

to the form of oath or affirmation to be taken by the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 83. Joint resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that members of the clergy of the religious faiths believing in Almighty God should be appointed as members of the delegation representing the United States of America at any peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1753. A bill for the relief of Desire J. Bouillion; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1754. A bill for the relief of Edwin Doyle Parrish; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCKENZIE:

H. R. 1755. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Reita Tabor Hammack; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PIÑERO:

H. R. 1756. A bill for the relief of the estate of the late Demetrio Caquias; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1757. A bill for the relief of S. I. Wooten, F. M. Maloy, and Mrs. Alethea Arthur; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROWAN:

H. R. 1758. A bill for the relief of Harry Tansey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRAYNOR:

H. R. 1759. A bill for the relief of Mildred Neiffer; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

35. By Mr. LeCOMPTE: Petition of Richard P. Newby, Oskaloosa, Iowa, and sundry other citizens of Iowa and other States in opposition to compulsory peacetime conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

36. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of 132 residents of Port Huron, Mich., urging an amendment to the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to prohibit interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial radio programs by educational institutions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who revealest Thyself in the true, the honest, the pure, and the lovely, make even our wayward minds Thy audience chamber and our fickle hearts Thy dwelling place. In this quiet

moment of prayer which stands as a hallowed altar in the midst of the demanding day, we pause to ask Thy guidance as we tread unknown and tangled ways. We seek that sense of the invisible and the eternal that alone can bring peace and restoration to jaded bodies and spirits with their spent strength.

In this great day of Thy visitation and of our opportunity, grant us such a vision of our needy world with all its yawning divisions and its poisoning suspicions, and yet with its dawning sense of human brotherhood, that the decisions that are here made may never have to be reversed by those who come after us. So at last may we be counted by grateful generations who shall inherit a kindlier earth among the architects of the final parliament of peace and plenty in which every kindred and tongue shall find its rightful place. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 22, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

THE MOYNE TRIAL—LETTER FROM THE EGYPTIAN MINISTER TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Egyptian Minister to the United States in reply to the statement I made a few days ago in the Senate in connection with the trial in Cairo of the two young Palestinians.

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

ROYAL LEGATION OF EGYPT,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1945.
The Honorable Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I have the honor to inform you that I have just read your speech inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 15, together with the story of the New York Times printed at your request and entitled "Moyné Trial."

While in no way desirous of discussing the nature of your speech based on this story, I respectfully wish to emphasize that the judiciary in Egypt, on whose benches I had the great honor to serve at one time, is and has always been independent and that no influence whatsoever can affect its decisions. Moreover, it is hardly conceivable that the British, whom, I have no doubt, are as jealous as your people and mine regarding the integrity of the courts and the prestige due to the judiciary, would attempt to bring pressure that could influence the judges.

Bearing in mind these principles practiced by civilized countries, I have no doubt the defendants had a fair and impartial trial. Permit me to add that if the presiding judge confined the debates to the facts or if, as it is claimed, the censor did not permit the reporting of certain utterances not pertaining to these facts, this procedure cannot affect, in any way, the course of justice and could have only been dictated in the interest of the defendants.

I can only hope that this letter will be accorded space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order to remove any doubt in the integrity of the Egyptian Judiciary.

Accept, sir, the assurances of my high consideration.

Sincerely yours,

HASSAN,
Egyptian Minister.

REPORT OF NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the National Mediation Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the tenth annual report of that Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

POST-WAR COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING—MEMORIAL

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as a part of my remarks and appropriately referred a memorial signed by 80 citizens of Mound Valley and Edna, Kans., in opposition to the May bill.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

We, the undersigned voters of Kansas, being of the opinion that the May bill pertaining to compulsory military training after the war for all youths reaching the age of 17 years, constitutes a national policy of the American Nation, and not an emergency measure, and is so radical a departure from all our historic precedents that we can afford to proceed with caution and certainly without haste, therefore we most heartily request that you use your influence to the utmost to persuade Congress to postpone until the war is over any action on the May bill.

LEGISLATIVE FARM PROGRAM ADOPTED BY KANSAS FARM BUREAU

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received the legislative farm program adopted by the Kansas Farm Bureau at their recent annual meeting in Topeka, Kans., and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

The American citizen of today has a definite responsibility to future generations, as well as a sacred obligation to those who have died on the battlefield, to use every available means to prevent future wars.

Many other momentous problems face the post-war world, including the preservation of democracy, the maintenance of full production, and the stabilization of prices at such levels as to treat all segments of our economy equitably.

Farmers are to be commended for their success in meeting production demands, thus enabling this war to go forward with ample food and fiber to a victorious conclusion.

Our boys and girls are fighting this war to win a lasting peace and to maintain our democratic way of life, making it possible for our citizens to choose their own governmental policies. With this in mind, we offer you this working program for the ensuing year

so that you may exercise your democratic rights in your choice of the same.

W. L. OLSON,
Chairman, Morris County.
MRS. HARVEY BROSS,
Dickinson County.
MRS. RALPH L. COLEMAN,
Douglas County.
DON CHARLES,
Republic County.
G. E. WILSON,
Hamilton County.

NATIONAL FARM PROGRAMS

We reiterate our emphatic approval and continued support of the broad principles of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 provides that the farm programs be administered by farmers. This has proved both practical and successful. Congress stipulated this when the appropriations were made for the 1944 program. We commend Congress for this action and recommend that farmer administration be further promoted to assure the practical application of the program.

Soil-conservation practices: We believe that soil-conservation practices should be extended to as many farms as possible, not only to retain soil and soil fertility, but also to aid in flood control.

Commodity loans and ever normal granary: We commend the ever-normal granary and the commodity loan programs which have functioned effectively and done much toward stabilizing farm prices. We further believe that any system of crop loans should be coordinated with a production control program.

Crop insurance: We recognize the urgent need of a sound crop-insurance program and believe providing crop insurance to farmers is a proper and legitimate activity of the Federal Government. Premium rates should vary as to the difference of risks in different areas, so that each farmer would bear his just share, eventually making the crop insurance program self-supporting.

PARITY

The parity concept of prices, one of the basic goals of agriculture, calls for prices for agricultural products bearing the same relationship to prices paid by farmers as existed during the base period of 1910 to 1914. We believe the established parity formula should be used as the basis of agricultural legislation until a special study has been made to determine if improvement can be made in order to meet changing conditions.

LIVESTOCK AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTS

We thoroughly realize that Kansas is inherently a livestock State and owes much of its progress to those actively engaged in that industry. We firmly believe that every effort should be made to improve the production and marketing of livestock, poultry, and their products.

PRICE GUARANTIES AFTER THE WAR

We commend the Congress of the United States for having passed laws directing the Government to support the prices of certain agricultural products at 90 percent of parity for 2 years, beginning with the first of January after the cessation of hostilities.

COMMITTEE OF KANSAS FARM ORGANIZATIONS

We again recommend participation in the Committee of Kansas Farm Organizations, so that organized agriculture may have a more effective voice in framing and enacting legislation in the interests of the industry.

FARM CREDIT

A cooperative system of farm credit is essential to the wellbeing of agriculture. The American farmer needs a system of dependable credit which will be at his service in times of adversity as well as in times of prosperity. We endorse the Farm Credit Administration, but we believe that the coopera-

tive features of the system should be strengthened by giving more responsibility and authority in the local Cooperative Credit Association.

COOPERATIVE ENTERPRISES

Cooperative marketing, purchasing, and service associations have made such marked growth in the past decade that their success has brought about a bitter fight against them from those whose past exploitations of the farmers through monopolistic control of goods and services have become notorious. Every Farm Bureau member has a stake in the success of cooperatives as a means of offsetting this influence and bringing about a more equitable distribution of income. We, therefore, renew our faith in the cooperative principle and pledge our more active support to legitimate cooperative enterprise of every description.

KANSAS COOPERATIVE COUNCIL

We will endeavor to render more aid by our participation in the Kansas Cooperative Council and to assist in the preservation and further expansion of cooperatives.

KANSAS COUNCIL FOR CHILDREN

We recommend continued collaboration with the Kansas Council for Children in their task of providing better health, schools and social conditions for our children.

RURAL SCHOOLS

Farm people have no greater responsibility than their obligation to protect and promote the rural schools of Kansas. We believe economic parity depends on educational parity. We urge a careful study of the recommendations of the Kansas Legislative Council concerning the improvement of our rural schools.

FARM-TO-MARKET ROADS

We urge special emphasis be given to farm-to-market roads in the allocation of Federal and State funds available in the post-war road construction program.

MILITARY TRAINING

We believe in a military-training program that will not interrupt the normal program of education of our youth yet provide a means whereby we would have sufficiently trained personnel for the armed forces.

POLAND—LETTER FROM PRESIDENT OF POLISH UNION FOR NEBRASKA

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have a communication from the State and district president of the Polish Union of the United States, Omaha, Nebr., which is self-explanatory, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

COMMUNITY No. 7 OF THE POLISH
UNION OF AMERICA,
Omaha, Nebr., January 13, 1945.

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: District No. 7, of the Polish Union of the United States, for the State of Nebraska, for its membership of Americans of Polish descent respectfully submits this letter for your careful attention.

We believe in the self-determination of all nations, large and small, and in their territorial integrity; that they should not be transferred from one country to another as if they were chattels; that just governments derive their powers from the consent of the governed.

These principles and others enunciated in the Atlantic Charter should not now be abandoned for the sake of appeasing any nation playing power politics.

Poland, the first to oppose by force the aggressors seeking world dominion, should not now be sacrificed to one of them that precipitated this great holocaust.

Justice, fair play, honor, and a regard for the opinion of mankind demand fair treatment of Poland as our ally.

Respectfully submitted,

FRANCIS C. KAWA,
State and District President,
Polish Union of United States.
JACOB MRUZ, Secretary.

DEFERMENT OF FARM LABOR

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter received from J. J. R. Claassen, of Beatrice, Nebr., supplementing my remarks on the floor of the Senate relative to the drafting of farm boys. The letter is self-explanatory. I should also like to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Herman Seeba, of Cook, Nebr., having to do with the same subject.

There being no objection, the letters are ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TYPICAL FARM SALE HEADING PUBLIC SALE

As my help has all gone to the Army, I am forced to sell my personal property, at the farm 2 miles west of Belvidere; 5 miles north of Hebron, on Monday, January 22. Sale starts at 10:30 central war time.

BEATRICE, NEBR., January 20, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR WHERRY: If the drafting of farm boys is continued, and increased as authorities in Washington now say must be done, production of foodstuff will be reduced more than they realize. Our local paper lists farm sales for nearly every day of the month and the reason is: Help unavailable.

We have 145 farm units (as of January 1, 1945). Have been doing the work the best we can with our 3 boys. Last week one of our boys received a I-A classification and after an appeal the draft board gave him a II-C for 30 days which gives us no chance for planning our spring work. Will we be forced to dispose of our 15 milk cows and 140 brood sows to farrow this spring, or what would you advise us to do?

Respectfully yours,

J. J. R. CLAASSEN.

COOK, NEBR., January 21, 1945.

SENATOR WHERRY.

DEAR SENATOR: Am writing you in regard to our Johnson County draft board. They have the idea that all our boys 18-26 years that are fit must be inducted in the Army regardless of how essential they are. They have at the present time 30 of our boys, mostly from the farm, in class I-A, and in a short time they will have them in the Army.

Several of us have tried to convince them that (according to the Tydings amendment) some of these boys at least should carry on with the farm work. I left the farm in 1936 on account of a bone infection in my thigh and up to this time I still suffer from the ailment. I have an only son who has taken over the farming since graduating in 1940 and he has done a good job of it.

I have read in the papers how you feel about this kind of a situation and am hoping that perhaps you might be able to do something for us. If there is anything you can do in this case please act at once. It will be highly appreciated.

Yours truly,

HERMAN SEEBE.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram sent to me by

Glenn J. Talbott, president of the North Dakota Farmers' Union and member of the State Selective Board of Appeals, Group No. 1, which deals with the subject of the drafting of farm boys and the relationship of the Tydings amendment to the general drafting program.

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

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., January 22, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER:

Reurtel. Tydings' amendment is ambiguous in that it leaves determination of essentiality of farm and/or registrant to judgment of local board. Therefore this judgment becomes vital in interpretation of Tydings' amendment. It is my belief that many, if not most local boards upon receipt of Hershey's recent directives have reclassified for military service substantial numbers of farmers and key farm workers who are so essential that their induction into the armed services will result in decreased production of some and abandonment of other farms. Shortage of year around manpower on our farms has already resulted in substantial reduction in number of milk cows with resultant loss of dairy products vitally needed in war effort. Summarizing—very few men can be taken from North Dakota farms without adverse effect upon our production goals.

GLENN J. TALBOTT,
President, North Dakota Farmers
Union, and Member, State Selective
Service Board of Appeals,
Group No. 1.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 22d instant,

Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 340) to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance, reported it on January 24, 1945, with an amendment, and submitted a report (No. 20) thereon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 314. A bill for the relief of Sigurdur Jonsson and Thorolinn Thordardottir; without amendment (Rept. No. 21).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 213. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of Canton, Ohio, for highway purposes only, a strip of land situated within the United States naval ordnance plant at Canton, Ohio; without amendment (Rept. No. 25);

S. 216. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to Oahu Railway & Land Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain lands situated at Halawa, Ewa, Oahu, T. H.; without amendment (Rept. No. 26);

S. 217. A bill to authorize an exchange of lands between the city of Eastport, Maine, and the United States, and the conveyance of a roadway easement to the city of Eastport, Maine; without amendment (Rept. No. 27);

S. 218. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease certain lands situated in San Diego County, State of California; with an amendment (Rept. No. 29);

S. 221. A bill to authorize Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson to accept decorations and orders tendered them

by the Government of the United States of Brazil; without amendment (Rept. No. 28); and

H. R. 626. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 23).

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE—RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 35) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 22) thereon.

In connection with the reporting of the bill I will say that I have conferred with the majority leader and the minority leader and have asked if they have any objection to my moving that the Senate proceed to the consideration of this bill on the next legislative day. I do not know whether that will be tomorrow or Monday. I now give notice that I shall move that the Senate proceed to consideration of the bill—and I think that is agreeable to both the majority leader and the minority leader—on the next legislative day, whenever that may be.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand the Senator makes no request now, but simply gives notice that at the next session of the Senate he will move the consideration of the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report submitted by the Senator from Louisiana will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATION OF CIVIL SERVICE LAWS (REPT. NO. 24)

Mr. ELLENDER. From the Committee to Investigate the Administration and Operation of the Civil Service Laws, I submit a report. I ask that a copy of the report be referred to the Committee on Civil Service of the Senate, and that at the conclusion of my remarks the conclusions and recommendation of the committee be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report submitted by the Senator from Louisiana will be received and printed, and without objection, a copy thereof will be referred to the Committee on Civil Service; and the conclusions and recommendation of the committee will be printed in the RECORD.

The conclusions and recommendation are as follows:

CONCLUSIONS

A survey of the present situation with regard to civil service administration reveals that much remains to be done to correct existing evils. Some of the corrective measures provided by Executive orders have been modified or nullified by succeeding Executive orders designed to meet war needs; others have been suspended for the duration of the emergency; while others were never effectively put in operation.

The only corrective measures instituted in the past 6 years that have remained in full effect during the war years have been those prescribed through legislation. These include the requirement that incumbents of positions

covered into the civil service pass a noncompetitive examination before being admitted into the classified service; the provision for within-grade promotions, and the establishment of efficiency rating appeal boards.

During these years, civil-service rules and regulations have been relaxed to permit recruitment of employees by agencies, admission to service by noncompetitive examinations, waiving of time limits on reinstatements, transfers during probation, transfers to classified positions by persons admitted to the service without competitive examination, and reinstatement of probationers through noncompetitive examinations. Competitive promotion examinations which were never uniformly established have been suspended for the duration. The Commission is authorized to refuse examinations to civil service employees, unless the employing agency agrees that better service can be provided in the position for which examination is being held. This operates to close to employees already in the service opportunities that are open to new recruits. While the appointments made to the service under war service regulations are limited to the end of the war or 6 months thereafter, many of the war service appointees have advanced to much higher positions than have permanent employees of equal qualification and greater experience.

Personal patronage is still prevalent throughout the civil service. During the war years appointments to high positions, unmerited promotions, transfers to higher grades, and excellent efficiency ratings have been increasingly awarded to personal followers. The Civil Service Commission has often been just a means for examining and certifying the friends referred by the agency head to the Commission for examination. Many highly qualified people who have taken examinations have been passed over to find later that their papers had not been graded by the Commission.

The personnel directors and the large personnel divisions within departments have not exerted the beneficial influence originally expected of them. Many of the responsibilities assigned to these divisions are in actuality carried out by the personnel clerks in individual bureaus. The personnel division acts as a form of clearing house through which personnel actions pass for review. Personnel policies remain in the hands of the agency head. The personnel director and his staff carry out these policies. The unprecedented expansion of personnel departments in agencies, without taking on responsibilities and duties in keeping with this expansion, might be questioned.

Although the efficiency-rating appeal boards have constituted a vast improvement in personnel practice, much remains to be done before the system becomes truly effective. The boards are still frequently dominated by the agency head. The employee who appeals his rating often has slight chance of winning and, even when he does, he and the witnesses who testify for him are likely to be subjected to further discrimination within the agency.

