comes out will be blood, whereas with respect to some others whose names I will not mention, a great many people are of the opinion that the fluid which emanates from their hearts is very chilly ice water.

There are some people, when they speak of labor—and again I will not mention any names, but I will give you one guess to whom I am referring—whose hearts get as big as ice wagons and just as cold.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to get this one thing clear. When the gentleman from Missouri was speaking some time ago, I interrogated him with respect to the question of whether or not this bill was intended to carry an appropriation to implement this so-called authorization. The gentleman indicated to me that that was the purpose and that he so understood it, and the RECORD will so show. He now says, in response to an inquiry from the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] that that is not the situation. I cannot conceive how you could have an appropriation of money made by the Congress in a bill of this chartcter, which is a legislative authorization, without any appropriating language being contained in the bill.

The point I think the Members of this House ought to know is that it is not intended that this bill shall carry an appropriation and that action by the Committee on Appropriations to furnish the funds must follow the action of the Congress in passing this authorization.

The question I want to ask the gentleman is this. Suppose this bill passes the House. It must then go to the Senate and be passed by the Senate, and be signed by the President, because that affects organic law and changes it. If that is true, then there can be no appropriation made by the Committee on Appropriations that would not be subject to a point of order until the bill is finally passed and is signed by the President. So, in the event we pass this bill today and an attempt is made to write an amendment into the pending deficiency appropriation bill to provide the funds to implement this bill and make it effective, any Member of the House could block such a move by making a point of order that the proposed appropriation is not authorized yet by law. Is that correct?

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman is right. The language in this bill is what the members of the Committee on Appropriations told me would be sufficient. They said that if the Committee on Accounts brought the bill to the floor of the House and it passed, even before the Senate acted they would accept the amendment. In other words, if the House by a majority vote passed the bill, that was sufficient for them to accept the amendment.

Mr. KEEFE. I think it should be perfectly clear, then, that when the Members vote on this bill they should not do so with exultation in their hearts, feeling that they have succeeded in adding $3,000 to the clerical hire in their offices.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. The Committee on Appropriations cannot accept the amendment if any Member of the House desires to offer a point of order to it. In that case, it will be rejected no matter what the Committee on Appropriations will be willing to accept.

Mr. KEEFE. That is exactly the point I wanted to make clear. So when this bill is passed it provides an authorization for an appropriation of sufficient funds to implement the pending legislation, but it cannot be effective so as to provide this clerical hire the first of the year unless the Congress, through the action of its Appropriations Committee, can get every Member in this House to waive any point of order that might be raised against the appropriation provided it is submitted before this bill finally becomes law.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The increase could be put on in the Senate after this act has been signed by the President.

Mr. KEEFE. That is very true, provided the increase should be put on in the Senate after the President signs the bill, that is, provided this bill becomes law.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Regardless of whether the President signs the bill, the provision could be put in because no point of order can be made against it in the Senate or in the House if it comes back with that provision in it from conference.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] rise?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before this debate closes and we vote on this bill, I want to see if in just a few words I cannot put this matter in its place where I think it belongs. We are engaged in the greatest war in all history, a war that has its roots largely in the fact that in certain nations of the world, democratic government found it impossible to live and all power was concentrated in the hands of an all-powerful executive clique who took over the complete direction of the destiny of those people and plunged the world into war. In this body and in the other body at the other end of the Capitol, there reposes more than in any other place in this whole world, the future destiny of democratic governments, and personal freedom and individual liberties. Why? Because to the extent this Congress does its job in the future, and does its job in a world most difficult, in a world afflicted by problems far more difficult of solution than any that organized nations have ever faced before, to the extent we do that job effectively we will justify democratic government and build strong and true for a nation governed by three departments of government, each with its coequal field and scope in that government, and with the defense of the liberties of the people secure in the hands of their own representatives. The reason I am for this bill and the reason my vote will be cast for this bill, is briefly this: I want to come as near as I can to doing the job I ought to do on national legislation.