The civil-service regulations for reduction in force have placed so much weight upon efficiency ratings, as compared with seniority in service, that it is possible for the employee of 5 years' service to displace the employee of 20 years' service. Complaints from employees in the past year have indicated that agency heads are already adjusting efficiency ratings to provide for future reductions. Employees, who have been rated excellent for many years, during the past year were reduced to good and thus made eligible for separation under these regulations.

RECOMMENDATION

This special committee recognizes the need for the relaxation of peacetime regulations

and the suspension of activities not essential to the promotion of the war effort. However, since the peak of civilian employment in Government has been reached, it would appear desirable that immediate consideration be given to the drafting of legislation designed to return the civil service to a peacetime basis and to merit-system principles. The corrective measures initiated by Executive orders should be considered with a view to perpetuating the desirable features of these orders through permanent legislation. Consideration should be given to the development of other legislation designed to strengthen and protect the merit system. In line with these objectives, consideration should be given to:

I. The effectiveness with which corrective legislation is being administered.

a. Personnel administration.
b. Efficiency rating systems and efficiency rating appeal boards.

c. Grievance appeal systems.

II. Regulations issued by Civil Service Commission under Executive Orders 9063 and 9067 relative to—

a. Appointments.
b. Examinations.
c. Reduction in force.

III. Effectiveness with which war transfer authority has been administered by Civil Service Commission.

IV. Need for legislation to insure—

a. More effective examinations.
b. Establishment or promotion, transfer, and reinstatement registers from which appointments would be made prior to appointment of new employees.
c. Strengthening of protective devices for employees.
d. Appeals regarding separations.
e. Protection of seniority rights of employees.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE WAR-MOBILIZATION PROBLEMS AND WAR-CONTRACTS MATTERS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Military Affairs I report a resolution approved by the committee, for reference to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution reported by the Senator from West Virginia will be received, and, under the rule, referred as suggested by the Senator from West Virginia.

The resolution (S. Res. 46) was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 107 and Senate Resolution 216, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, authorizing a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee to study the problems of war mobilization; and that the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 193 and Senate Resolution 288, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, authorizing a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee to investigate war contracts, termination of war contracts, and related problems, be and are hereby continued to July 1, 1945.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no per-

manent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 385. A bill for the relief of Glassell-Taylor Co., Robinson and Young; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 386. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Tensas River National Park, Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 387. A bill for the relief of Sam Swan and Ally Swan; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 388. A bill granting a pension to Earl E. Bayles; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 389. A bill to amend section 310 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1928 by revising the basis and rate of retired pay of members of the honorary retired list of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 390 (by request). A bill to provide for the retirement of certain veterans who served in both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 391. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the national security and defense by establishing daylight saving time," approved January 20, 1942, so as to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to discontinue daylight saving time under such act in any time zone in which it finds that the continuance thereof is no longer necessary; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 392. A bill for the relief of Nebraska Wesleyan University; and

S. 393. A bill for the relief of the Farmers Union Cooperative Association of Dawson, Nebr.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 394. A bill for the relief of Guy Albert Wheaton; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for Mr. HATCH):

S. 395 (by request). A bill to modify the application of the excess-land and repayment provisions of the Federal reclamation laws to the Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 396. A bill providing for the transfer of a certain fish hatchery in Comanche County, Okla., to the city of Lawton, Okla.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 397. A bill to provide for the presentation of medals to members of the United States Antarctic Expedition of 1939-41; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 398. A bill for the relief of Joseph Kenney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON:

S. 399. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lula Wilson Nevers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TUNNELL:

S. 400. A bill for the relief of Elisabeth Andersen; and

S. 401. A bill for the relief of sundry fruit growers of the State of Delaware who sustained losses as the result of the fumigation of apples with methyl bromide in order to comply with the requirements of the United States Department of Agriculture relating to the Japanese Beetle Quarantine; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 402. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the

classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920;

S. 403. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, for the purpose of making possible the crediting under such act of certain periods of State service;

S. 404. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended;

S. 405. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended; and

S. 406. A bill to provide for health programs for Government employees; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 407. A bill for the relief of Pierce William Van Doren and Elmer J. Coates;

S. 408. A bill for the relief of certain persons;

S. 409. A bill for the relief of Sigfried Olsen, doing business as Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co.;

S. 410. A bill for the relief of Marino Bello; and

S. 411. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mae E. Sutton; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 412. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of alien Chinese wives of American citizens who are admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those authorizing exclusion on grounds of race or birth in a defined geographical area; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 413. A bill for the relief of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 414. A bill to restore to the active list of the Army and to active duty certain retired officers of the Regular Army, and for other purposes;

S. 415. A bill to enable the mothers and widows of deceased members of the armed forces now interred in cemeteries outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska to make a pilgrimage to such cemeteries; and

S. 416. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire certain lands in the State of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL LENDING AGENCIES—AMENDMENT

Mr. AIKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 375) to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. SALTONSTALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 35) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AVIATION EXHIBITION FACILITIES AT SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. WHERRY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 47), which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

Whereas the Smithsonian Institution has one of the world's most valuable aviation collections; and

Whereas lack of space has seriously handicapped the effective display of such collection, and has prevented the addition thereto

of exhibits reflecting recent progress in aviation; and

Whereas, as a world leader in the field of aviation, the United States should take steps to preserve for future generations a complete historical record of its contributions to the development of aviation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of exhibition facilities at the Smithsonian Institution with a view to ascertaining what additional facilities are necessary to provide for the proper display of aviation exhibits now in the possession of such Institution, and to provide adequate space for the housing and display of such additional exhibits as may be acquired for the purpose of bringing up to date and maintaining a complete aviation collection. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations as to the construction immediately after the war of such additional facilities as may be found to be necessary.

INSPECTION OF NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS BY NAVAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. WALSH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 48), which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof duly appointed by the chairman of the committee, is hereby authorized to visit, for the purposes of inspection, during the present Congress, any part of the Naval Establishment in the Western Hemisphere, the expenses incurred in pursuance thereof, not to exceed \$4,000, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate. The members of such committee or subcommittee shall be paid the actual expenses of transportation incurred by them for travel performed under the provisions of this resolution and a per diem allowance as provided by law while performing travel authorized by this resolution.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for Mr. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 49), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 14, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to employ an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$2,880 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

ADDITIONAL CLERK, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for Mr. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 50), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 251, agreed to June 4, 1942, authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to employ an additional clerk, to be paid from the contingent funds of the Senate at the rate of \$1,800 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. HILL (for Mr. ANDREWS) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 51), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 170, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to September 29, 1941, as supplemented by Senate Resolution 326, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to December 15, 1942, authorizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$1,800 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

RETIREMENT PRIVILEGE FOR CERTAIN SENATE RESTAURANT EMPLOYEES

Mr. MCKELLAR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 52), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That any person who shall have served as an employee of the Senate restaurant for 55 years or more shall be entitled, upon making application to the Secretary of the Senate, to be retired and to receive retirement pay at a rate equal to the rate of the basic compensation he was receiving at the time of his last active service as such employee: *Provided*, That this resolution shall not apply to any person while he is receiving an annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended. Such retirement pay shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall determine eligibility for retirement pay under this resolution on the basis of records or secondary evidence. For such purposes, actual service in the Senate restaurant shall be deemed to be service as an employee of such restaurant whether or not the person performing such service was carried on the Senate rolls as such an employee during the time such service was performed, and any person performing such service for the major part of the time during which the Senate was in session in any calendar year shall be deemed to have performed a year's service as an employee of the Senate restaurant during such calendar year.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Mr. TUNNELL (for Mr. GREEN) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 53), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 28, agreed to January 10, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Privileges and Elections to employ an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$2,220 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect from February 1, 1945, to the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

Mr. HILL (for Mr. PEPPER) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 54), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That Resolution No. 12, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Patents to employ an assistant clerk during the Seventy-seventh Congress, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$2,400 per annum, hereby is con-

tinued in full force and effect until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], I ask that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] be excused from further service on the Committee on Enrolled Bills, and that he be assigned to the chairmanship of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

I also request that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS] be assigned to service on the following committees:

District of Columbia, Interstate Commerce, Printing, and Territories and Insular Affairs.

I also ask that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] be assigned to service on the following committees: Interstate Commerce, Mines and Mining, Public Buildings and Grounds, and Territories and Insular Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CONNALLY AT PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS' DINNER

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator CONNALLY at the Presidential Electors' dinner in honor of the inauguration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and HARRY S. TRUMAN, held in Washington, D. C., January 19, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH—EDITORIAL FROM BIRMINGHAM AGE-HERALD

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Thomas of Utah" published in the Birmingham Age-Herald of January 11, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY TO BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the annual dinner of the Fall River Area Council, Boy Scouts of America, Fall River, Mass., January 16, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR WORLD AIMS—EDITORIAL FROM BIRMINGHAM AGE-HERALD

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our World Aims," published in the Birmingham Age-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

MILITARY TRAINING FOR NATIONAL SAFETY—EDITORIAL FROM THE SAT- URDAY EVENING POST

[Mr. GURNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Military Training for National Safety," by Ben Hibbs, editor of the Saturday Evening Post, from the issue of January 27, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ROOSEVELT TODAY—EDITORIAL FROM BIRMINGHAM AGE-HERALD

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Roosevelt Today," published in a recent issue of the Birmingham Age-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DUMBARTON OAKS PROPOSALS—THE FIRST STEP TOWARD WORLD SECURITY

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for more than 5 minutes at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Vermont will proceed.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

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	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gurney	Overton
Bailey	Hawkes	Pepper
Ball	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bilbo	Hill	Revercomb
Brewster	Hoey	Robertson
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Burton	Kilgore	Smith
Bushfield	La Follette	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Taylor
Capehart	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McMahon	Tobey
Connally	Maybank	Tunnell
Cordon	Mead	Tydings
Donnell	Millikin	Vandenberg
Downey	Mitchell	Walsh
Eastland	Moore	Wherry
Ellender	Morse	White
Ferguson	Murdock	Wiley
Fulbright	Murray	Willis
George	Myers	Wilson
Gerry	O'Daniel	

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

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent on public business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Senator from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the contemplated meeting of the Big Three Powers, which the President indicates will be held "anon," and the location of which Prime Minister Churchill refers to as "up yonder," impels me to make a brief statement relating to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. My purpose is partly to stimulate such an expression of consecrated effort by our people toward prompt establishment of the Security Organization as will give vital spirit to the basic treaty to which we may agree.

Partly, also, I am interested that we inspire in the negotiators confidence that

the Government of the United States can be relied upon to promote the General International Organization for Security, advocated in the Connally resolution, and in the Moscow Declaration, and finally given form in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

The all-party action by 16 new Senators yesterday strengthened the arm of the President immediately. I am sure the 16 Senators will accept from an older Senator who has been in the Senate 14 years a word of commendation for the initiative which the new Senators have displayed. I think the exercise of their functions at such an early date in such a manner as to indicate the power of unity is a great service to our country at this critical hour. If it was an unusual act I hope that hereafter it may become a habit. From my point of view I see nothing but good and great achievement in it, and I want to encourage its repetition.

Mr. President, to give it point I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD—

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator permit me to place the letter in the RECORD a little later?

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, yes, Mr. President. That is a very gracious move on the Senator's part. I am glad to have the great chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate place the document, which is a letter to the President, in the RECORD. I regard this as an event which in due time will speak with remarkable accent on the development of patriotism and unity in the United States at the time when it was most necessary, and by that I mean while the meeting of three great powers is going on.

Yes, Mr. President; I am glad to yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that I did not want to interrupt him or to consume any of his time, and if it will not interrupt the Senator, and if it will not consume too much of his time, I should like to ask that the letter be read at the desk.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am glad to have that done, Mr. President.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have read in to the RECORD the letter addressed to the President by 16 so-called new Senators with regard to the formation of a United Nations organization along the general lines drafted at Dumbarton Oaks. I feel sure that the action of these Senators will be of very great help and will give impetus to what many of us have been undertaking to accomplish in the past. The 16 Senators were not Members of the Senate when the so-called Connally resolution was adopted, but the older Senators were, and I regard it as particularly appropriate and particularly helpful that the new Senators have addressed to the President this great letter setting forth their views, and I ask that the letter may be read at the desk at this point. I thank the Senator from Vermont for so generously yielding to me for this purpose.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations for having this letter placed in the RECORD. I consider it to be an integral part of the attempt I am making toward the same encouragement of the negotiators who will be anon "up yonder."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask that the letter be read at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRIGGS in the chair). Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., January 23, 1945.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The undersigned new Members of the Senate of the United States, conscious of the profound significance of the conferences soon to be held with our principal allies wish to convey to you for your consideration, some of our thoughts concerning the foreign policy of this Government.

We realize that it is important for you to be advised of the views of the new Senators who heretofore have not had the opportunity to make their position clear.

I. We favor the formation at the earliest possible moment of a United Nations organization, to establish and preserve the peace of the world, along the general lines tentatively drafted at Dumbarton Oaks;

II. We believe this Government should use all reasonable means to assure our allies and the other nations of the world that we intend to share in the direction of and the responsibility for the settlement of this war and the maintenance of peace;

III. We suggest that treaties among the major allies be concluded as soon as possible, to demilitarize Germany and Japan and to keep them demilitarized;

IV. We believe that this Government should, as soon as possible, arrange to participate affirmatively in all decisions affecting the establishment of law and order in the liberated or enemy countries.

Trusting that these suggestions may be of assistance to you and wishing you success in the forthcoming conferences, we are,

Yours respectfully,

Frank P. Briggs, Missouri; Homer E. Capehart, Indiana; Forrest C. Donnell, Missouri; J. W. Fulbright, Arkansas; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, Iowa; Clyde R. Hoey, North Carolina; Olin D. Johnston, South Carolina; Warren G. Magnuson, Washington; Brien McMahon, Connecticut; Hugh D. Mitchell, Washington; Wayne L. Morse, Oregon; John Moses, North Dakota; Francis J. Myers, Pennsylvania; Leverett Saltonstall, Massachusetts; H. Alexander Smith, New Jersey; Glen H. Taylor, Idaho.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, in order to give specific point to the support which we wish to give to the negotiators, let us consider briefly the progress evidenced in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as compared with the League of Nations Covenant. The League combined two duties—that of policing the enemy and that of policing the members of the League. Provision for this twofold responsibility proved to be a defect—I shall not say a fatal defect, because no one knows what it was, alone and of itself, that caused the League to fail to reach its objective.

The security organization for member states under the League was frustrated by the fallacies and frailties inherent in the discipline of Germany. The pacification of Germany should have been the

single duty of an organization composed of Germany's military conquerors. An effort was made by France to obtain a separate German treaty for this purpose, but it was rejected in the League Covenant.

By contrast, the Dumbarton Oaks proposals envisage a special policing of enemy states, providing, in chapter 12, subsection 2:

No provision of the treaty should preclude action taken or authorized in relation to enemy states as a result of the present war by the governments having responsibility for such action.

Every word of that sentence is of high value and great importance, and none of it can be omitted in interpreting it. Here and now let us put to rest turbulent thinking in relation to the various bilateral agreements—the Anglo-Soviet mutual assistance agreement of May 26, 1942; the Soviet-Czechoslovak treaty of December 12, 1943; the Franco-Soviet treaty of alliance and mutual assistance of December 10, 1944; and any similar agreements which might be made, such as the agreement which was suggested by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] only a short time ago. Such agreements are for security. They run against Germany and her Axis specifically. They fit the pattern of the general international organization for security and peace.

Let us see if that is true so far as the existing treaties are concerned.

The Anglo-Soviet pact precisely implemented the Atlantic charter, and is in harmony with the preamble of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and with its articles, as shown by the following extract from the treaty:

The high contracting parties declare their desire to unite with other like-minded states in adopting proposals for common action to preserve peace and resist aggression in the post-war period.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals subsequently adopted indicate awareness of that treaty and the intention to foster other arrangements for security against the enemy. Current opinion that through this treaty the United Nations were then fighting for a common cause was well expressed in the New York Times of June 12, 1942, in an editorial containing the following sentence:

But neither its bilateral character nor the suggestion that it may foreshadow the system of regional groupings, vaguely envisaged in London and Washington as the larger units of a new peace structure, affects in any degree the close cooperation of Russia, Great Britain, and the United States in the war effort.

This treaty was openly arrived at, and its text was published in our own Department of State bulletin on September 26, 1942. I quote further from the New York Times editorial for interpretation, in order that we may see that the public had this information currently:

Our Government was not only in consultation with the British at every stage of the negotiations with Moscow; there is reason to believe that the final draft of the accord was influenced by our views.

Let us now turn to the Soviet-Czechoslovak treaty signed December 12, 1943.

That is also limited in its terms to the function of policing the enemy, policing Germany and states associated with her in acts of aggression. It expressly incorporates some of the principles of the Atlantic Charter. I quote from article IV of that treaty:

The high-contracting parties, considering the interests of security of each of them, agree to maintain close and friendly cooperation in the period after the reestablishment of peace and to act in conformity with the principles of mutual respect for their independence and sovereignty, as well as for nonintervention in the internal affairs of the other state. They agree to develop their economic relations on the widest possible scale and to render each other every possible economic assistance after the war.

A protocol to that treaty opened the door—and I quote from it the significant words—

* * * to some third country which borders on the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or on the Czechoslovak Republic and which formed the object of German aggression in the present war.

Such a country as Poland, desiring to join that treaty, would be accorded that opportunity on the mutual consent of the parties thereto. This is in line with the Dumbarton Oaks policy to depend upon states surrounding or in proximity to Germany, as governments "having responsibility for such action." Those are precise words, describing, as I think, those members of the family of nations who are competent to maintain security and peace under the law, and who are now already sacrificing and striving to their utmost to attain that objective.

Of course, this treaty was colored with great feeling of distrust and sorrow. It was colored by the atrocities of Lidice, which emphasized the necessity of providing special treatment for Germany in the general international organization. To forestall German aggression is one of the measures which are necessary for collective security.

Now let us turn to the Franco-Soviet alliance. I quote from a preamble which has been referred to time after time since then by officials of the various governments interested:

Convinced that when victory is achieved the reestablishment of peace on a firm basis and its maintenance during a long period in the future will be served by the existence of close collaboration between them and all the United Nations—

"Them," of course, refers to the parties—France and Russia—

having decided to collaborate in the creation of an international system of security for the effective maintenance of general peace and for the assurance of the harmonious development of relations between nations.

Of course, this is only an extract from the preamble.

This and other definite references to the policy declared at Moscow, Teheran, and Dumbarton Oaks, such as in the words "in complete accordance with the aims which the United Nations have adopted," show that the Franco-Soviet alliance is an act of performance within the spirit and letter of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. The special and distinctive obligation created in this treaty is policing Germany and its Axis. It leaves

to the United Nations' organization the general obligation of policing the United Nations, free from the special difficulties inherent in disciplining an enemy.

Of course, Mr. President, let me observe that the world contemplates pacification of the enemy and contemplates such a policing of the civilization of both Germany and Japan that they will ultimately qualify to be freed from this sort of policing and discipline, and will seek to become members of the general organization and, by its express terms, will be entitled to be members of it, and ultimately will be members of it.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Are not the compacts to which the Senator has been referring in substance the same as those between France and countries bordering on France, known as the cordon sanitaire treaties?

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not know to what the Senator refers. I have noticed that from time to time throughout history there have been alliances for security purposes. If that is what the Senator refers to, I would answer in the affirmative, and I would say that the character of protection afforded by such treaties with countries surrounding a definite state is similar to the character of protection set up by the balance of power between the states of Europe in ancient times. The difference is, however, that the so-called cordon sanitaire is not around the circumference of the country which wishes to be protected. It is around the enemy.

These treaties are in reverse of the ancient balance-of-power treaties. These treaties operate against the enemy, and are designed to be limited in time. For example, I think every one of them contains a 20-year limitation, and some of them contain a fact-and-event limitation, namely, such an event as the establishment of the general international organization referred to. I cannot say, from memory, which ones they are, but they all are aimed at policing the enemy during the period of pacification, and in that respect I believe they are different from any other treaty which has ever been entered into heretofore for security purposes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is my memory, and I make the statement only upon that basis, that France set up the cordon sanitaire treaties after the last war. The end point in my mind was, of course, that under stress those treaties fell down.

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. They had no usefulness.

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am wondering how we can distinguish the treaties to which the Senator has been referring, in their prospect of ultimate usefulness, as against the history of the cordon sanitaire treaties which failed.

Mr. AUSTIN. Of course, I do not quite recognize the cordon sanitaire treaties to which the Senator has referred. But assuming that there have been such treaties, they failed to prevent war. However, at that time there was in existence no international organization with

power to police its own members. All it could do was to advise and recommend.

I shall endeavor to point out the difference between the progress made by the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and the progress made by the League of Nations Covenant, namely, that whatever treaties there may have been, there was an infirmity in the League of Nations Covenant which the Dumbarton Oaks proposals overcome; that is to say, there was combined in the League of Nations Covenant the policing of the enemy with the policing of the members of the League, but with the weakness of having no power of organization to move any agency of policing. That simply rendered the League futile in the case of Manchuria and in the case of Ethiopia, and the League and all the treaties which then existed for security broke down.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make a brief observation?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am heartily in favor of joint action under an international system whereby the successful allies shall conserve the peace by policing our defeated enemies. I am heartily in favor of that. I simply wish to make the point now that the cordon sanitaire treaties became an incitement to war, rather than a deterrent to war.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; I think they would, if they were set up in a world which had made no effort at all to substitute pacific methods of settlement of international disputes for determination of them by the test of battle.

Although some progress in that direction was made by the League of Nations, and although we are going to make use of it in the effort we now will make—we will start off from where they left it, and we will build on to it and will better it—I have more faith in the pacific elements—that is, the peace forces other than the military, that are provided by the Dumbarton Oaks proposals—than I have in any other part of them. I have more faith in their pacific elements than I have in their military strength. But I think we are not at the stage of civilization where we can depend upon pacific means alone, with no provision for military sanctions. I think we must have them ready, and I think that we as a country must keep ourselves vigorous and well armed at all times.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to ask whether the Senator intends to make a rather complete analysis of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement with reference to these points.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; with reference to the points about which the Senator has asked me, I intend to offset one against the other, namely, the frailties of the League of Nations Covenant as compared to the power and strength of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I was very much interested in the Senator's compliment to the letter signed by the new Senators. I am rather a new Senator, so I have a general simpatie with them. I greatly

respect their nerve and their ardor as Lochinvars wooing a general world organization, but I think it would be well to take a look at the girl before we start to write her compromising letters.

Mr. AUSTIN. That might very well be. I myself should like to be careful. Let me say that I once tried a breach of promise suit; and I found on the door of my colleague's office, when I went there, a little card which said, "Do right, and fear no man. Don't write, and fear no woman!"

I propose to refer to current official statements relating to the Franco-Soviet treaty in order to show how the people received the treaty, and how they looked upon it as a part of the general movement toward security and peace.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I assume that it is the Senator's view that whatever may have been the failures of the past, there is no reason now for our continued acquiescence in failure and impotence; but, on the contrary, the very failures of the past are recalled to us in making a further effort toward a world organization and world peace.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator. He points up the ideal very beautifully, as he always does.

I am now talking about official statements. The official statements then current expressed the unanimity of the great powers in interpreting the Franco-Soviet alliance as being in furtherance of the purpose of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

Thus, the French Foreign Minister Bidault, in reporting on this treaty to the French Consultative Assembly on December 22, 1944, emphasized the firm determination of France and the Soviet Union to work with the United States and Great Britain for an effective world security organization.

On the same day General De Gaulle stated that the Franco-Soviet pact was a necessity, and that the realism which inspired it was not exclusive, and was in the interest of all the United Nations.

Let us cross the channel. Mr. Eden, in the House of Commons, responding to questions regarding the treaty, stated that it was in no way in conflict with the security organization proposed at Dumbarton Oaks, and pointed to the preamble—the preamble which I have read to the Senate—recording the joint conviction that the maintenance of peace in the future would require the closest collaboration of all the United Nations, and their joint determination to work together in elaborating a system of security.

Of course, when we start this edifice we expect its architecture to be such that it can be expanded, developed, and made to fit the ever-developing and advancing conditions in the world.

Coming across to our own country, on the day the pact was made public Mr. Stettinius stated at his press conference that he could find nothing in the pact which ran counter to the ideals of world organization. He also pointed to the preamble to which I have re-

ferred. In other words, the parties to these three great security treaties, being governments described in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as "the governments having responsibility for such action," thus provided for such action without consulting the Security Council.

Mr. President, I wish to explain the last phrase, "without consulting the Security Council." As I understand the proposed organization, should it be set up as proposed by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the United States would forthwith enter into treaties with those countries and with others which come within chapter XII, subdivision 2, to which I have referred, as being "the governments having responsibility for such action," and we should thus be taking a step forward in the establishment of security by taking out of the general international duties of this organization the special business of policing the enemy during the period of pacification. Of course, that would not come under the regional arrangements which require that what the governments do shall first have the consent of the Security Council. This would not be a regional arrangement if the United States were a party to it.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I merely wish to suggest that there may have been a certain self-serving quality in the statement of Mr. Eden and statements from Washington with reference to the Soviet-French agreement. There is opinion to the effect that we had been giving De Gaulle the "hot foot" and when the treaty was announced there was considerable consternation in Washington. Of course, the making of that statement both in Great Britain and in Washington, was very adroit, and the only thing left to do under the circumstances.

Mr. AUSTIN. I believe we must recognize the fact that man can accomplish nothing by putting agreements in writing, or engraving them on stone, unless he is willing to abide by them, and it is in his heart to give fidelity to the agreements which he enters into. So I feel that the work which we do today necessarily involves such an understanding of the objective, and of what it will cost in the way of yielding independence, that when we enter into the agreement we shall enter into it with full light upon it, and with nothing hidden, so that our people can always be earnest in their devotion to the agreement.

The two distinguished men to whom I have referred made statements to the public relating to the treaty as a part of the great enterprise in which we are here engaged, of undertaking to speak at this moment with the voice of the people. I have faith in what they have said, and I believe the Senator from Colorado has, although I agree with what he has said about expediency. I think this was an expedient thing to do, and one which we had to do from our point of view. There is no doubt that we have made mistakes. I believe that it is necessary to have candor in facing them and correcting them.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. AUSTIN. The French Pact is definitely within the framework of the general international organization, and constitutes a basis for conviction, rather than doubt, that the United Nations are fighting for a common cause. The question has been asked, Are we fighting for a common cause? I believe that the three treaties to which I have referred, and a treaty such as the one proposed by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] entered into, should not be used as a pretext for obstruction, hindering, or delaying, and certainly not for opposing the adoption of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals in writing the basic treaty. I believe that such treaties for the separate policing of Germany are a necessary step in the accomplishment of security procedures. If they can be entered into concurrently with our negotiations for the Dumbarton Oaks Treaty, very well; but if the circumstances require that we choose which one we will work for first I should say take the Dumbarton Oaks proposal, because by setting up that organization we would put a stop to the temptation, and probably to the possibility, of unilateral acts with reference to the kinds of government which are to be erected in the liberated areas and many other questions which touch upon social standards, economic life, and all that.

Let us arrange to have this organization working at the earliest practicable date, partly for the purpose of having a judicial tribunal in which we can have faith, and which will have the authority to decide some of these questions which are certainly justiciable. One, for example, would be, Is this boundary line a line by title or is it not? It would make much difference with the lawyers of the world, would it not, if they knew that one of the contestants was legally right.

This new method of separate policing of the conquered enemy is but one of the important advances over the League of Nations Covenant. There are other differences which I think justify faith in effective security through the establishment of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. I shall now point them out. I do not pretend to point out all the differences, but I do claim that these differences alone justify the adoption of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals just as they are, without waiting to settle the undecided questions which are left open and yet to be decided. Of course, the Big Three may decide some of the undecided questions during their interview and consultation, but if they do not do so and yet agree to call a full-dress meeting for the purpose of writing out the terms of a basic treaty which would establish the organization described in these proposals, I would be for it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Do I correctly understand the Senator to ad-

vance the theory that certain nations, close-lying neighbors, for instance, have a primary responsibility in demilitarizing Germany, as compared to the secondary interest of such a nation as the United States, which is located at some distance?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I answer the question in the affirmative. There are two types of agreements outside of although within the framework in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. One type is regional arrangements, provision for which will be found in section C of chapter VIII. There it will be noted that if regional arrangements are set up, then the Security Council shall, where appropriate, utilize such arrangements or agency for enforcement action under its authority, but no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council.

That is one thing, and, as will be seen, it is a limited and restricted agency. On the other hand, there is such an organization as that envisaged by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in which European states and states of the Western Hemisphere join together in a policing organization. That comes under chapter XII, Transitional Arrangements. As will be noted by the title, they are intended to exist only during the period of pacification.

Subsection 2 reads:

No provision of the charter should preclude action taken or authorized in relation to enemy states—

Do not forget the expression "enemy states"—

as a result of the present war by the governments having responsibility for such action.

To me that means all the great powers who are engaged in active warfare and who are expected to be responsible because they are competent and are the only countries on the globe that are competent to do the job. That is what I interpret the words "the governments having responsibility for such action" to mean. I think that is an answer or I have tried to make it an answer to the question of the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Going back to the regional agreements, does the Senator from Vermont believe that the provision prescribes the authority which the regional organization may exercise, or does the Dumbarton Oaks agreement say that the over-all organization shall determine whether the regional organization has decided the question properly?

Is permission granted merely to take up the question or may the over-all organization supervise the action of the regional body?

Mr. AUSTIN. There are two points in the question of the distinguished Senator. One relates to organization and one relates to operation.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. AUSTIN. As to organization, the answer appears in a section I have not read, which is couched in this language:

Nothing in the charter—

Meaning the Dumbarton Oaks charter—

should preclude the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the Organization. The Security Council should encourage settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies, either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council.

Now, as to the operation—

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

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Suppose the Dumbarton Oaks Organization is approached by a regional body, can the Dumbarton Oaks Organization say "We do not like the set-up; it does not come within what we think it should and therefore we deny you the right to form that kind of an organization"?

Mr. AUSTIN. Probably the language could be interpreted in that way—

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the way I read it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Because there is a proviso which imposes the condition that the action taken by the regional agency must conform to the purposes and the principles of the Organization. Otherwise, regional organizations could so disrupt the general organization that it could not live overnight.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree; and I take it from what the Senator has said that he is in favor of the interpretation that we both have given that provision.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am.

Mr. FERGUSON. Otherwise, there would be no over-all body and the regional body might be stronger than the over-all body.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am in agreement, and I thank the Senator from Michigan very much.

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

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

Mr. WHITE. The colloquy between the two Senators has included all I could say about the situation. My understanding is that the Dumbarton Oaks proposal authorizes sanctions or whatever the word may be, regional gatherings and regional determinations, which are to be precisely what the word "regional" indicates, in the first instance, of narrow concern. They are to be solutions of problems which involve, say, two or three nations, and apparently only two or three nations.

I think the Dumbarton Oaks draft as it now stands contemplates that such agreements between two or three member states shall be binding, shall be of full force and virtue, provided they are confined within the four corners, as I

may express it, of the Dumbarton Oaks proposal, and the principles and purposes of the Dumbarton Oaks proposal.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I think that is correct. That is my view, anyway. I think it is all contained in this phrase, "such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action." Is not that a good phrase? I think it expresses the limitations. This world organization is not going to meddle with Western Hemisphere affairs unless a matter relates to international peace and security. It will be noted that all through the Dumbarton Oaks proposals the organization is not to begin to take action unless there is a threat to international peace. Of course, there is the postulate—the thing that is not necessary to demonstrate, it is so true—that a disturbance of international peace anywhere on the globe disturbs our peace and the peace of every nation which is a member.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Certainly.

Mr. WHITE. Let me interpolate the suggestion that there is nothing novel about the proposal for regional conferences and regional agreements. Senators will find in our communications agreements with the other nations of the world that precise authority for nations to enter into local agreements with respect to international communications. They have full and plenary authority so long as they keep within the confines of the general international agreement. I think, too, in our treaties with respect to safety of life at sea, relating to shipping, provision will be found for local agreements which relate only to the ships of the two or three nations which may be involved and which do not run counter to the general agreements of nations. The administration in working out the Dumbarton Oaks provision has merely made use of a device which is followed in other fields of international relations.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the remarks of the Senator from Maine reveal something which occurs in the United States Senate quite often; that is, there is no subject one can bring up in this body but some Member of the Senate will be found who has had special knowledge and experience about it, and now has special judgment regarding it. Here is the distinguished Senator from Maine, who has dealt with the matter of international communications of all kinds, by ship, by radio, by cable, concerning which he has a special knowledge which comes so beautifully into play when we undertake to interpret a new proposal, but dealing with the same broad, general principle. I thank the Senator for his help.

Mr. WHITE. Let me say that I am very glad I interrupted the Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I take it, from the Senator's remarks, that he looks upon

the Dumbarton Oaks charter as divided into two essential parts, first, the principles which draw the nations together, and, secondly, the means of enforcing the principles on which they agree. As he explains it, I take it that the machinery for enforcing the principles which have been agreed upon is largely like that of a city and its police force. The city adopts certain regulations for the keeping of the peace which it deems to be authorized and proper, which are analogous to the principles of the charter. Then it has a police force to carry out or enforce those principles in the community. It has policemen who have certain beats. It does not use all its police force to police the northwestern or the southwestern section of the city. A policeman keeps order on his beat. He does not call on the central body unless the emergency is so great that he needs the help of others besides himself to carry out the principles agreed upon.

So that even in the "regional" or the "beat" activity, the general principles, as I understand, which bind the nations together, are supposed to be, and are intended to be, the scope which surrounds any nation dealing in regional activities. They must not conflict with the over-all general principles which bind the nations together.

It is often supposed that a nation having primacy in a region might so utilize its primacy as to develop its influence economically, or geographically, or politically, but as I comprehend the situation, within the scope of human failing it is the intention that the primary principle shall always be peace, and that therefore the scope in which a nation can act regionally will depend on whether its activities are within the peace principles of the general organization, to wit, to keep the peace.

So that what we have is really an enlargement of the city council, single policemen, and the whole police force of the city, to keep intact a system of law and order for the government of the world.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think the Senator from Maryland has simplified the picture for us.

Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield first to the Senator from Texas; then I shall yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator, somewhat in the nature of an observation as well as a question, that some features of this document probably have not been given consideration, and I think they deserve it; that is, that throughout is the indication that, whether a matter is regional or whether it is general, resort must first be had to peaceable measures, diplomacy, arbitration, conciliation, mediation, and all the related measures of that nature.