I want enough help in my office and help which is well enough paid, so that all the detailed work that ought to be done by my office, and the many things I am asked to do and which I should properly be asked to do by the people of my district, can be handled efficiently and well and so that I still will have time to inform myself adequately and to study with care the weighty problems before us. Every one of us must be able to come before the House on these national legislative questions that will affect the destiny of millions of people as well prepared as is humanly possible to pass on such questions. That is why I am for this bill.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this is but the first step in the action of this Congress to strengthen itself to do this tremendous job. I hope it is not the last step. For in my judgment there are other measures of greater importance. I hope these will follow on the basis of the study and thought of Members of this body. I believe the American Congress is going to equip itself to do its part in governing this democratic Nation so well that by the effectiveness of the job it does, it will justify its own position and put to shame, the people who have questioned the future vigor and strength of the democratic institutions of this great Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill close in 10 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] to the effect that all debate on this bill and all amendments thereto do now close.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is satisfactory to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi to the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. LANHAM, having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 5590, pursuant to House Resolution 672, and reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANHAM). Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. 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 pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 202, nays 88, not voting 138, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

YEAS—202

Allen, La.	Gavin	Merrow
Andersen, H. Carl	Gerlach	Miller, Mo.
Anderson, Calif.	Gibson	Mills
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gifford	Monroney
Andresen, August H.	Gillespie	Morrison, La.
Andrews, Ala.	Goodwin	Morrison, N. C.
Andrews, N. Y	Gordon	Mundt
Angell	Gorski	Murdock
Arends	Granger	Myers
Arnold	Grant, Ala.	Norton
Auchincloss	Gregory	O'Brien, Ill.
Barden	Gross	O'Brien, Mich
Barrett	Hagen	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bates, Ky.	Hale	O'Connor
Bates, Mass.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Hara
Beall	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Konski
Beckworth	Halleck	O'Toole
Bell	Hancock	Patton
Bender	Harless, Ariz.	Peterson, Fla.
Bishop	Harris	Peterson, Ga.
Bloom	Hart	Phillips
Bolton	Hébert	Pittenger
Bonner	Herter	Poage
Boren	Hess	Powers
Boykin	Hill	Priest
Bradley, Mich.	Hobbs	Rabaut
Bradley, Pa.	Hoch	Randolph
Brehm	Hoffman	Rankin
Buck	Holmes, Mass.	Reed, Ill.
Burchill, N. Y.	Holmes, Wash.	Reed, N. Y.
Butler	Howell	Rivers
Byrne	Hull	Robsion, Ky.
Canfield	Izac	Rogers, Mass.
Carter	Jackson	Rolph
Case	Jarman	Sabath
Celler	Jennings	Sadowski
Chiperfield	Jensen	Scrivner
Cochran	Johnson, Anton J.	Sheppard
Coffee	Johnson, Ind.	Short
Cole, Mo.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Slaughter
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Okla.	Snyder
Cox	Kean	Somers, N. Y.
Cravens	Kee	Spence
Crawford	Kefauver	Stanley
Crosser	Kelley	Starnes, Ala.
Cunningham	Keogh	Stevenson
Curley	Kerr	Stewart
Day	King	Stigler
Dilweg	Kirwan	Stockman
Dingell	Kleberg	Sumners, Tex.
Dirksen	Landis	Sundstrom
Domengeaux	Larcade	Talle
Dondero	Lea	Thomas, Tex.
Drewry	LeFevre	Torrens
Eberharter	Lesinski	Vinson, Ga.
Elliott	Lewis	Voorhis, Calif.
Ellsworth	Lynch	Walter
Engel, Mich.	McCormack	Wasielewski
Engle, Calif.	McKenzie	Weaver
Feighan	McMillan, S. C.	Welch
Fellows	Madden	White
Fernandez	Manasco	Wickersham
Fish	Marcantonio	Wigglesworth
Forand	Martin, Iowa	Winter
Fuller	Martin, Mass.	Wolcott
Gamble	May	Woodruff, Mich.
Gathings		Woodrum, Va.
		Worley
		Wright

NAYS—88

Abernethy	Clevenger	Gossett
Bennett, Mo.	Colmer	Graham
Bland	Cooper	Gwynne
Brown, Ga.	Curtis	Heidinger
Brumbaugh	D'Alesandro	Hoeven
Bryson	Doughton, N. C.	Hope
Burch, Va.	Durham	Jenkins
Camp	Dworshak	Johnson, J. Leroy
Cannon, Mo.	Ellison, Md.	Johnson, Luther A.
Carlson, Kans.	Elmer	Jonkman
Carrier	Flannagan	Keefe
Chapman	Folger	Kinzer
Church	Gilchrist	
Clason	Gillette	