Too much emphasis must not be put upon the thought that ultimately there is the employment, if need be, of armed force. Let me suggest that the armed force not only has its own virtue and

virility but that frequently the mere fact that it can be employed will very greatly aid in conciliation and mediation and adjustment, and other peaceable measures, in a dispute which might otherwise result in a breach of the peace.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas for his observation. I sincerely agree that, as nations, we are not at that stage of self-discipline where we can get along without armed force as the ultimate sanction. We must have the assurance of the existence of armed force ready, able, competent to act swiftly and with certainty whenever a threat to international peace occurs.

I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, going back to the question as to the regional body, I take it that the able Senator from Vermont understood it as a double-barreled question. I think we agree on one-half of it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to divide the other part of the question into two questions. Let us take for granted that we have the regional organization set up and sanctioned by the over-all organization, or the United Nations organization, which is the name given in the charter. Are the questions which are submitted to the regional body only such questions as the United Nations organization wishes to submit to it? I will ask the Senator to consider that question first.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think the question is answered by clause 3 of section C of chapter VIII, reading as follows:

The Security Council should at all times be kept fully informed of activities undertaken or in contemplation under regional arrangements or by regional agencies for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Being informed, then it tests its jurisdiction by asking itself: Are these matters that relate to the maintenance of international peace and security and that are appropriate for regional action? If they are not, we are not then concerned, unless they attain the portent of being a threat to international peace.

Then the Council comes in either way, by invitation, or on its own initiation. It must act in that event, and that action is necessarily through conciliatory means first, and if such means become exhausted, then by military means.

Does that answer the question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am fearful from the language which has been used that it is not clear whether the regional body can initiate its own act, and its own investigation, let us say, or whether it can pass only upon those things which are submitted to it by the over-all body.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me say in a word that the answer will be found in section B of that same chapter, showing clearly that a means has been set up whereby it can perform its duty directly, with certainty and with speed. It will take a great deal of time to read into the RECORD all the paragraphs dealing with the matter, but let me say that I refer the distinguished Senator to section B of chapter VIII to find that, should the Security

Council deem that a failure to settle a dispute in accordance with the pacific method has occurred, it is bound to take jurisdiction, it is obliged to act. We find in clause 4 of section B of chapter VIII:

Should the Security Council consider such measures to be inadequate, it should be empowered to take such action by air, naval or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security—

And so forth. I have read only one sentence. But all through the document will be found authority to act, the power to direct, and yet there is the gloved hand, there is, in the pacific means provided, the hope of humanity that it will never have to use force. As the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations pointed out, if this efficient military power is always available there will be the greatest incentive for pacific settlement and for lifting up the standard of thought and of living, and of beginning to acquire habits of self-discipline which are the only basis on which we can have a prolonged peace. We cannot have a prolonged peace solely by military compulsion.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Referring to the point suggested by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], is it not true that the Charter or the compact enables the regional organization either itself to initiate or to consider these problems by reference from the General Council Assembly? As a matter of fact, however, the secondary authority still resides in the Council of the whole organization, because if the regional organization should come to a conclusion which in the view of the central organization would threaten or endanger the peace, it would have the authority to override the regional organization and insist upon some other treatment.

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, it might be said that there is the right of a superior body to overrule the regional body if the superior body decides that a wrong decision has been made in an effort to keep the peace.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is all based upon the theory that there must be a threat to the peace of the world, otherwise there would be no power attached to it at all.

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, if the decision of the regional body would threaten the peace of the world, the United Nations body would have the right, under the Dumbarton Oaks proposal, to overrule the decision of the regional body.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is my interpretation.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is also my interpretation, but I was not quite clear from this language that it could of its own motion initiate its own investigation and action. I am glad to get the interpretation of the able Senator from Texas and the able Senator from Vermont on that question.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. For what it may be worth, may I voice my concurrence in

what the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Texas have said. I take it that the adherence to the Dumbarton Oaks charter does not strip a member nation of all its sovereign authority. It has yielded up certain of its rights, it has made definite commitments under the charter, but it has retained within itself many rights of sovereignty. Included in those rights which are reserved is the power to negotiate with its neighbor states with respect to matters of mutual concern, and which may have in them the threat of peace between two nations. I entertain no doubt at all that under this authority as it will be drafted and as it is now drafted there is the power of initiation in the several regions of the earth. There is in the Council also the power of review. So long as the Council acts within the authority which the member nations repose in it, the Council has the authority in reviewing to superimpose its judgment as to what makes for the peace of the world upon the judgment of two or three member states. I think that is the situation.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think that is the situation.

I now wish to proceed with my statement of the advantages in the proposal. Mind you, Mr. President, I realize we are talking about nothing but a proposal. It is not a treaty; it is not in that form; but, as we go along, I want to point out this difference between the League of Nations Covenant and the Dumbarton Oaks agreement. The League failed to unite for military enforcement all of the nations competent to prevent or repel a threat to international peace. It will be recalled that it made no distinction at all between nations, and it seemed to deal out advice under article X and recommendation under article XVI to a country whether it was large or small, whether it was competent or incompetent. After giving the advice or making the recommendation, then it left to the individual member the responsibility of following the advice or the recommendation, and in that regard it was practically a futility.

On the other hand, as we look at this United Nations proposal, we note that the responsibility for maintenance of order under law is expressly transferred to the organization. It is a great shift. It is the shift from individual effort—that is, unilateral action of a single nation—to organized society responsible for maintaining law and order in the world of nations.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suppose the corollary to that is that the organization contemplated by the Dumbarton Oaks proposal will have an international military force of size large enough to be militarily successful against any one, we will say, of the Allied nations that might become an aggressor.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is not the way it is set up now, and I doubt if I would be for it if it were. This is only one man's judgment. I think it is safer to regard these armed forces as pooled forces, just as we now regard the United Nations. We are pooling our effort, but

we are not integrating our armies. There is no mixture of American and British, Russians and Americans, Russians and British, or French and Americans by nations. There may be an accidental mixture of racial stock, but the identity of the armed forces of the United States is maintained.

How do we unite them? We unite them through the combined chiefs of staff. The operational plans are agreed upon. They are plans which must be talked over and assented to by the various parties who are responsible for the operation. Thus we have a pool of power which we believe will be triumphant, provided we keep this unity.

My idea is to extend this unity into the future, project it into the peace, and have a great pool of power that can be called upon immediately, at any time. A wing of air force might be called from the United States to operate in a neighborhood near to the United States, if that sort of activity were ever necessary, rather than to call for a wing from China to come half way around the world to do it. My idea is that it is a good deal better to keep the forces proposed in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals separate—each country maintaining an armed force which is earmarked or allocated to this duty. That is not provided for in the proposals. There is nothing said about that subject in the proposals, except that a separate arrangement shall be made for this purpose, separate from the establishment of the organization.

Another thing that is separate, and not involved in those proposals, is the authority of our delegate to the Council. Both those subjects are premature. They are not in this debate. They will never be in it except as they are injected into it; and I think they would be irrelevantly injected. We will tackle each question on its own merits singly, so that we can study the problem fully and have a good understanding of it. When we come to the question of appropriating money to maintain an army earmarked for this purpose, that problem will be before us unencumbered and unclouded by the many other issues which are in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Speaking generally, is it not true that if the Council contemplated under the Dumbarton Oaks proposals does not have the authority either to call on an international force or on segments of national forces, the whole structure is worthless, under the theory of the proposals?

Mr. AUSTIN. That is true. That is just the point; that is it exactly. That was what was the matter with the League of Nations.

Mr. MILLIKIN. So if one is for the Dumbarton Oaks proposal as it now stands, under its theory one must commit himself to the proposition that the Council or the organization shall have the power to summon, whether from an international body or from the separate countries making up the organization, military forces capable of whipping one

of the most powerful allies, if one of the most powerful allies should be the aggressor.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the forces are not capable of doing that then we are doing a futile thing.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is exactly so. We must face that question. It calls for a good deal of fortitude to face it, too.

Mr. MILLIKIN. But the detail is not in the proposal.

Mr. AUSTIN. It is not here.

Mr. MILLIKIN. And the question of voting the use of that power is not in the proposal.

Mr. AUSTIN. It is not. We shall have an opportunity, by itself, to deny the power, or to grant it with certain limitations as to magnitude, and so forth.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe that the Senator is making a genuine contribution to the study of the subject by bringing out the fact that at the present time we are dealing with something which is uncompleted.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. And which, when completed, may present an entirely different aspect from that now presented.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from Colorado is correct. I want to go that way. I hope that whatever we do, we will keep the door open for improvements for years to come. It is not a matter of a few days or a few months in our time. It will not be finished by us. We shall hand to our successors in office the tremendous duty of always striving to better what we have done.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. Does the Senator believe that if we endorse the proposal of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement to this point, those who support the agreement to this point will be morally committed to implement this organization with security council power sufficient to organize the force necessary to meet any problem that may arise in the future?

Mr. AUSTIN. I should feel bound that way; but I should not be limited in my thought on the subject of how it should be done. I should feel perfectly free to exercise my judgment about the size of the force, the amount of the appropriation for it—

Mr. WILLIS. And the nature of the problem?

Mr. AUSTIN. And the nature of the authority which will be exercised over it, as well as whether we shall have a string tied to it or not. All those factors are left open to be decided.

Mr. President, I have a sense of dedication to this cause which I think overshadows anything I have ever undertaken, of either a public or private nature. To me it seems that there is nothing so important as providing some security against a disturbance of international peace. That is something that we have never had the courage and the hardihood to do, because we thought it would cost us too much. We are faced with that question. If we are not willing to pay

the cost, of course, we shall not have the security. We shall have its alternative, which is certain war, in which my grandchildren will fight, and perhaps die.

That is the cause. Although I should like to have a perfect arrangement handed to us complete in all its details, yet the impossibility of such a thing cannot deter me from moving forward and achieving something good, even if it is not perfect. The only way in which we can progress as human beings is to take one step at a time. Let us take the next step.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I believe the Senator is to be commended for his courageous and forthright statement that he is willing to commit the entire resources and destiny of the United States upon this program.

Mr. AUSTIN. I did not know that I had said anything of the kind.

Mr. WILLIS. I should so take it, if the Senator is willing to give to the proposed organization all the force and power necessary to carry out the commitments which the Council might make.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think the Senator is stretching what I said far beyond its proportions. In other words, the Senator is trying, in an indirect fashion, to make the argument that the cost of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals would be everything we have. That is an absurdity to which I do not subscribe.

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator will not go that far?

Mr. AUSTIN. No.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator has been very generous in yielding to me. I should like to ask one more question.

When the Dumbarton Oaks meeting was held in Washington, a number of Senators made inquiry about the meeting and about what the intention was and what the delegates there were doing. The meeting had received a grand build-up. A great estate was opened to receive the delegates. But when some Senators showed an actual interest in the matter, they were told, "Do not worry yourselves. These are just a bunch of"—in effect—"second-class or third-class flunkies who are doing spadework, and in due course that will be considered by higher levels, and something will come before us."

My question goes to the point that many Senators have relied on that assurance. I know some have. But day by day the Dumbarton Oaks proposals seem to have assumed a jelled status, a status of something which has passed through the higher levels, something which we may now consider as far as it goes.

Will the Senator give me some enlightenment on that point, please?

Mr. AUSTIN. I am ready to state what I know about it. The Senator's question relates to what led up to those proposals; does it not?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me say that for some 2 years I participated in meetings in the office of the Secretary of State, at which there were experts upon practically every subject which could challenge the attention of the Department of State or the Congress, relating to the possible arrangements after the war for security and peace. In the course of those meetings there were four different drafts of a plan which would be the American proposal whenever there could be brought together representatives of the great powers which are responsible for the victory which may form the cornerstone of peace and security in the future. So all that was done. The fourth copy was finished before the Republican and the Democratic Parties held their great conventions in Chicago.

It was felt that those plans ought not be made public until they were submitted to our vis-à-vis friends—namely, Great Britain, Russia, and China. It was believed that it would be an affront to them to have the public have those plans before they were submitted to the countries which would be most concerned and would be the parties to them. So they were not made public. In the committees in the conventions—I know from what the distinguished Senator from Texas has said publicly and privately that it is true of his committee, as well as of the committee of which I happened to be chairman, the Committee on War and Peace—the members were informed privately of the substance of those plans. The distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and I, who were on the Mackinac committee which drafted the proposal to be submitted to that committee of the Republican National Convention, according to publicly known plans, knew what was contained in that American plan. The plank of the Democratic National Convention and the plank of the Republican National Convention on that subject were written with full knowledge of the proposal, and were written in such manner as to make it feasible for us to throw our strength and to have a unity of these two great parties behind the American plan.

We know that the Dumbarton Oaks proposal is substantially the American plan. It may be a coincidence that other countries, such as Great Britain, submitted a plan which is similar in many features, but taken by and large, what we have before us today contains the substance of the American plan.

So far as publicity is concerned, after the meeting, after the American plan had been submitted to the vis-à-vis inspection of the countries which would have to consider whether they would agree to it, it thereupon became public, and has been public ever since. Of course, I believe in having treaties openly negotiated, if they possibly can be, and I see no earthly reason why we cannot openly negotiate the basic treaty for this organization and talk about it, and discuss what happened behind closed doors, and have everything out in the open. If Russia and France have an agreement or a treaty, I think we should have a frank understanding of it. I think it is better to know in advance.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Of course, I agree entirely with that.

I was referring to the more limited point that at the time when the Dumbarton Oaks proposal was being manufactured there was an attempt to give the Senate the impression—perhaps I am mistaken about it, but I can produce definite debate in the Senate along that line—that the conference was definitely a hush-hush affair, and we were told, "Do not talk about it now, because it is only in the preliminary stages, and must later go to higher levels. Do not talk about it until it comes to us for discussion." But I notice that now it is more or less jelled. I ask, What has happened since the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, what has occurred through the higher levels, which gives the agreement that tentative finality?

Mr. AUSTIN. It is stated right in the submission what it is. I think this is the best way to answer the question:

Statement issued simultaneously by the participating governments.

This is dated October 9, 1944, and the distinguished Senator will remember that that is about the time when the conference rose. I read:

The Government of the United States has now received the report of its delegation to the conversations held in Washington between August 21 and October 7 1944—

The Senator will note that this statement was made 2 days after the conference had concluded its sessions—

with the delegations of the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the Republic of China on the subject of an international organization for the maintenance of peace and security.

There follows a statement—

This is the important thing—

of tentative proposals—

I have tried to call attention to that point in my discussion today, namely, that this is nothing but a proposal—

indicating in detail the wide range of subjects on which agreement has been reached at the conversations.

The governments which were represented in the discussions at Washington have agreed that after further study of these proposals they will as soon as possible take the necessary step with a view to the preparation of complete proposals which could then serve as a basis of discussion at a full United Nations conference.

That is all this is. That is authentic. That is the simultaneous statement of the participating governments, and that is what gives these proposals their dignity and status before us. They give us something definite to talk about.

When I say here that I would take them as they are, imperfect as they are, I mean to say that I still hope they can be made more perfect and I am still free to discuss the improvements which I think ought to be made in them. But I can take them as they are for the reason that I wish to see something done in the world to terminate unilateral actions which seem to be necessary because we do not have any organization,

If we could set up the Dumbarton Oaks organization in its present form, without perfecting it, without deciding the question of veto power, without deciding the question of voting, we would, nevertheless, retain the consultative features which are contained in the General Assembly, and the powers which are contained in the Council, because we would create the organization by treaty. We would head off all questions of a unilateral nature with respect to the kind of governments which should be organized in liberated countries, and we would have the means, established by treaty, of handling problems in a cooperative way. That is why I state that I am willing to take the organization as it is. I do not expect we shall have to do that. I am using the debater's privilege of expressing my point as clearly as I can do so. I believe that the proposal in its present form is so far in advance of anything contained in the League of Nations Covenant that we would be performing an act of security and peace by merely taking the proposal in its present state.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield so that I may ask him one more question?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am trying to get at the question of the time when we should discuss the Dumbarton Oaks proposal. If it is still tentative and if it has to come back with further amendments, that is one thing. If it has jelled to a point where prudence on our part requires its present consideration, that is another thing.

Mr. AUSTIN. In opening my remarks I undertook to say that my purpose in speaking was twofold. I wanted to provoke from the public a response consecrated to the establishment of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. I also wanted to show, if possible, to the four great powers who will be "anon" "up yonder," as it is said, that in the Senate of the United States of America there is a firm conviction on the part of at least one Senator that those powers should in any event call a meeting for the establishment of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, even if they do not change an "i" or a "t." That is the purpose in making my remarks. I am not trying to say to the Senate or to the world that I regard the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as ideal, finished, or perfect. On the contrary, I am trying to prove that they are better than anything which we now have, or ever have had, in a tendency toward security and peace.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator is so very generous and so very frank in his answers that I was somewhat disturbed by his reply to the question of the able Senator from Indiana. Do I understand correctly the Senator to say that he would not pledge all the resources of this country in case we entered into the agreement?

Mr. AUSTIN. I would certainly not want to set up a treaty which undertook to pledge to an international organization all the resources of this country,

Mr. LANGER. How far would the Senator go?

Mr. AUSTIN. I would go far enough to enable the central organization to call upon a certain allocated and limited force in dealing with the preservation of the peace. I would be willing to help pass any necessary statute which would set up a court of international justice, perhaps having branches in different regions of the world. All that, of course, would be a separate consideration. I thought that my answer to the distinguished Senator from Indiana was quite candid. I have no idea of abandoning this country to a super world organization. That has never been my idea of what should be done, and I always opposed it when I was asked about it.

I think this proposal is very limited and restricted. It will probably be trimmed down further before we make an agreement, because the agreement will be made only by an act of Congress. The troops and the wings which we will earmark will be determined after debate in the Congress, and both Houses of Congress will pass upon that question as well as upon the question of necessary financial support. I certainly meant no discourtesy and intended no concealment in my answer to the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LANGER. No; I said the Senator was very frank. But suppose the Senator agreed, for example, to set aside 100,000 soldiers, and the question then arose, as pointed out by the able Senator from Colorado, concerning trouble with Russia. Would the Senator stop at a hundred thousand soldiers, or if we were once in and more than a hundred thousand men were required, where would the Senator stop?

Mr. AUSTIN. Let us adopt the right ground in connection with this matter. The Dumbarton Oaks proposal does not deal with war except to prevent it. I ask Senators to keep that in mind. It does not deal with the subject of fighting a war. It does not have any bearing upon the exclusive control of Congress over that subject. It is directed toward threats of disturbance of the international peace. The whole design of the plan is for the prevention of war. It does not contemplate war except as it contemplates the suppression and prevention of it. If we look at it in that way, when we come to debate the question of how much of our armed forces we will appropriate to the proposed use—we have not yet arrived at that question—we will debate it in the light of the purpose of the organization and of our treaty.

What I have stated would not interfere with our own thought concerning our general position with respect to military training and preparedness. I now believe, and I think I shall persist in the belief, that we should pass a universal training act, and that we should maintain such a strong organization militarily that our voice for peace will have tremendous weight in the world generally, and with the United Nations' organization in particular. Of course, we do not intend to furnish a great military force to be used by the council of the United Nations. Why? Because they cannot

conduct a war for us, or even declare war for us. I think that distinction has been confused a great deal in public debate. This is not a measure for waging war; it is a measure for preventing war.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think that perhaps my colleague has already furnished the information for which I was about to ask. Is that part of our armed forces which is to be allocated to the international police force to be segregated, or shall we furnish so many men, planes, ships, and so on, to the armed services and then give whatever part of our own forces seems necessary when they are asked for?

Mr. AUSTIN. By my colleague's question he indicates an opinion of his own.

Mr. AIKEN. No; I have no opinion. That is the reason I have asked the question.

Mr. AUSTIN. I should prefer to keep the forces unmarked and retain them in our own great general pool so that if we saw fit to respond to a call for armed forces we could take them from any convenient place.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe I can agree with that statement; but I want to make my position clear because I do not want to burn my own bridges. What the Senator and I say about this today must not bind what he and I may do by and by because we may want to change our position on that point when we come to debate the question fully, and when we come to study the question of whether the allocated troops shall be earmarked we shall have to have some special information from the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Air Forces in order to decide the question wisely. We do not arrive at it in discussing the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, which will be the foundation for an organization in the world which is to operate mutually; but we are to do it, according to the terms of the proposal itself, in an outside agreement which the Congress will make by statute.

Then the manner in which we will furnish our proportion of the world police force will be determined by the Congress after the Dumbarton Oaks proposal or any modification thereof has been accepted by the Nation?

Mr. AUSTIN. That is it exactly, and I am very much in favor of that. I should like to have these questions separated because all of them are full of trouble and they have all got to be debated frankly in order to reach a wise decision.

Mr. AIKEN. I can see plainly the Senator's viewpoint, even though he says it is possibly subject to change, that if we were called upon to furnish ships or troops we might want to take them from Alaska or from Florida or from Hawaii or any other part of the world and not rely on a segregated force.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President—

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator, as I recall, suggested that he wanted a court in the organization.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Is it the Senator's opinion that that court should have jurisdiction over political matters?

Mr. AUSTIN. I think not. I have never entertained the idea that it was wise for a court of justice to pass upon political questions, and our courts generally refuse to do so, even if such matters are involved in a justiciable question. Often there will be noted in the reports of decisions of our courts the remark by the court, "That is a political question, and we decline to pass on it."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes. The reason I asked the question was that when the Congress was requested to enact legislation to adhere to the League of Nations Court, in the debate all Senators who were in favor of that action declared that the Court had no jurisdiction over political matters. Now, if I may, I should like to suggest to the Senator that what killed the League of Nations Court was when the Court took jurisdiction of the German-Austrian Anschluss case. Judge Loder, who wrote the constitution for the Court and was its first president, said to me that in that case the Court took jurisdiction of a political matter which they had no business to do. Since that time we have heard very little about the League of Nations Court, or the Court of International Justice.

I am glad to have the Senator's view that he does not want the world court to have jurisdiction over political matters; and most international controversies are political, if I understand them correctly.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I hope that the proposed court will operate on the equivalent of a bill of rights which will comprehend human relations and that the court will be competent and qualified to pass upon such rights and liabilities where they enter into international relations. That is something never contemplated before; it is new and, therefore, the idea has not been widely discussed.

I want to see this court have compulsory jurisdiction, that is, the power to issue a summons to a country, at the petition of another country, for the purpose of a specific determination of a justiciable controversy. I had no idea of debating these details today. I wanted principally to point out the advances, as I view them, in security and peace which we find in the proposals of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference over the League of Nations covenants, as a reason why we should give courage and stimulus to the President of the United States in his great mission today.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I merely desire to make an observation. In view of the statements made by the able Senator from Indiana, there seems to be some apprehension about the employment of the re-

sources of the United States, I presume in both material and manpower, for the enforcement of any agreement we might enter into such as the Dumbarton Oaks proposals contemplate. Whatever fears may be justified in that speculation, I suggest that we at this moment are pledging all our resources both of manpower and materials to try to save the American way of life against willful aggressors. This pledge did not come through an attempt to rely upon a league of nations or any other international document. It is here, in my opinion, because we do not have one. The very objective the able Senator from Vermont has pointed out as the aim of the Dumbarton Oaks proposal, namely, to keep the peace and eliminate war, is the thing that most thinking people understand. In view of the fact that we now have 11,000,000 men and women in the armed forces, many of whom will never return, and many who do will be injured for life, since our national debt will be increased by the billions, it seems that these factors should be ample reason for every Senator going all the way in supporting the Dumbarton Oaks proposal as a beginning to keep the peace. From that point we can move step by step to try to perfect it in line with what humanity dictates.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, in response to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, which I appreciate, let me say that my view is that repression of a threat to peace wherever it may occur is an act of defense of every member of the United Nations. I say that because it is a fixed belief with me that the day has come when communication is so swift and weapons are so far-reaching and destructive that a disturbance of the peace anywhere on earth puts every other nation in the world on defense.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. As I understand it, I think the Senator's position is, and, if so, I am in full agreement with it, that henceforth no major nation or no primary power can escape involvement in a war, of more than local consequence, at least, unless it is able to prevent the war itself.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I believe that sincerely, and, as I have said, I have a consecration to the objective I am discussing which I have never had to any other. It is so great that it overshadows any other duty I have in the office of Senator of the United States.

How are we to make this defense of ours effective? Only by pooling our power with that of other nations. That is the only improvement that is before us or possible for us to make over the existing state of affairs, which result in a war once in 25 years or so. A combination great enough should be made feasible by the willing surrender of a degree of individual liberty, individual independence. That is one point on which we have differences of opinion, and I desire to make this comment in the hope that it will be so simple and

clear that at least the position I take will be understood. The point is that the surrender of a certain amount of independence by every peace-loving country on earth is relatively the same, and the consequence is that the relative independence of countries all over the world is exactly what it was before.

In this respect the vague obligations of the League would be supplanted by specific undertakings to be set forth in the charter, and in special agreements therein referred to. One of the grounds for confidence in the plan is that such combined action would operate free from the suspicion of selfishness, exploitation, aggrandizement, or imperialistic purpose. The moral power of such a combination would be assured by provisions for certainty of action and speed of application when a threat to international peace should arise.

A further fundamental difference between the League Covenant and the Dumbarton Oaks proposals consists in the determination of threats to the peace, or acts of aggression and action in respect thereto. The League Covenant provided for advice upon the means by which the obligation of the members to respect and preserve against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members, should be fulfilled. That is a long sentence, but I had to make it so because that is the way it is in the League Covenant.

In the article relating to sanctions the Covenant of the League provided for recommendation to the several governments concerned as to what effective military, naval, or air force the members should severally contribute—notice that, "should severally contribute" to protect the covenants of the League. This is the point: The Covenant did not equip the League with any authority or any organ to act with armed force.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals, however, provide the Security Council with power to take action by such air, naval, or land forces, as may be necessary. Here is a significant thing: It sets up a military staff committee to assist the Security Council in plans for the application of armed force.

Another difference—and I call it a tremendous advance—between the League Covenant and the Dumbarton Oaks proposals contains promise of security and peace, in this way: The provision for an international court of justice constituted in accordance with a statute which shall be a part of the charter of the organization is proposed in the Dumbarton Oaks proposal. The Covenant of the League, on the other hand, contemplated a court. It would advise about that. But the court was not required to be a part of the organization. An opportunity to the world is now given to establish a judicial system in which the rights that grow out of or are affected by international relations can be peacefully enforced.

Another major improvement in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals over the Covenant of the League consists in arrangements for international economic and social cooperation. Let us not for-

get that economic peace is a prerequisite of political peace.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals place the removal of causes of war, and the pacific methods of determining and settling controversies among nations, before military interposition. However, they realistically provide for the certainty and the imminence of military sanctions to stimulate the use of pacific methods.

These proposals envisage preventive and enforcement machinery, which the League wholly lacked.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would the Senator say that it is implicit in approval of the Dumbarton Oaks proposal, as far as it has been evolved, that the Council shall have the power, whether by a majority vote or a unanimous vote, by whatever voting mechanics can be decided on, to put military forces, whether international forces or drawn-upon forces, under predetermined proportions, into action against an aggressor nation among the present Allies?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would the Senator say that is implicit?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; not only implicit, it is expressed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would the Senator say the same thing is implicit or expressed in the letter addressed by the new Senators to the President?

Mr. AUSTIN. I ask to be excused from answering that question because I should want to examine the letter carefully with respect to that point, and I have not done so. I know about the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, however. They do expressly contain this authority. Let me read the statement:

Should the Security Council consider such measures to be inadequate, it should be empowered to take such action by air, naval, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security.

Does not that answer the question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. After listening to the Senator, it occurred to me that perhaps my question was "off the beam," for in the last analysis the Senators will speak for themselves and give their own interpretation of the letter.

Mr. AUSTIN. I had not thought of that.

Mr. MILLIKIN. But under the Senator's theory, if that is not implicit in the letter, then the letter serves no useful purpose and might serve under the Senator's theory a harmful purpose.

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not know that I should go so far as the Senator has in that comment. My notion is that it is such an important encouragement to the President of the United States in his relations with Stalin, Mr. Churchill, and perhaps someone else, that it constitutes a State paper of great importance. That is my impression of it, and I gained that impression because it endorsed the prompt consideration of the Dumbarton Oaks proposal, and it endorsed the prompt consideration of the Vandenberg suggestion about a separate policing

force. Those two elements of themselves make that paper, coming at this time, an act of greatness, as I see it. Then there is the quality of its being an all-party pact. Every one of the new Senators, regardless of the party he represents, is a member to that pact. Taken altogether, I am greatly encouraged by it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator agree with me that the significance of the letter would be profoundly different if on the one hand those matters which we have been discussing as implicit in the Dumbarton Oaks proposal are intended by the letter, or if on the other hand they are not intended by the letter, or if there is a division of opinion on that?

Mr. AUSTIN. Of course, I could not interpret the letter. It is not my letter. I could tell what I thought it meant to me, but that would not help much on the record. I do not think that there is any excuse or outlet or escape or foot in the door that is visible in that letter. I think it is a very straightforward and clearly expressed letter. Beyond that I do not care to comment.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I agree that we are more or less limited in our speculation on what each of those Senators intended, but from the Senator's standpoint I will ask him, Does he construe the letter as containing the expression to the President of the wish of the Senators who signed it that we shall enter into an international organization, the Council of which will have the powers which the Senator has said are implicit in the powers reposed in the Council proposed by the Dumbarton Oaks proposals?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; that is my understanding of it, and that is all I care to say. I so understand it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think that is as far as the Senator can go.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. With reference to the question which has repeatedly come up as to whether, in joining the organization as envisaged in the Dumbarton Oaks agreement, we are pledging our full resources in case it becomes necessary to take military action against one of the great powers, I take it the Senator from Vermont will agree with me that the primary purpose of this organization will be to prevent any future great wars.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. And if it becomes necessary to coerce against its will, at least in the next decade or two, any one of the major powers that will come out of this war victorious—Russia, Britain, or the United States—if it becomes necessary against its will to coerce it into accepting a decision of the Council, or if any one of those powers embarks on military aggression, are we not then in a major war?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes, of course.

Mr. BALL. So that the purpose of the organization has then been defeated?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes,

Mr. BALL. The point I am trying to make is that the success of this organization is built on the foundation of continued cooperation and confidence among those major allies, and faith in their nonaggressive intentions in the future.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am glad that the Senator from Minnesota has brought out that point, because it is the oaken beam that supports the whole superstructure of this building. Without faith, anything that we put into a treaty will fall, no matter whether we have the peace force of military kind in it or not. If we have to suppress by armed force one of the great powers, we are at war already. We are not dealing with that sort of a thing when we are setting up this organization. We are dealing with the prevention of a threat; that is all. We are not dealing with carrying on a war.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In view of the very interesting remarks made by the Senator from Minnesota, which, I believe, stated the conclusion that the success of any world organization will depend upon the wholehearted support of the major powers of the world, and which has been very ably added to by the Senator from Vermont, we reach the conclusion, then, that any plan of world peace based upon an organization must be subscribed to and supported by every one of the larger powers. Is that correct?

Mr. AUSTIN. Certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And if one of them breaks away from it, then the world organization has collapsed.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct. I do not want to beg a question here, but I might observe in passing that I am not so terribly concerned over the questions about voting rights, about veto. What do they amount to? In the final analysis, if we do not have unanimous agreement among all the members of that Security Council, what have we got by way of attaining peace and security?

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would not discourage any professions of faith that we can make to advance an efficient world organization—and when we endorse our name on a promissory note, we are engaging in an act of faith—but we are not at all prudent if we do not consider what can happen to us by putting our name on that promissory note.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I am about to conclude.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator yield, Mr. President, before he concludes?

Mr. AUSTIN. Certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I had to be out of the Senate Chamber for a while. I do not know whether the able Senator has discussed subsection 5 of section B of chapter VI dealing with the functions and powers of the Security Council with respect to formulating plans for the establishment of a system of regulation

of armaments. Has the Senator discussed that section?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; I have not taken up the document and discussed it section by section. All I have tried to do, I will say to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, is to point out the advantages contained in the proposals of Dumbarton Oaks over the League of Nations. I have pointed out the conspicuous advantages toward security and peace, in the hope that I could summon to the support of the President at this critical moment, discussion and other evidence of great popular support for his effort to have an early meeting of the countries interested in bringing to some sort of definite form these proposals. I have not tried to analyze in detail, chapter by chapter, the different features of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator has gone into an extended discussion of the Dumbarton Oaks plan with respect to subsection 5 of section B of chapter VI, which reads as follows:

In order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion of the world's human and economic resources for armaments, the Security Council, with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee referred to in chapter VIII, section B, paragraph 9, should have the responsibility for formulating plans for the establishment of a system of regulation of armaments for submission to the members of the organization.

Does that mean that the Security Council composed of the component nations shall have the power to formulate a plan to limit armaments of different countries, and submit such plan to the member of the organization, and if the plan is adopted, it would be binding upon all countries?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, my answer is "No." It might be elaborated by simply saying that the language states definitely that such plans would be formulated for submission to the members of the organization. That is very simple language, and the scope of the provision is simply submission. In that regard it resembles the advisory function of the League of Nations. The Security Council cannot prescribe limitations of armament for any nation, whether a member or nonmember, but they can take the whole world situation into consideration and give us their advice.

Mr. REVERCOMB. They can submit a plan.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of what use would it be to have a provision in this system for the formulation and submission of a plan if the plan could not be adopted?

Mr. AUSTIN. That would be a question for us to decide. We could debate it, and if we had a Congress that recognized that it was a good plan, we could adopt it. But we are not likely to be caught in the same trap in which we were caught once before by destroying vessels and throwing our own relative

strength out of relationship to that of the armed forces of other countries.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further observation?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have in mind that today the United States has the greatest Navy in all the world. I certainly do not want to see the time come, under any plan or suggestion, when this country will be called upon to sink that Navy, or a part of it, or divide it with other countries.

Mr. AUSTIN. I join hands with the Senator from West Virginia in that sentiment. I think it is perfectly sound doctrine.

Mr. President, I close with this brief statement. It seems to me that certain war is the alternative to unity in the cause of peace. In other words, we cannot leave the situation as it is, with the responsibility upon individual nations to maintain order among nations under the law. We must have unity of nations in order to do it. Is not the accord of the great powers on these first footsteps toward security cause for assurance that, here a little and there a little, precept upon precept, we shall achieve the objective?