Kunkel	Pratt, Joseph M.	Sumner, Ill.
Lanham	Ramey	Taber
LeCompte	Rees, Kans.	Tarver
Lemke	Richards	Thomason
Ludlow	Robertson	Tibbott
McConnell	Rockwell	Vincent, Ky.
Mahon	Rodgers, Pa.	Vorys, Ohio
Mason	Rohrbough	Vursell
Michener	Rowe	Wadsworth
Miller, Conn.	Sauthoff	Weichel, Ohio
Miller, Nebr.	Schwabe	Whitten
Mruk	Simpson, Ill.	Whittington
Murray, Tenn.	Smith, Ohio	Willey
Murray, Wis.	Smith, Va.	Wilson
Norman	Smith, Wis.	Zimmerman
Norrell	Springer	
O'Neal		

NOT VOTING—138

Allen, Ill.	Grant, Ind.	Outland
Baldwin, Md.	Griffiths	Pace
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hare	Patman
Barry	Harness, Ind.	Pfeifer
Bennett, Mich.	Hartley	Philbin
Blackney	Hays	Ploeser
Brooks	Heffernan	Plumley
Brown, Ohio	Hendricks	Poulson
Buckley	Hinshaw	Pracht, C. Frederick
Buffett	Holifield	Price
Bulwinkle	Horan	Ramspeck
Burdick	Jeffrey	Reece, Tenn.
Burgin	Johnson, Calvin D.	Rizley
Busbey	Johnson, Ward	Robinson, Utah
Cannon, Fla.	Jones	Rooney
Capozzoli	Judd	Rowan
Carson, Ohio	Kearney	Russell
Chenoweth	Kennedy	Sasscer
Clark	Kilburn	Satterfield
Compton	Kilday	Scanlon
Cooley	Klein	Schiffler
Costello	Knutson	Scott
Courtney	LaFollette	Shafer
Daughton, Va.	Lambertson	Sheridan
Davis	Lane	Simpson, Pa.
Dawson	Luce	Smith, Maine
Delaney	McCord	Smith, W. Va.
Dewey	McCowen	Sparkman
Dickstein	McGehee	Stearns, N. H.
Dies	McGregor	Stefan
Disney	McLean	Sullivan
Douglas	McMillen, Ill.	Talbot
Eaton	McMurray	Taylor
Ellis	McWilliams	Thomas, N. J.
Elston, Ohio	Maas	Tolan
Fay	Magnuson	Towe
Fenton	Maloney	Treadway
Fisher	Mansfield, Mont.	Troutman
Fitzpatrick	Mansfield, Tex.	Ward
Ford	Merritt	Weiss
Fulbright	Miller, Pa.	Wene
Fulmer	Monkiewicz	West
Furlong	Mott	Whelchel, Ga.
Gale	Murphy	Winstead
Gallagher	Newsome	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gearhart		Wolverton, N. J.
Gillie		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Knutson against.

Mr. Carson of Ohio for, with Mr. Jones against.

Mr. Dickstein for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Ramspeck with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Outland with Mr. Shafer.

Mr. Winstead with Mr. Jeffrey.

Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Merritt with Mrs. Luce.

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Elston.

Mr. Courtney with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Weiss with Mr. Stefan.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Talbot.

Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Smith of Maine.

Mr. Mansfield of Montana with Mr. Ploeser.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. Kilday with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Rizley.

Mr. Pace with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Hare with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Grant of Indiana.

Mr. Rooney with Mr. Harness of Indiana.

Mr. Maloney with Mr. McGregor.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. LaFollette.

Mr. Lane with Mr. Lewis.