Mind you, Mr. President, these are nothing but proposals, but they are proposals which the representatives of four of the great powers of the world have agreed to submit to their respective governments. At this moment the practical service required of us and of our Government is to give all that it takes to establish the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as an operating authority. As Americans, as fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, wives, and children of those who offer life and sound bodies and minds to the cause of security, we shall consecrate ourselves to the duty which is ours. Let us demand the earliest practicable meeting to establish the Dumbarton Oaks organization.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR MALONEY

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, on Friday last, with other Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives, I journeyed to Meriden, Conn., to attend the funeral of our beloved friend, FRANCIS MALONEY, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

On that occasion, the Most Reverend Henry J. O'Brien, auxiliary bishop of the Connecticut diocese of the Catholic Church, delivered a very beautiful funeral oration. Mr. Herman H. Angell, of the Meriden Morning Record, has sent me a copy of that address. At this time I wish to read the tribute delivered by the Most Reverend Henry J. O'Brien:

"I have fought a great fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. As for the rest, there is laid up a crown of justice which the Lord, the Just Judge, will render me on that day" (II Timothy iv: 7, 8).

It is not customary in this diocese to preach a eulogy on the occasion of the death of a member of the laity, nor do I intend to attempt to do so this morning. I would feel remiss in my duty, however, if I did not pay my tribute of respect to the noblehearted

soul for whom we have celebrated mass this morning. He was a big man, big in mind, in soul and heart. He realized only too well we all have an obligation to keep God's law, but he realized, too, a special call goes out to those who have the good will and generosity to accept it. It is a call to a greater service, to a service above the average. He definitely felt he was called to a life of public service; he dedicated himself to it with a generosity of spirit that was characteristic of him. All the great qualities with which he had been so largely gifted by God, he bent to this service. His life indeed was an inspiration to those who had the good fortune to know him.

Formal education, as such, he was forced to forego at an early age. He was, however, keen, inquisitive, and observant by nature. What was lacking in formal education he more than supplied by his reading and experience. Indeed, circumstances threw him among the poor. He learned to know and appreciate their trials and difficulties. It awoke in him a deep sense of social justice.

His genial personality, his clear judgment, his hard common sense, drew the attention of men to him. It opened to him a new field in life and journalism. This gave him the opportunity to study more deeply and to share his opinions with others more widely. There he attracted attention to himself by his interest in affairs of public welfare. He was generally regarded as a man—intelligent, fair-minded, honest, thoroughly upright in character. His personal life was unblemished.

It was but natural, then, in the early thirties during the heavy days of depression, the people of this, his native city, looked to him for leadership. They elected him, then, mayor for two successive terms. So capably and wisely did he administer municipal affairs during those trying days, the people of this district sent him first as their Representative in the House of Congress and then to the Senate. There he remained as our senior Senator from Connecticut for the past 10 years. The glowing tributes he has received from colleagues in the Senate, the general esteem in which he was held in that august body, was nationally recognized. "He was diligent and intelligent, sane and sound in his principles. He had a genius to see things through to their ultimate conclusion. He helped to clarify issues on more than one important occasion and to bring order out of confusion." His opinions were respected by his colleagues even when they felt it necessary to disagree with him; his advice was sought on matters of momentous importance.

He was a humble man, humble in the true sense of the word. He realized he had been gifted by God generously, but he realized, too, he was but the steward of these rich gifts of heart and mind. He wholeheartedly devoted them all to the betterment of his fellow countrymen. He had a burning desire for social justice—he looked forward and bent all his energy during these past few years to a peace founded on justice and charity. Few public men had a deeper grasp and understanding of the social program of the church as enunciated by Leo XIII, Pius XI, and Pius XII than he. It was the basis of the philosophy underlying his zeal for social reform. It was to this he dedicated his life. His selfless service demanded much sacrifice. The long period of separation at times meant the disruption of family life which was so dear to him and separation from his wife and family who were ever a source of inspiration to him.

We in Connecticut are justly proud of him. We Catholics are justly proud of him, for both in his private and public life he evidenced himself always as a true son of the church. The lessons he early learned at his mother's knee were the source of the sterling qualities which had gained for him the respect of all who had the happiness to know

him. These deepened as he grew in age and wisdom. He had a deep conviction that public office was a public trust. It was a calling from God. He accepted it generously, and with a generous, wholehearted spirit he devoted himself to it. His advice and counsel would have meant much in the trying days before us. We in this diocese lament his loss as one of our foremost Catholic laymen.

While we are gathered here to pay our last respects to his mortal remains, to extend our condolences to his bereaved wife and family, we should be not unmindful that as he was generous in his service to us in life, we should not forget him in death. Our prayers should follow him before the judgment seat of God. May he yet see the vision of that peace for which he so industriously labored. May his soul and the souls of the faithful departed through the mercy of God rest in peace.

Mr. President, as one of his colleagues in the Senate, I feel certain that all of us would join in expressing the hope and the faith that the perpetual light of God's sunshine will always be upon him and that the soul of this illustrious son of Connecticut may rest in peace.

REGULATION OF THE BUSINESS OF INSURANCE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 340.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 340) to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in section 4, on page 2, line 24, after the word "any", to insert "agreement or", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress hereby declares that the continued regulation and taxation by the several States of the business of insurance is in the public interest, and that silence on the part of the Congress shall not be construed to impose any barrier to the regulation or taxation of such business by the several States.

SEC. 2. (a) The business of insurance, and every person engaged therein, shall be subject to the laws of the several States which relate to the regulation or taxation of such business.

(b) No act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance, or which imposes a fee or tax upon such business, unless such act specifically so provides.

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, or the act of June 19, 1936, known as the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act, shall apply to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct of that business.

SEC. 4. (a) For the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made and legislation to be adopted by the several States and Congress, until June 1, 1947, the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, shall not apply to the business of insurance, or to acts in the conduct of such business, and until January 1, 1948, the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act,

shall not apply to such business or to acts in the conduct thereof.

(b) Nothing contained in this section shall render the said Sherman Act inapplicable to any agreement or act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect in any manner the application to the business of insurance of the act of July 5, 1935, as amended, known as the National Labor Relations Act, or the act of June 25, 1938, as amended, known as the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

SEC. 6. As used in this act, the term "State" includes the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 7. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, until June 5, 1944, the business of insurance had been regarded as a local matter, and subject to regulation or taxation by the several States. While that view had been contested many times by various insurance companies, various decisions of the United States Supreme Court had fostered and augmented it for a period of more than 75 years, until on June 5, 1944, in its opinion in the case of United States against Southeastern Underwriters Association and others, the Supreme Court held in effect that the business of insurance was commerce and, therefore, subject to the Sherman Act of July 2, 1890, as amended, and the Clayton Act of October 15, 1914, as amended.

Since that decision was rendered, the States have been greatly concerned about the business of insurance, insofar as regulation and taxation are concerned.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield. Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand the bill its purpose and effect will be to establish the law as it was supposed to be prior to the rendering of the recent opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. I would say that subsection (b), at the bottom of page 2, would allow the provisions of the Sherman Act to apply to all agreements or acts of boycott, coercion, or intimidation, and subsection 4 (a) would suspend the application of the provisions of the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act, insofar as States may regulate and tax such companies, until certain dates or until Congress may act in the meantime in respect to what Congress thinks should be done with the business of insurance.

In other words, the bill would establish a moratorium on the application of the provisions of those acts until the date set forth in the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in order to show the importance of this matter to the States, let me say that this morning I received word that Commissioner Charles F. J. Harrington, of Massachusetts, who is chairman of the com-

mittee on Federal legislation of the insurance commissioners body, was advised by William P. J. Hodges, insurance commissioner for the State of North Carolina, that some insurance companies had given notice to their States that they would not pay the tax which is being levied in those States, or that they would pay it under protest. Under the law, it would be necessary to suspend the licenses of such companies and of all their agents. The insurance tax would have to be paid by February 15. In South Carolina, Kentucky, and Tennessee the tax is due on February 1.

So it is advisable that the bill be passed quickly, if it is possible to do so.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Let me inquire whether I am justified in understanding that the bill comes before the Senate with a unanimous report in its favor from the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. FERGUSON. The report is unanimous.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as I understand the situation, the bill is entirely satisfactory to the State insurance companies.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is entirely satisfactory to the insurance commissioners; and the various organizations of insurance companies have, without exception, so far as my knowledge goes, taken the position that it is satisfactory to them. There is no objection. The bill is a compromise measure; it is the best that could be agreed upon at this time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very much in favor of the bill, and I hope it will pass.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the bill in its present form contemplate that a State legislature may enact laws which would permit agreements in violation of the Sherman Act?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would say that until June 1, 1947, State legislatures could enact laws which would be in conflict with the Sherman Act, but could not pass laws which would permit either an agreement or an act on the part of an insurance company, or insurance companies, of boycott, coercion, or intimidation. If, in the meantime, Congress passed legislation contrary to the laws passed by State legislatures, such State laws would be nullified because, under this bill, and subject to certain exceptions set forth in the bill, insurance is treated as interstate commerce.

Mr. MURDOCK. If I followed correctly the distinguished Senator, he takes the position that the respective State legislatures may pass laws permitting agreements in violation of the Sherman Act.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; if the agreements do not violate paragraph (a) or (b) of section 4 of the bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. I invite the distinguished Senator's attention to that part of the report on page 2 which appears under the heading "Purpose of the bill." It is as follows:

It should be noted that this bill, by the moratorium proposed therein, does not re-

peal the Sherman and Clayton Acts, but opportunity will have been granted for the States to permit agreements and contracts by insurance companies which otherwise might be in violation of the Sherman and Clayton Acts.

It seems to me that while this bill may not specifically repeal the Sherman Act, it does provide for repeal of the Sherman Act by the State legislatures by permitting them to enact laws which would allow agreements and contracts in violation and in derogation of the Sherman Act. Is that not what the bill would do? I believe that its language accomplishes that very thing.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I have already stated, the intent of the bill is to permit State legislation along the line mentioned in the excerpt which the Senator has read, if it does not violate paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 4 of the bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. I invite the Senator's attention to paragraph (b) of section 2 of the bill, reading as follows:

(b) No act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance, or which imposes a fee or tax upon such business, unless such act specifically so provides.

That part of the bill is applicable, is it not, to Federal statutes now in existence?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the purpose of the section.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is also applicable, is it not, to any Federal statutes which may be enacted in the future?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; provided the statutes do not specifically relate to insurance.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the Senator will pardon me, I agree with him that the language affects only statutes the subject of which is insurance.

Mr. FERGUSON. Or specifically relating to insurance.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. But certainly that part of the bill to which I have referred would allow repeal by State legislatures of the Sherman Act so far as it relates to insurance unless the Congress of the United States should amend the Sherman Act so as to provide specifically either the repeal, invalidation, or impairment of such a State law.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the Senator has used the word "repeal." The bill would not go so far as to repeal the Sherman Act except as there would be a temporary repeal until the dates mentioned in the so-called moratorium section.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is the very point which I am making. While the language would not specifically repeal the Sherman Act with regard to insurance or the regulation thereof, it would confer, so far as Congress can confer power on the State legislatures to repeal by State statute the Sherman Act insofar as it relates to the insurance business.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; except paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 4. I do not believe that under the bill a State could pass a law permitting an agreement or an act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

Mr. MURDOCK. Let us look at that phase of the subject for a minute. We now leave section 2 of the bill and drop down to section 4. Paragraph (a) of section 4 provides for a moratorium, or a suspension of the Sherman and Clayton Acts insofar as they relate to insurance, for a period, respectively, until June 1, 1947, so far as the Sherman Act is concerned, and until January 1, 1948, so far as the Clayton Act is concerned.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Paragraph (b) reads:

(b) Nothing contained in this section shall render the said Sherman Act inapplicable to any agreement or act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

Would the Senator agree to an amendment of the bill which, instead of limiting paragraph (b) of section 4, by the word "section" on page 2, line 23, would strike out that word and insert the word "act"? In that way we would not be limited merely to that one section.

Mr. FERGUSON. The only reason why I believe it should not be done is that the Sherman Act is the only act which relates to boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not believe the Senator gets my point.

Mr. FERGUSON. Perhaps I do not.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the Senator will look at page 2, beginning in line 23 of the bill, he will find the following language:

Nothing contained in this section—

Referring to section 4 of the bill—

shall render the said Sherman Act inapplicable to any agreement or act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

My suggestion is to strike out the word "section" and insert in lieu thereof the word "act," so that the language would then read:

Nothing contained in this act shall render the said Sherman Act inapplicable to any agreement or act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

Mr. FERGUSON. I see no reason for not changing the word "section" to "act," because I am of the opinion that that was the intention of all concerned.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think it would improve the bill very materially.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Perhaps the Senator first wished to make a statement in response to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I will yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in order to have a clear understanding of the bill, the attention of the Senate should be called to the fact that, as the Senator from Michigan has said, over a long period of years the courts have held that insurance is subject to State regulation. It will also be remembered that the question as to whether the Federal antitrust laws applied to insurance was never decided until the Southeastern Underwriters case was before the Supreme Court. On the day on which that

case was decided the Supreme Court handed down another decision in what is known as the Polish-Alliance case in which it held that the National Labor Relations Act applied to insurance. In the Polish Alliance case the Supreme Court said by unanimous decision that the business of insurance was so affected with a national commercial interest that the National Labor Relations Act, which was passed under the commerce clause, applied to the business. On the same day by a divided Court it held that the antitrust laws applied.

It should be pointed out that every case involving the construction of insurance regulation laws which had been passed upon by the Supreme Court down to the time when the Southeastern Underwriters case was decided involved State statutes. Every such case, so far as I am advised, was brought to the Supreme Court because insurance companies had endeavored to escape State regulation. Before the Southeastern Underwriters case was decided bills were introduced in the Congress to exempt insurance wholly and altogether from the effect of the antitrust laws. Those bills failed of enactment. As the unanimous report of the committee says on the first page:

The Attorney General, in several appearances before the Judiciary Committee, frankly stated that the Department of Justice had no opposition to an extension of time to the insurance industry in order to make necessary adjustments to this decision.

It is stated in another part of the report, on page 2:

What is more, the Congress proposes by this bill to secure adequate regulation and control of the insurance business.

Another paragraph, under the heading "Purpose of the bill," reads as follows:

The purpose of the bill is twofold: (1) To declare that the continued regulation and taxation by the several States of the business of insurance is in the public interest; and (2) to assure a more adequate regulation of this business in the States by suspending the application of the Sherman and Clayton Acts for approximately two sessions of the State legislatures, so that the States and the Congress may consider legislation during that period. It should be noted that this bill, by the moratorium proposed therein, does not repeal the Sherman and Clayton Acts.

The Sherman antitrust law contains two primary provisions. The first section of that law, which takes its name from Senator Sherman, of Ohio, makes illegal contracts or agreements in restraint of trade. The second section of the law makes it a misdemeanor for any person or group to make any contract or agreement which monopolizes or attempts to monopolize any part of trade or commerce.

The questions which have been raised by the Senator from Utah prompted me to ask the Senator from Michigan this question: Does the Senator from Michigan conceive that the pending bill as reported by the Judiciary Committee, with the language which I have just read, has the effect of making it possible for a State to legalize contracts in restraint of trade or has the effect of making it possible for any State to authorize attempts on the part of any group of insurance

companies to monopolize the business of insurance. I did not understand that to be the opinion of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. No. I will answer that by saying that if agreements in restraint of trade or to monopolize amounted either to a boycott and/or coercion and/or intimidation, they would be absolutely void, because they would contradict the bill which is now being considered by the Senate and which it is hoped will be passed today. But certain agreements might be permitted in the States if they did not violate the terms of this bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator desire to tell the Senate that it is his purpose and the purpose of the pending bill to say to the State legislatures that laws may be enacted which will permit monopoly to be created in the insurance industry?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator from Michigan to respond to the inquiry before he yields?

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to yield to the Senator from Utah so that he may answer the question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would rather have an answer from the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will answer it later, if the Senator please.

Mr. MURDOCK. I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming to the report itself, from which I quote, as follows:

"It should be noted that this bill, by the moratorium proposed therein, does not repeal the Sherman and Clayton Acts but opportunity is granted to the States by subsection B of section 2 to accomplish this very purpose. Certainly the Congress does not want to do that.

This is the important part of the report, and I think it is in full conformity with the bill itself "but opportunity will have been granted for the States to permit agreements." What kind of agreements? Agreements which do not conflict with the restrictions in subsection (b) of section 4, but "agreements and contracts by insurance companies which otherwise"—"which otherwise"—and I stress these words of the report "might be in violation of the Sherman and Clayton Acts."

Certainly the very purpose of the bill, if subsection B of section 2 is not stricken, is to provide that State legislatures, if they so desire, may relieve insurance companies from contracts in restraint of trade which are prohibited by the Sherman Act, so long as such contracts and agreements do not come within the inhibition of subsection (b) of section 4, which refers to agreements or acts of boycott, coercion, or intimidation. The report itself, in my opinion, answers the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I will answer the question of the Senator from Wyoming in the same way the able Senator from Utah has answered it. Just as he read, the bill provides that agreements or contracts may be permitted by State legislature within the moratorium

period if they do not violate paragraph (b) of section 4.

As I read the bill proposed by the able Senator from Wyoming, his measure would permit the same thing if the State acts specifically so provided.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the bill which was presented by the Senator from Wyoming contained a section which does not appear in the pending bill, a section which undertook to exempt from the effect of the antitrust law certain types of combinations and agreements, but certainly not such an agreement as would enable any State to be in the position of authorizing the establishment of monopoly. It was clearly with the understanding that the bill was a good-faith attempt not to get around the antitrust laws, or the decision of the Supreme Court, but to enable the insurance industry and the States to accommodate themselves to the decision and to the antitrust laws, that the Judiciary Committee made a unanimous report.

I am somewhat surprised, I am frank to say, that the Senator seems to have taken the position now that the intent is to enable any State which so desires to permit national organizations to monopolize the business of insurance. Have I correctly interpreted the Senator?

Mr. FERGUSON. Subject—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Subject only to a boycott, intimidation, or coercion.

Mr. FERGUSON. In section 4 it is provided "for the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made and legislation to be adopted by the several States and Congress."

If any State should attempt to pass such legislation, Congress in the meantime could pass laws specifically providing that contracts made thereunder were void, or, if such an act was passed after the moratorium, then it would be void.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator from Michigan desire that the bill, if it shall be passed by this body, shall be interpreted anywhere as an intention of Congress to permit monopoly to be established in the insurance industry?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; by no means does the bill anticipate that any act would or should be passed which would create monopoly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then, does the Senator believe that the bill as it now stands permits that interpretation?

Mr. FERGUSON. It would permit it. I understood the Senator from Wyoming to be familiar with the language on page 2, which was read by the able Senator from Utah, and I think the bill is broad enough to allow a State to pass a law allowing any agreement or contract other than those inhibited in paragraph (b) of section 4. But it is not the purpose of the bill at all to foster monopoly, or to anticipate that any act will be passed permitting or even encouraging monopoly. A State law relating to taxation, a law relating to regulation, for instance, the fixing of rates, or the fixing of the terms of a contract of insurance, which might under some definitions of monopoly be monopolistic, would be permitted under the pending

bill; but if the State law undertook to authorize a boycott, a coercion, or an intimidation, or an agreement to do any one of those three things, then it would be clearly void because Congress would have already spoken, and once Congress speaks on interstate commerce, no State can speak contrary to the congressional declaration.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The bill does not say what the Senator has indicated. What the bill says is that every act of Congress in existence now or which may be enacted in the future dealing with the question of insurance or the regulation of insurance shall not be construed—and that is pretty strong language—"to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance, or which imposes a fee or tax upon such business, unless such act specifically so provides."

So we would do what? We would say to the State legislatures, "You can pass any law you desire with reference to insurance and the regulation thereof which does not involve agreements or acts of boycott, coercion, or intimidation, unless the Congress at some future date specifically repeals or invalidates your State law."

I wonder if the Congress of the United States wants to do that.

Mr. FERGUSON. The bill does not go as far as that.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield for a further observation?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. My understanding of what the Senate Judiciary Committee wanted to do and what I hoped it would do was that we would by the enactment of a bill of this kind call the attention of the respective States of the Union to the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States had held that the business of insurance is commerce, and knowing that certain hardships were inevitable because of past practice and procedure, it was my intention, and I thought the intention of the Committee on the Judiciary, to say to the States, "For a certain period, long enough for you to take action, you will be allowed to make adjustments of your State laws to harmonize with the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States." But under the bill we would not do that. In my opinion, we would do exactly what the Senator from Wyoming implies we would do—that is, invite the respective State legislatures to pass acts which would permit agreements which would otherwise be in violation of the Sherman Act.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think an explanation of paragraph (b) of section 2 should be made at this time. The purpose of that provision is very clear, that Congress did not want at the present time to take upon itself the responsibility of interfering with the taxation of insurance or the regulation of insurance by the States. We were able to single out and to indicate that we had in mind three acts of which we wanted

to make exceptions, because they did not relate to insurance. I read from the bill:

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, or the act of June 19, 1936, known as the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act, shall apply to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct of that business.

Now on page 3, and we find section 5:

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect in any manner the application to the business of insurance of the act of July 5, 1935, as amended, known as the National Labor Relations Act, or the act of June 25, 1938, as amended, known as the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Permit me a further word of explanation.

Mr. MURDOCK. Very well.

Mr. FERGUSON. If there is on the books of the United States a legislative act which relates to interstate commerce, if the act does not specifically relate to insurance, it would not apply at the present time. Having passed the bill now before the Senate, if Congress should tomorrow pass a law relating to interstate commerce, and should not specifically apply the law to the business of insurance, it would not be an implied repeal of this bill, and this bill would not be affected, because the Congress had not, under subdivision (b), said that the new law specifically applied to insurance. I think that makes the bill very clear.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am quite satisfied that it is the intention of the Senator and the intention of the Committee on the Judiciary to grant a moratorium and invite the States to step in and regulate the insurance business. It seems to me that if the Senator would agree to striking from the bill subsection (b) of section 2, and then agree to the other amendment which I suggest in subsection (b) of section 4, that we would do that very thing; but we would not take the long step which has been indicated today by the Senator from Wyoming of inviting State legislation, permitting violation of the Sherman Act as to monopolies and agreements in restraint of trade. I do not believe that any Senator wants to invite any State legislature to step into the insurance field and permit contracts and agreements in restraint of trade or contracts and agreements which would evade the monopoly provisions of the Sherman Act.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I simply wish to ask, Why is not the Senator willing to accept that amendment? It seems to me it is a very proper amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, with this one explanation—

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Senator say that he will agree to that amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. I wanted to make a statement.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the amendment would clear the matter.

Mr. FERGUSON. Provided the word "agreement" in subsection (b) of section 4 is understood to relate to boycott, coercion, or intimidation. Is it the interpretation of the Senator from Utah that the word "agreement" in that paragraph relates to boycott, coercion, or intimidation?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. With that explanation on the record—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that the pending question is on the committee amendment in line 24, on page 2, and that another amendment is not now in order until the committee amendment is disposed of.

Mr. FERGUSON. At the proper time I shall consent that the word "section" be changed to "act."

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I hesitate to differ with the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], but I want to call his attention to a fact which is, of course, very obvious, that the difficulties of working out the insurance readjustment following the decision of the Supreme Court are colossal. I do not believe anyone who does not come very closely in contact with the insurance business can realize that the decision by the Supreme Court to which reference has been made is one of the most far-reaching ever rendered by that Court. It means that an enormous business which, with the unqualified approval of the Federal Government, has operated for many years in a certain way, must now meet the new and fundamental conditions involved necessarily in any passage from State to Federal regulation. That does not involve merely one but a thousand-and-one different problems to be handled, many of them around the first of the present calendar year.

Ever since this problem arose it has received the closest attention. On June 6, 1944, the day after the decision of the Supreme Court was rendered, I wrote a letter to the President of the United States and asked for a moratorium, and he wrote me a letter in reply. Subsequently, on December 20, 1944, the day after the adjournment of the last Congress, I again wrote the President in regard to a moratorium, to which he replied on January 8. I do not desire to delay the Senate by reading the correspondence, but I ask permission that the letters addressed by me to the President and his replies thereto be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I called the President's attention to the gravity of the situation and asked for a moratorium. His response was favorable, as it was later in answer to my letter of December 20. Of course, no one knows what legislation any State might try to pass. It might try to pass any sort of legislation, but it is extremely unlikely that any State, knowing that at

the end of several years the moratorium provided for in this bill will come to an end, would try to run amok and pass any such law as the Senator from Utah suggests.

In subsection (b) there are several purposes contemplated. The insurance commissioners and many of the insurance companies have been in very great doubt as to how they could operate at this time with respect to matters of collection of premiums, general regulations, the issuing of licenses, and many other aspects of the business. Therefore, it seems very desirable that somewhere in this measure there should be a statement that the right of the States to regulate and to collect taxes should not be terminated or should not be repealed by implication. Otherwise, I think the States may find themselves from time to time in a very serious situation in trying to function. Unless it is clearly stated somewhere that there is not a repeal by implication, such omission is likely to throw restraint upon or put serious hindrance in the way of the States functioning properly. In giving a moratorium to a business and to State governments harassed greatly by the effect of the decision of the Supreme Court, let us not do so begrudgingly or in a halfway fashion which might prove to be gravely insufficient to meet situations which we cannot today foresee.

EXHIBIT A

HON. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The decision of the Supreme Court yesterday, reversing the long-time settled law in that the Court decided that insurance comes under the supervision of the Sherman Antitrust Act, is I think, one of the most far-reaching which has been rendered for a long time.

Of course it means in substance probably that the insurance industry, one of the largest in the country, will be turned over from the supervision of the States to that of the Federal Government. The demand upon manpower and time of the Federal Government to take over this gigantic industry cannot be satisfied, I assume, without very heavy strain upon the energies of the Federal Government in carrying on our war program.

Several months ago in talking to Attorney General Biddle I urged that if *Paul v. Virginia* were reversed that the Government should not only be slow to attempt to up-set all the existing arrangements authorized by the States, but should also issue reassuring statements that there would be no haste. I have the impression that the Government intends to show some restraint in this matter.

The Bailey-Van Nuys bill has been held in the Judiciary Committee awaiting the decision of the Supreme Court in the case just decided.

It is very fortunate that the insurance interests, although under State control, stood very staunchly during the depression, and I understand that State officials, boards of trade, and insurance interests quite generally have registered vigorous opposition to the suggested shift from State control to Federal.

I have studied the matter carefully for years and have seen no adequate justification for such a shift. It seems to me that such a transfer in time of war, and I may add in a political campaign, is especially unfortunate.

Very respectfully,

GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, June 10, 1944.

HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR RADCLIFFE: I have your letter of June 6 with respect to the recent decision of the Supreme Court deciding that insurance comes under the provisions of the Sherman Act. You suggest that this would probably mean supervision by the Federal Government.

The Attorney General advises me that he does not believe that this alternative is inevitable or even probable. He tells me that there is nothing in the decision which prevents the regulation by the States of insurance rates as long as that regulation does not interfere with the provisions of the Sherman Act.

Personally, I know of no effort at this time to bring insurance companies under over-all Federal regulation. Whether or not such control were adopted would depend, I think, very much on the attitude of the companies themselves in complying with the provisions of the Sherman Act.

The Attorney General assures me that he is anxious that the insurance companies and the State insurance officials shall have a reasonable time within which to conform their practices and statutes to the decision of the Supreme Court.

With best regards, always,
Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

DECEMBER 20, 1944.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing this note in regard to the insurance situation. On June 6, 1944, one day after the very far-reaching decision of the Supreme Court reversing *Paul v. Virginia*, I wrote a letter to you emphasizing what I thought was the gravity of the situation. I suggested that you declare a sort of moratorium during which essential adjustments could be made to the new decision. I also requested that you issue a reassuring statement to the industry suddenly facing problems of a grave and unprecedented nature. On June 10 you very kindly wrote me a letter in which your position was, on the whole, favorable to what I had requested.

Since that time the insurance industry, insurance commissioners, certain officials of the Federal Government, Members of Congress, and others have been endeavoring to work out an arrangement which would seem to be adequate. Likewise the status as to State taxation and other forms of State regulation have been questioned in some channels.

The adjournment of Congress has come before such plans could really be carried out. I have been in close touch with Attorney General Biddle, who has been very helpful. It is my impression that he is in favor of a suitable moratorium, but there are some departments of the Federal Government closely involved which do not come under the supervision of the Attorney General.

I again very respectfully suggest that you give expression to some form of moratorium under which State activities could continue freely pending Federal and State legislation which will undoubtedly be passed and put into operation within the very near future.

I am sure everyone is in accord with the idea you expressed in your letter to me of June 10, that the insurance industry which is one of the largest and most important in this country should have every reasonable opportunity for readjustment.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE.

JANUARY 2, 1945.

MY DEAR SENATOR RADCLIFFE: In your letter of December 20, you suggest that there

should be some form of a moratorium during which insurance companies will have an opportunity to readjust their practices in order to bring them into conformity with the Supreme Court decision in the South-Eastern Underwriters Association case, and during which legislation might be enacted. The Attorney General advises me that several months ago he told the Senate Judiciary Committee that no new antitrust prosecutions against insurance companies would be instituted during a reasonable readjustment period.

The responsibility for the regulation of the business of insurance has been left with the States; and I can assure you that this administration is not sponsoring Federal legislation to regulate insurance or to interfere with the continued regulation and taxation by the States of the business of insurance. But there is no conflict between the application of the antitrust laws and effective State regulation of insurance companies, and there is no valid reason for giving any special exemption from the antitrust laws to the business of insurance. The antitrust laws prohibit private rate fixing arrangements between insurance companies and acts of boycott, coercion, or intimidation. The antitrust laws do not conflict with affirmative regulation of insurance by the States such as agreed insurance rates if they are affirmatively approved by State officials.

Senator O'MAHONEY introduced a bill in the last Congress which would have provided for a moratorium from the Sherman Act, except for acts of boycott, coercion, or intimidation, until March 1, 1946. This would appear to give sufficient time to permit the necessary readjustment to the Supreme Court decision. I would favor legislation of this general character. It would permit the orderly correction of abuses which have existed in the insurance business and would preserve the right of the States to regulate with full responsibility.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to answer the question of the Senator from Maryland first. The language of section 2 answers the question:

The business of insurance, and every person engaged therein, shall be subject to the laws of the several States which relate to the regulation or taxation of such business.

That is the insurance business. So the bill specifically provides that the State laws shall apply to taxation and regulation of insurance.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wanted to make exactly the statement to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that the Senator from Michigan has made, and that is that nothing could be more emphatic or plainer than subsection (a) of section 2:

The business of insurance, and every person engaged therein, shall be subject to the laws of the several States which relate to the regulation or taxation of such business.

When we go that far Congress expresses itself emphatically that the regulation of the insurance business should be under State law. But when we take the next step in subsection (b) it is an invitation, in my opinion, to do the very thing that I, and I hope the Senator from Maryland, want to prohibit.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I agree with the Senator from Utah that the statement in subsection (a) of section 2 is quite definite and clear. But it has seemed to those who have been working upon this bill that there was some need or at least advisability that there should not be any repeal by implication. The statement beginning on page 1 is a general statement setting forth the purposes.

Since there seems to be doubt in the minds of certain people that there might be repeal by implication or that a general statement might have some crimping effect, it would not be at all unusual if a saving clause were put in the bill. It may not be necessary, but in the spirit of caution I think it might be desirable, especially knowing the very serious problems which have been confronting the insurance companies and the various States to leave them free to meet conditions some of which cannot now be foreseen. We want the companies to understand clearly and we desire the States to realize definitely that the States can go ahead and issue permits, collect taxes, and do the various other things which are necessary to be done. For that reason I think that full and unmistakable emphasis upon that right is essential. It is unnecessary and unwise to create any doubt as to the right of the States to go ahead and function freely in handling insurance.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I agree that it should be very clear that the States can regulate and can tax insurance in all its phases. Section 2, in my humble judgment, is a very clear provision providing for such taxation and such regulation. The language of the bill makes clear the purpose of the legislation, that the taxation problem will be taken care of, and that there will be no excuse for paying under protest or not paying at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 24.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I move to amend by striking subsection (b) of section 2 from the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to speak for a few moments on the amendment.

The purpose of the bill would be nullified if the amendment were to be adopted. Today the various States have laws relating to insurance. It would be a physical impossibility to examine, in a short time, all those State laws and their ramifications. One State law provides that the insurance companies may fix rates subject to the approval of the insurance commissioner. Others provide that rates may be fixed if the Commission does not repeal them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does not subsection (a) of section 2 take complete ac-

count of that fact, and grant complete protection to existing State laws?

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree that, as to existing State laws, subsection (a) of Section 2 does so provide.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me read it:

The business of insurance, and every person engaged therein, shall be subject to the laws of the several States which relate to the regulation or taxation of such business.

That is complete.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no reason for misunderstanding on the part of any State official or any insurance company or any policyholder with respect to the meaning of that subsection as it applies to existing law.

Mr. FERGUSON. As it applies to existing law, that is correct. However, subsection (b) provides for something further. It provides that no Federal legislation relating to interstate commerce shall by implication repeal any existing State law unless such act of Congress specifically so provides.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator puts his finger upon the precise center of this dispute, or misunderstanding. Let me say to the Senator that, recognizing the complexity of this problem, and the desirability of maintaining State regulation and State taxation, members of the Judiciary Committee who were opposed to the proposal to grant a blanket exemption from the antitrust laws desired to go as far as was humanly possible in the direction of giving the States a clear-cut opportunity to adjust State laws in accordance with Supreme Court decisions and the antitrust laws.

It is no secret that Senate bill 12, introduced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and myself, and Senate bill 340, the bill which was reported by the committee, are modifications of a measure which was originally drafted by the legislative committee of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners. So there was an effort to work with those groups. In drafting those two bills we sought to spell out each particular law which might apply to insurance. We referred specifically to the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Robinson-Patman Act, the National Labor Relations Act, and the Fair Labor Standards Act. In other words, a good-faith attempt was made to specify every single law which had an application, or might have an application, to insurance.

Section 2 (b) was drafted and written into the bill which I introduced, in the belief, not that it would be interpreted as an additional exemption from the antitrust laws, but that it would be a sort of catch-all provision to take into consideration other acts of Congress which might affect the insurance industry, but of which we did not have knowledge at the time.

I am sure that the Senator from Michigan does not wish to ask the Senate, in view of the interpretation which has been placed upon this section, to enact that provision. To do so would put us in the position of saying that any State, if it so desires, may authorize monopolies,

I suggest to the Senator from Michigan that the elimination of subsection (b) of section 2, as suggested by the Senator from Utah, would not in any way, shape, or form prevent carrying out the understanding which was had with State insurance commissioners.