Mr. Dawson with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Davis with Mr. Chenoweth.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress (hereinafter referred to as the committee), to be composed of six Members of the Senate (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six Members of the House of Representatives (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. No recommendation shall be made by the committee except upon a majority vote of the Members representing each House, taken separately.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution. This study shall include, but shall not be limited to, the organization and operation of each House of the Congress; the relationship between the two Houses; the relationships between the Congress and other branches of the Government; the employment and remuneration of personnel by the Members and the committees of the Congress; and the structure of, and the relationships between, the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress: *Provided*, That nothing in this concurrent resolution shall be construed to authorize the committee to recommend any amendment to or change in the parliamentary rules governing proceedings in either House.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties. The committee may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as it deems necessary and is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government.

(c) The committee shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives the result of its study, together with its recommendations, not later than April 1, 1945. If the Senate, the House of Representatives, or both, are in recess or have adjourned, the report shall be made to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be.

With the following amendments:

On page 3, strike out paragraph (c) up to and including line 2 on page 4.

Page 4, line 3, strike out (d) and insert in lieu thereof (c).

Page 4, line 5, after the word "recommendations", strike out the remainder of the sentence and insert in lieu thereof the following: "not later than April 1, 1945."

UNITED STATES NAVY ADDITIONAL ORDNANCE PRODUCTION FACILITIES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 664, Rept. No. 2044) on the bill S. 2194, 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 S. 2194, a bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, 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 the 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.

RECLAMATION WORK

Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 3429, for printing under the rule.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Oil City Derrick.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SAN FRANCISCO HONORS GREECE

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, on November 26, 1944, approximately 10,000 people assembled in San Francisco's municipal auditorium to celebrate Greek liberation. A beautiful pageant depicted thrilling episodes in Grecian history.

The hearts and souls not only of those with Hellenic blood in their veins but all liberty-loving Americans are stirred in knowing that the Nazis have been expelled. Greece is free. At the San Francisco gathering, every reference to the 4-year struggle against Hitler was greeted with tremendous applause. No one will ever forget the intense loyalty and devotion of those present.

But deep interest in Greece by Americans is nothing new. In 1821 the brave little country regained its independence from Turkey. James Monroe was President of the United States at the time. Speakers in the Congress expressed satisfaction that Greece had been able to set up her own government. Federal authorities in Washington sent medical supplies and food to the new nation. Our two countries have always been extremely friendly.

Accounts of current Hellenic events are confusing to all Americans. American-Greeks desire to see their mother country restored to order. They want to see it get along and prosper. They do not want any revolution.

Not once since 1821 has Greece been threatened with civil war. Always changes have been accomplished without bloodshed. As in the United States itself, constitutional methods invariably prevail. Americans are confident the present situation will be met in the same statesmanlike manner. We extend greetings and best wishes to a brave people and a gallant nation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two different subjects.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not propose to object, I would like to inquire of the distinguished majority leader what will happen to the bill we have just passed; that is, the clerk-hire bill. Can the gentleman tell us what will be the disposition of that legislation?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I welcome that inquiry, in a sense. Of course, I have no knowledge of what will take place. But I hope and assume that tomorrow, while the deficiency appropriations bill is pending, an amendment will be offered, having the effect exactly of the bill adopted by the House today. It seems to me it would be unnecessary, in view of the fact that we are now considering the deficiency appropriations bill, to send two bills to the Senate. Assuming a point of order can be made, and I do not undertake to pass upon what any occupant of the chair might rule on a point of order, but assuming that a point of order is made, and assuming under the rules of the House, the point of order would have to be sustained, it seems to me in view of the fact that the House has taken action as it has, and expressed itself as it has, I would hope that no Member would make a point of order. The bill has been debated on its merits and the House has expressed itself, and those who are opposed to it have had an opportunity of placing themselves on record. It would be my hope that the policy of a good sport and good loser would be adopted by anyone who voted against the bill. I do not know if that answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. FISH. Yes; it answers my question completely. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman that the Members who voted against the bill ought to refrain from making a point of order.

Mr. McCORMACK. We will continue with the consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill. Then we will take up probably the admirals bill, which I understand has been more or less ironed out. Then I gave a promise last week that the Jackson Hole would be put on the program for this week. I do not like to break my promise.

Mr. FISH. I hope the gentleman before he makes a definite commitment will remember that some of us have special orders tomorrow, and we would like to address the House before 6 or 7 o'clock at night.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman will remember that a member of the Committee on Rules last week very courteously served notice on me that it is his intention to exercise his right under the rule and have members of the Committee call up the rule on the Jackson Hole bill, it having been reported out of the gentleman's committee for a period longer than 7 legislative days. I placed it on the program and I told him it would be on the program, and be brought up next week, which is this week. Tomorrow is the last day. I gave a promise to the House and I am going to keep my promise if I can. If it cannot be kept, it will be because of circumstances over which I have no control. I prefer not to have the bill up. I would not have such a bill on the program if I had my way, I will be frank to say.

Mr. FISH. Would there be any difference if the bill came up on Monday next.

Mr. McCORMACK. I made a promise that the bill would come up this week. So far as I am concerned, if the House takes a position contrary to my wishes on this bill I would welcome it, but I am going to stick by the commitment that I made.

If the deficiency bill gets through at a reasonable time tomorrow these things can be accomplished, but, of course, if it goes on to 5 o'clock, then I don't think that anyone would think I am violating a promise by not taking up the Jackson Hole bill at that time. I shall keep my promise unless circumstances present a different situation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the Jackson Hole bill should by any chance not be reached tomorrow, it would be in order for Monday, would it not?

Mr. McCORMACK. I feel the commitment I made would mean that I should have to bring it up as soon as I can. To be absolutely frank, I hope the Jackson Hole bill does not come up tomorrow, though I intend to keep my commitment, if I can.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, so far as the clerical help bill which has just been passed, is concerned, as the gentleman knows, I was opposed to this procedure. I did not like to see it done in this way, to have it taken up in the midst of the consideration of an appropriation bill. However, inasmuch as such a large majority of the House approved of that procedure, I hope that no one will object tomorrow to the interjection and insertion of this important legislative bill in the regular appropriation bill under consideration, in violation of the rules of the House, but in keeping with the sentiments of a majority of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. If that were done I am sure my friend the gentleman from Michigan would agree that it would be in conformity with the rules of the House, considering the action that has been taken.

Mr. MICHENER. I would take just the opposite view; I would say that the Chairman would hold that any legislative language in an appropriation bill is subject to a point of order unless the appropriation has been authorized by law. This could not be authorized by law until it had passed the Senate and the President signed the bill. I could make a point of order against this tomorrow, or any other Member could make a point of order against it, and the Chair would have to sustain the point of order; but in view of what has happened I hope that will not be done.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has clarified it in my mind. I agree with the gentleman's statement as to the authority of law and the processes the bill would have to go through.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourn today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

SHIPPING FACILITIES FOR OFFSHORE SUGAR

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, last spring I called attention to the neglect of Government agencies charged with administering the supply and distribution of sugar. It was especially emphasized

that trans-Atlantic shipping lying idle in New York Harbor for want of dock-side facilities while waiting to reload, could and should be utilized for bringing in sugar from Caribbean ports. Government agencies took that course and a number of ships were released and assigned to the task of bringing in off-shore sugar. Thereupon they immediately restored to commercial users of sugar 80 percent of the 1941 allotment of sugar which had previously been cut to 70 percent of 1941 use.

Notwithstanding the amelioration through this correction there was still an acute and disastrous shortage of sugar throughout the current year. In the fall, sugar for canning was practically unobtainable by housewives. Fruit crops were wasted, destroyed, and dumped, even after going to the trouble and expense of picking them. The tragedy was even worse than that, if I may record a single instance. One fruit grower in my district, a man only 45 years of age, enjoyed the first big peach crop from an orchard that he had nurtured for years. In September, after selling a few loads on the city market for about what it would cost to pick them—although he had picked them himself—he was told by buyers on the market that they did not want his peaches because there was no sugar obtainable for canning purposes. He took his load of peaches back to the farm and in despair he hanged himself beside the load of unwanted peaches. In an adjoining part of his barn, when they found him, were another 80 to 90 half-bushel baskets of peaches, ready for the market. This man, under the slogan that "food will win the war" had done his part toward the winning of the war only to find that the inability of the civilian administration to efficiently back the war effort, brought all his splendid efforts and success to naught.

I am informed that in my district and in that locality 500 bushels of peaches were dumped into one ravine because there was no market, because there was no sugar for canning. All over the district I was confronted with complaints about the acute sugar shortage, alike for commercial consumption or canning purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have always been and still are willing to make any sacrifices and bear any tragedy necessary to win the war and win it quickly, but they are not content to stand by and see our civil administration take away from our military leadership and our fighting forces the credit of winning the war and at the same time excuse their neglect and inefficiency in the handling of the civilian responsibility in the war effort, under the claim that their whole effort is centered on winning the war in the field of battle.

The administration's first and great responsibility is to furnish to our fighting forces everything that is needed for them to win the war and win it quickly, but they cannot thereby avoid the secondary responsibility of furnishing the home front with everything possible, not needed or used by the military, to the end that the home front can back the war effort. To meet this secondary obligation and especially in the matter of our sugar supply for 1945, will require the administration's best efforts.

In the last week I have received letters and telegrams from my State and district expressing apprehension about a more serious sugar shortage in 1945 than was experienced in the current year. And it seems to me that their fears are well grounded, for yesterday I received a report on the sugar situation by the Food Supply and Allocation Committee, being a subcommittee to the Food Industry War Committee, a trade organization, which was shocking to me.

It showed that on October 1, 1940, sugar stocks in the continental United States totaled 1,320,564 short tons raw value; that on October 1, 1943, they totaled 860,944 short tons raw value, and that this year on October 1 they had diminished to 465,000 short tons raw value, the lowest level in more than 10 years.

Think of it, on October 1 of this year, we began facing next year with a little better than half the stock pile we had last year at the same time and a little more than a third what we had in 1940 at the same time. There is indeed cause for alarm.

Sugar—

As is quite well known, and as the report I have referred to states—

is a vital energy food. Its nutritional importance is increased during the strain of a war period when civilian morale must be maintained. About 16 percent of the total food energy requirements of the people of the United States during pre-war years were supplied directly by cane and beet sugar. In addition, sucrose (cane and beet sugar) is an essential ingredient or an integral component part of many major processed food items of bakeries, bottlers of soft drinks, canners and preservers of fruits and vegetables, confectionery and chocolate manufacturers, packers of cereal products, meat packers, milk and milk product processors (like condensed milk, ice cream, frozen confections, etc.), makers of flavoring extracts, of sirups, to mention only a few.

This report further states that the current sugar shortage has been caused chiefly by:

1. Inadequate assignment of ships to bring in raw sugar that is available in the offshore areas.

2. Insufficient continental production of sugar.

These are still the same reasons advanced by me as a member of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee last spring and it is to be hoped that all the Government agencies responsible will lend every effort to use all available ocean tonnage that can be used without impairing war shipping, to the maximum extent. At the same time they should use every effort possible to increase cane- and beet-sugar production in the United States, which, of course, involves no ocean shipping.

The report to the Food Industry War Committee offers a program which I believe will afford substantial relief, in which I concur, and which is as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE CONDITIONS

Unless constructive action is taken quickly by all governmental agencies having any responsibility for formulating sugar policies, we face a particularly difficult situation in distribution of sugar to the consumers in the United States during the first 9 months of 1945.

1. The most vital need is that action be taken at once to provide adequate shipping to bring in raw sugar so that refineries can operate at uninterrupted capacity.

2. All possible steps should be taken to encourage maximum sugar production in the United States in 1945 for which ocean shipping is not required.

3. Increased production in offshore areas should be stimulated to provide increased sugar for 1946.

4. The Government should give domestic refiners assistance on manpower and necessary equipment priorities.

5. The present rationing and allocation program should be revamped so that it can be administered more efficiently, thereby avoiding loose and illegal distribution of sugar.

6. No sugar should be diverted to high-test molasses to make industrial alcohol.

OTHER SUPPLEMENTARY RECOMMENDATIONS OFFERED

Besides the six major recommendations set forth above, the committee makes six additional recommendations that supplement the earlier proposals:

1. Governmental agencies charged with sugar control should measure, as accurately as possible, the over-all supply of sugar for 1945, including the carry-over.

2. Similarly these Government agencies should agree on realistic estimates of our requirements taking into account administrative problems in controlling sugar distribution. For example in 1944 sugar deliveries are running about 750,000 tons above original estimates of requirements.

3. We recommend that the armed forces study their requirements carefully so they will be certain to have a sufficient quantity, but avoid building up a needlessly high stock pile.

4. Government agencies should measure our domestic sugar needs carefully before assigning sugar for distribution to our allies, United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (U. N. R. R. A.) and Lend-Lease. While the objective of supplying sugar to these groups is commendable, there is no reason why it should be done at too great a sacrifice to the United States consumers of sugar and sweetened products. Domestic consumption, under the rationing systems, already have been drastically curtailed.

5. We should avoid, as much as possible, bringing refined sugar to the United States for trans-shipment abroad. We should utilize the refining capacity in Cuba for direct shipment from Cuba to its final destination for at least a portion of Army, Lend-Lease, and U. N. R. R. A. sugar requirements. Also raw sugar supplies might be sent direct to north Africa, France, or Belgium for refining.

6. We should make certain that every possible pound of European beet sugar production is utilized to lighten the relief load on Western Hemisphere sugar supplies.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein certain quotations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BUFFET, for this week, on account of personal illness.

To Mr. HORAN, for 3 days, on account of illness.

To Mr. KILDAY (at the request of Mr. LUTHER JOHNSON of Texas), for today, on account of important Government business.

To Mr. DILWEG, for the remainder of the week, on account of important official business.

To Mr. MCCOWEN (at the request of Mr. JENKINS) indefinitely, on account of death in family.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 hour on Monday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and other special orders.

I do this in case the time I have for tomorrow is not available to me. I am rather hopeful I will be reached tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4311. An act to authorize the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution to extend the statute of limitation in certain cases.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1744. An act to provide Government protection to widows and children of deceased World War No. 1 veterans, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4311. An act to authorize the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State;

H. R. 4366. An act for the relief of Alex Wylie, and the estate of James Evans; and

H. R. 4917. An act conferring upon the State of Montana authority to exchange for other lands certain lands selected by the State of Montana for the use of the University of Montana for biological station purposes pursuant to the act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1080).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, December 8, 1944, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

2064. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting copy of the estimate of personnel requirements of the United States Tariff Commission for the quarter ending March 31, 1945, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. H. R. 5590. A bill to increase clerk hire, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2029). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Interim report pursuant to House Resolution 52. Resolution to continue the investigation by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries begun under House Resolution 281, Seventy-seventh Congress (Rept. No. 2030). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CAPOZZOLI: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Interim report pursuant to House Resolution 52. Resolution to continue the investigation by the committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries begun under House Resolution 281, Seventy-seventh Congress (Rept. No. 2031). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 5387. A bill to amend sections 101 (a) and 212 (b) (2) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2032). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1898. An act to amend section 99 of the Judicial Code, as amended, so as to change the term of the District Court for the District of North Dakota at Minot, N. Dak.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2033). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 671. Resolution for the consideration of the bill (S. 2019) to establish the grade of fleet admiral of the United States Navy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2034). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 672. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 5590, to increase clerk hire, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2035). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4425. A bill to incorporate the Regular Veterans' Association; without amendment (Rept. No. 2036). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROCKWELL: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. S. 1571. An act to provide that the transmountain tunnel constructed in connection with the Colorado-Big Thompson project shall be known as the "Alva B. Adams Tunnel"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2037). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLE of New York: Commitee on Insular Affairs. H. R. 5570. A bill to provide that the term of office of the Governor of Puerto Rico shall expire 60 days from the enactment of this act and at the end of each 4-year period thereafter; without amendment (Rept. No. 2038). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 4683. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation; with amendment (Rept. No. 2039). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 4988. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; without amendment (Rept. No. 2040). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 5159. A bill to regulate in the District of Columbia the transfer of shares of stock in corporations and to make uniform the law with reference thereto; with amendment (Rept. No. 2041). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WHITE: Committee of conference, H. R. 3429. A bill to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406); as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148); with amendment (Rept. No. 2042). And ordered to be printed.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. Senate Concurrent Resolution 23. Senate concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; with amendments (Rept. No. 2043). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 664. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 2194, a bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2044). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 4932. A bill to amend sections 4, 7, and 17 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) for the purpose of extending the time in which amendatory contracts may be made, and for other related purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2045). 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. CELLER:

H. R. 5592. A bill to increase compensation of Members of Senate and House, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 5593. A bill to provide that commissioned and warrant officers placed in St. Elizabeths Hospital or certain United States Public Health Service hospitals shall be liable to pay such rate per day as may be prescribed from time to time by the President, and to authorize the heads of the several agencies to deduct such sum from their pay and to transmit it to St. Elizabeths Hospital; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 5594. A bill for the relief of the Fair Haven Yacht Works; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 5595. A bill for the relief of the Mount Desert Boat Yard, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULLER:

H. R. 5596. A bill for the relief of Hutchinson's Boat Works, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 5597. A bill for the relief of the First National Bank, of Merrick, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5598. A bill for the relief of Bruns Kimball & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 5599. A bill for the relief of the San Pedro Boat Works; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 5600. A bill for the relief of the Channel Boat Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 5601. A bill for the relief of Reed Bros.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5602. A bill for the relief of S. B. Norton & Son; to the Committee on Claims.

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, November 21, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, whom we seek in vain without unless we first find Thee within, may the hush of Thy presence fall now upon our driven lives. In a time for greatness save us from inner cowardice which makes us unwilling to pay the price of better things. We confess that too often we have desired Thy coming, but not through us; we have sought for a new order that would leave our own lives still unchanged.

By the light of a guiding star, by the song of a heavenly host, by the lure of a lowly manger, by the smile of a little child, reveal to us the false pride that inflates our petty knowledge and grant us the humility that stoops to learn Thy ways. Give us a part in bringing in a world delivered from disorder and aggression a civilization saved from collapse and catastrophe, a humanity redeemed from another and more dreadful dark age:

"'Til rise at last to span
Its firm foundations broad,
The commonwealth of man,
The city of our God."

Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Secretary, Edwin A. Halsey, read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., December 8, 1944.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. McKELLAR thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, December 7, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 933. A bill for the relief of Conrad H. Clark; and

H. R. 3929. A bill for the relief of Katherine Scherer.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5590) to increase clerk hire, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H. R. 933. An act for the relief of Conrad H. Clark and Rocco Cellette; and

H. R. 3929. An act for the relief of Katherine Scherer.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Gerry	O'Daniel
Austin	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Green	Overton
Ball	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Gurney	Reed
Bilbo	Hall	Revercomb
Brewster	Hatch	Reynolds
Brooks	Hayden	Robertson
Buck	Hill	Russell
Burton	Holman	Shipstead
Bushfield	Jenner	Smith
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Capper	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	La Follette	Tunnell
Chandler	Langer	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Lucas	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Walsh
Connally	McFarland	Weeks
Cordon	McKellar	Wheeler
Danaher	Maloney	Wherry
Davis	Maybank	White
Downey	Mead	Wiley
Ellender	Millikin	Willis
Ferguson	Murray	Wilson
George	Nye	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on important public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

CREDENTIALS

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have the honor to send to the desk the certificate of election of my distinguished colleague [Mr. AIKEN] as a Senator from the State of Vermont for a term of 6 years, beginning the 3d day of January 1945. It has been signed by His Excellency the Governor of Vermont, William H. Wills, and countersigned by the secretary of state, Rawson C. Myrick.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be read.

The credentials were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF VERMONT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November 1944 GEORGE D. AIKEN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Vermont a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1945.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor William H. Wills and our seal hereto affixed at Montpelier this 5th day of December in the year of our Lord 1944.

WM. H. WILLS,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] RAWSON C. MYRICK,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I present the credentials of the distinguished Governor of South Carolina, Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON, who has been recently elected for a full 6-year term in the United States Senate commencing in January.

Mr. HALL. Mr. President, the Governor of South Carolina is a native of my home county of Anderson, and I am very happy indeed to join with the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina in connection with the presentation of his credentials.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be read.

The credentials were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November 1944, OLIN D. JOHNSTON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of South Carolina, a Senator from said State to represent the said State in the Senate of the United States for a term of six (6) years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1945.

At an official meeting of the State board of canvassers on December 2, 1944, in the office of the secretary of state, OLIN D. JOHNSTON was officially declared elected to the United States Senate.