The bill which we drafted grants a clear-cut moratorium for a much longer period than the Department of Justice had originally suggested, which was acceptable to some Members of the Senate and some of the insurance companies. Furthermore, it grants a moratorium from those provisions of the Clayton Act which have to do with interlocking directorates. In that case the moratorium is 6 months longer than that proposed to be granted for the purpose of adjusting State laws to the antitrust laws.

Section 4 provides as follows:

For the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made and legislation to be adopted by the several States and Congress until June 1, 1947, the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, shall not apply to the business of insurance—

And so forth. I submit to the Senator from Michigan that this represents a good-faith effort on the part of all concerned to extend to the States an opportunity to approach this problem in the light of the Supreme Court decisions and in the light of the antitrust laws.

No one is more ready than I to acknowledge that the insurance industry is a very complex industry, and that opportunity ought to be extended for necessary adjustments. However, the charges which have been made have been made not by the Government but by persons engaged in the insurance industry; not by any Member of Congress but by policyholders and agents and those who have been affected by the insurance industry. It has been charged that improper attempts have been made to monopolize this business.

As I understand, it is not the purpose of the Senate to grant opportunity for such monopoly. It is the purpose to enable the States and the Congress to make a good-faith effort to adjust themselves to the industry and the conditions which now exist; and I trust that the Senator from Michigan will accede to the suggestion made by the Senator from Utah and accept the amendment.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. This whole controversy arose, Mr. President, because of the custom and practice, which had grown up in this country during a period of 75 years and which had been upheld by the courts of the country, of not considering insurance to be commerce. The Supreme Court finally decided otherwise.

Subsection (b), which has been referred to in the present discussion, does not, it seems to me, relate at all to the learned remarks just made by the Senator from Wyoming.

The subsection reads in part as follows:

Sec. 2. (b) No act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law—

And so forth. The whole crux of the subsection is the word "construed."

The purpose of the framers of the bill, Mr. President, was to provide against a sudden adverse decision by some court in construing this Act or some State act thus throwing the business of insurance into confusion. The word "construed" is the whole crux of that particular subsection. I think to eliminate it would destroy the assurance given by the bill to the insurance business, and I would vote against eliminating it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think it can fairly be stated that today absolute chaos exists in the insurance world, and it has been caused by the decision of the Supreme Court to which we have referred. The pending bill is an attempt to remove and dissipate that chaos by enacting a law by which the insurance companies will be able to abide for the time being.

As I said before, the State of North Carolina, which I am informed uses the revenue obtained from the taxation of such companies for the payment of pensions, has advised us that by February 15 of this year it will be compelled to suspend the licenses of certain insurance companies and all their agents to do business there because the companies have decided that under the present chaotic conditions they do not wish to pay the tax. They do not know whether they should or should not pay it. If subsection (b) is deleted, I am of the opinion that we shall accomplish nothing by enacting the bill; because the insurance companies will still be unable to decide what they can or cannot do, and for that reason they will abide by the provisions of the State laws, and the present chaos will continue.

I think it is fair to say that a great deal of time and attention have been devoted to preparation of the pending bill. The able chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is the coauthor of the bill. It was submitted to various insurance companies—fire insurance, life insurance, marine insurance, and casualty insurance companies, and so forth—through the insurance commissioners of the various States, because the Commissioners were aware of the chaotic condition which exists at the present time.

After almost a week of work upon the bill, which in similar form was introduced in the last session, it was possible to reach an agreement under which the insurance companies believed they could work, for the time being, until January 1, 1947, and until January 1, 1948. The two separate dates were provided because we wished to allow sufficient time for two sessions of the State legislatures to be held. For instance, the Clayton Act applies to interlocking directorates. It was the opinion of the insurance commissioners and the insurance companies that it would be impossible to change the interlocking directorate laws of the State unless a considerable period of time were allowed. That is the reason why two dates for the so-called moratorium are provided.

The bill does not provide for repeal of the Clayton Act or of the Sherman Act, because if an attempt were made to repeal them, before they could again become effective it would become neces-

sary to reenact them. So the language of the bill is such as to provide that they will be in full force and effect, except there will be a moratorium for a certain period. Thus there will be no necessity for the reenactment of those laws so as to make them apply to insurance in the future, unless Congress desires to do so by specific legislation.

Mr. TAFT and Mr. MURDOCK addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to ask whether it might meet the objection of the Senator from Wyoming if the word "heretofore" were inserted in subsection (b), so as to make it read:

No act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law heretofore enacted by any State—

And so forth. That would certainly eliminate the possibility of its application to future State action. My interest is to preserve the State laws of Ohio, for instance, which tax insurance companies and bring in certain amounts of revenue. I do not wish to have those laws changed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to say a word in my own right on that point. By the provisions of the bill we are in effect asking the legislatures to put their own houses in order during the next 2 years. The danger of inserting the word "heretofore," as the able senior Senator from Ohio has just proposed, is that the legislatures would be unable to pass any laws which in their opinion might violate the provisions of that subsection.

Mr. TAFT. We wish to have them put their houses in order by adopting laws which do not conflict with the Sherman Act. As I understand the provisions of the bill, it would allow a period of 2 years during which such legislation might be adjusted to the provisions of the Sherman Act or other existing Federal statutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. At the present time, every State rate-fixing authority violates the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act, or both. There are many State laws which violate the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act. It is our purpose to permit those laws to continue in force and effect until at least 1947 and 1948.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but this section will not cease to be effective in 1947 or 1948; it will go on forever. If the Senator could provide a limit—for instance, until 1947—that would be helpful, although it is difficult for me to understand how it is possible to provide that an act of Congress shall be construed one way for 2 years and another way thereafter. It seems to me it would be necessary to change the language of the section.

Mr. FERGUSON. I would have no objection to inserting the words "until January 1, 1948."

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio has

put his finger on the crux of the matter. If it is the intention of the Senator from Michigan to provide a moratorium for the States, in order to allow them to put their houses in order, so that their laws may conform to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, then certainly it is inconsistent to include subsection (b) of section 2 in its present form. I am in agreement with the Senator from Ohio in believing that in all probability the amendment offered by me would be fully taken care of if the word "heretofore" were inserted at the proper place in subsection B of section 2, rather than to strike out the whole subsection. The language then would read:

No act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law heretofore enacted by any State—

And so forth. I know the Senator certainly will agree to the adoption of my amendment, with the change suggested by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is not only to permit the States to put their houses in order, but to attempt to do away with the confusion and chaos which now exist, so that at least until the date stated in section 4, the moratorium section, the respective States may enact legislation on such subjects, except as forbidden in the bill. I hope that the Senate today will approve the bill in its present form so that it may be made applicable by February 1 in order that the States may tax and regulate.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Earlier in the day the Senator from Michigan spoke to me about the situation in South Carolina and with regard to communications which were received last year with reference to the pending subject. I wonder if the Senator from Michigan has any comment to make upon what others who are interested in the matter thought with regard to the particular section under discussion.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have been in touch with two officers of the legislative committee of the State insurance commissioners and they have advised me that the various commissioners desire that the bill be passed in its present form. So far as I know, no objection to the bill in its present form has been made by the commissioners.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator for the information he has given, which accords with the information I had already received.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, as the Senator from Michigan said a few moments ago, the purpose of the bill is not only to afford time to the States to readjust themselves to the decision of the Supreme Court, but to give them an opportunity to function without hindrance. Efforts were made by some persons connected with the insurance business, by insurance departments, and by the Department of Justice, to draft legislation immediately and to come before the Congress with the statement that they thought such legislation was necessary in order to comply with the deci-

sion of the Supreme Court. But after the matter had been given careful consideration it was realized that the drafting of a necessary bill could not be done quickly. Therefore it is highly imperative that time should be afforded for certain studies to be conducted, and they cannot be made unless a moratorium is granted.

It is not now possible to foresee all the questions which may arise for consideration in the future, and it is likewise not possible for us to know what may be the restrictive effect of some of the Federal statutes now in existence. It is gravely dangerous to assume that there are no hidden restrictions which may arise to plague and harass us. Because of the present language of the bill, difficulties might arise and seriously interfere with the work of transition from State to Federal regulation, which is one of the most far-reaching moves with which any industry in this country has ever been confronted. I believe that language should be inserted in the bill which would protect us from such a danger. The insurance commissioners also believe such precautionary provisions should be inserted. Many persons who have studied the matter very carefully feel that obstacles may arise which cannot now be foreseen and provided against, and, therefore, that the bill we pass should be very clear and clean-cut. I believe that is the justification for the provision to which reference has been made.

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

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think there is an ambiguity in the bill. Assume that no more legislation were enacted and in 1948 a case should arise involving the question. Does the Sherman Act invalidate any State law under this bill? In section 4 (a) of the bill it is implied that in 1948 the Sherman Act shall again come into force unless something has been done in the meantime. However, in section 2 (b) it is implied that even in 1948 the Sherman Act shall not invalidate any State regulatory law. I think that in that respect the bill is ambiguous on its face. We should straighten out the difference between the two sections.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I would assume that at the end of the period of moratorium the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act would apply.

Mr. TAFT. Paragraph (b) of section 2 of the bill states that "No act of Congress shall ever presume to invalidate a State law on the subject of insurance."

Mr. FERGUSON. I suggest that we could remedy the defect by making the subsection read: "Until January 1, 1948, no act of Congress," and so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan offer that as an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK]?

Mr. FERGUSON. I offer it as an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. If what the Senator from Ohio has said is true, or if there is any doubt of it, it would be well to clarify the language. It was clearly the under-

standing of those drafting the bill that at the end of 1948 the moratoriums would come to an end.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Michigan state his amendment to the amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. On page 2, in line 4, after "(b)", I move to strike out "No" and insert the words "Until January 1, 1948, no."

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, as I understand, the pending question before the Senate is my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah offered to amend by striking out paragraph (b) of section 2 on page 2. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has offered a perfecting amendment which takes precedence over the amendment of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I ask the Senator from Michigan to state again what he is offering by way of amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. On page 2, in line 4, after "(b)", I move to amend by striking out "No" and inserting "Until January 1, 1948, no."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to the amendment of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I ask for time to enable me to understand clearly the proposed amendment of the Senator from Michigan. My present understanding is that the Senator offers to amend—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will ask the clerk to read the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 4, after "(b)", it is proposed to amend by striking out the word "No" and inserting the words "Until January 1, 1948, no", so that the subsection will then read: "(b) Until January 1, 1948, no act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate, impair," and so forth.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, it is my judgment that the amendment of the Senator from Michigan would bring about complete harmony between section 2 and section 4. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment at this time in order that the Senate may act upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Utah is withdrawn.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the discussion concerning the amendment to paragraph (b) of section 2. It occurs to me that not only does the proposed act provide for a suspension of the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act, but the very purpose of it is to restore the control of the insurance business to the States. If we make the change proposed in this section and say "until January 1, 1948", then the bill in its completeness will end in 1948. The present provision is—and this was the measure reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary—

No act of Congress—

Existing at this time, or passed before this, or to be passed in the future—

shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State * * * unless such act specifically so provides.

I do not think there should be any limitation of time in the provision. We do not want the law to end on January 1, 1948. We want the business left in the control of the States, unless by enactment in the future we specifically state that we do not want something they are doing to be continued.

Therefore, I call to the attention of the able Senator from Michigan the fact that if the language suggested by him shall be written into the bill, this very section will become ineffective on January 1, 1948.

What is the danger of the language as written?

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Not at the moment. What is the danger of the language as written, when it provides that no act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate a State law dealing with insurance unless the act of Congress specifically states that it is intended so to do? That saves the power of Congress. Why provide an automatic ending of this provision, if it is the intent of Congress today to leave to the States the conduct of the insurance business and the taxing of the insurance business, because if the States cannot control the companies, the States cannot tax them. The companies are refusing to pay taxes to the States, and that is one of the things which have brought forth this proposed law. Why provide an automatic termination upon a declaration of policy by fixing a date of termination?

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator's suggestion might be pertinent if it were not absolutely contradicted by section 4, which provides that on June 1, 1947, the Sherman Act shall again apply to the business of insurance. If we leave that provision in the bill, the one now being discussed is inconsistent with it, because if the Sherman Act applies to the business of insurance, any State law which authorizes a rating bureau becomes invalid, or those engaged in the business are subject to Federal prosecution for complying with the State law.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The only two Federal laws mentioned are the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act, and the purpose of mentioning those specifically is to require the States so to enact legislation as not to violate those two existing laws. If any legislation is enacted in the future, whatever it may be—I cannot contemplate it today—if any law shall be enacted by the Congress on interstate commerce which could possibly affect the business of insurance and bring it within the general term "interstate commerce," it would apply. Why not let the provision stand that it shall not apply unless Congress specifically says in an act that it shall apply to the business of insurance, which we are now trying to return to the States?

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. If I understand the Senator correctly, he intends by the proposed act to bring about the repeal of the Sherman Act insofar as it applies to insurance.

Mr. REVERCOMB. No, if by "repeal" is meant specific repeal of the act. What we mean to do is to say to the States, "You can regulate insurance, but you cannot provide for anything that will violate the Sherman antitrust law or the Clayton Act, after the dates fixed in the bill, namely, 1947 and 1948."

Mr. MURDOCK. If the Senator will indulge me for a moment, if that is what the Senator intends, then certainly what has been called to his attention by the distinguished Senator from Ohio is applicable. What subsection (b) does, and what I object to, is that very thing. It permits the States to repeal the Sherman Act. The Senator does not want that, nor do I. What we do want to do is to grant the States a moratorium during which they can make their State laws conform to the Supreme Court decision, and regulate insurance. But if we pass the proposed law with subsection (b) of section 2 in it, it not only refers to the existing laws of the Federal Government, but to all future laws of the Federal Government. What the Senator from Michigan proposes brings subsection (b) of section 2 in line with section 4, which follows, and grants what the distinguished Senator from West Virginia wants, if I understand him, that is, a moratorium until June 1, 1947.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I see it, two things are proposed by this bill. Not only a moratorium with respect to the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act—and we all agree that that is its purpose—but it goes further than that, if I may say so to the able Senator, and carries out the purpose of giving power to the States of regulation of insurance and the taxing of insurance companies, so long as they do not get into conflict with a Federal law. The section before us provides that no act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate a State law unless the act of Congress specifically states that the State law is in conflict with the Federal act and is designed to override it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then it is applicable, it does apply, does it not, to the Sherman Act, and also to the Clayton Act, presently, because neither one of those acts specifically repeals or impairs or invalidates any State law?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not agree with that conclusion, because section 4 of the bill specifically says that the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act shall again be in force on the dates mentioned.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is what the Senator from Ohio called to the Senator's attention, that there is an inconsistency in the two sections, which is clarified by the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not think there is an inconsistency when they are

read together. One says that no act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate unless Congress specifically says that it shall invalidate. Section 4 provides specifically with respect to the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act. Subsection (b) of section 2 would apply to all other laws. Section 4 (a) applies to the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act. I think the sections can be read together. But I wish to say to the Senator from Michigan that if he inserts the language "until January 1, 1948," as the time to which that section shall be in effect, he automatically terminates it at that time, and automatically terminates the control of the States over insurance.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, after a little more thought about the language proposed, I am of the opinion that we could make the bill further the purpose we had in mind by not changing it as suggested by the able Senator from Ohio, but changing it in this way, making it read:

No act except the Sherman Act—

And inserting the date—
and/or the Clayton Act—

Inserting the date—
shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance, or which imposes a fee or tax upon such business, unless such act specifically so provides.

In other words, the case before the Supreme Court was a case applying the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act. We wanted to have the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act apply to insurance, but we did not want to go back into all the laws which had been enacted respecting interstate commerce and apply them to the business of insurance. So I should like to have the able Senator from Ohio withdraw his amendment.

Mr. TAFT. I did not offer the amendment; the Senator himself offered it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I withdraw the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has the right to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. I propose an amendment in line 4, on page 2, after the words "No act," to add "except—"

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Michigan the phraseology "except as hereinafter provided in section 4."

Mr. FERGUSON. I think we should refer specifically to the two acts by name and by date. I think the language should be:

No act—

And then we should insert the words: except the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and/or the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That amendment should come in after the word "Congress" and not after the word "act."

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. The amendment should come after the word "Congress."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated, so that Senators may understand it.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 4, after the word "Congress", it is proposed to insert "Except the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and/or the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act."

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the language now proposed by the Senator from Michigan is more clarifying than anything he has offered heretofore, and in my opinion, Mr. President, brings subsection (b) of section 2 and section 4 in complete alinement and harmony. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. What bothers me about the amendment is that it implies that the measure may invalidate fees or taxes upon such business. The Senator might add at the end of section 4 "or to be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose", and so forth, during that period. The difficulty with the Senator's amendment is that it suggests at least that these two acts, even before 1947, although they do not apply to the business, might possibly invalidate a State law. I do not want the bill to carry that implication.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the Senator explain again just where he would insert his proposal?

Mr. TAFT. At the end of section 4, line 22 on page 2, the Senator might add this language "or to be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State", and so forth.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator feel that the words "shall not apply" are not as broad as the words now proposed by the Senator? We would use language to the effect that the Sherman Act shall not apply; we except it in subsection (b), and then we say it shall not apply. So if it does not apply, I do not see how we can say that it would interfere with the taxation or the regulation of insurance.

Mr. TAFT. Perhaps I am unduly concerned, but I am afraid the insurance companies which are doubting the validity of the taxes imposed upon them will not be greatly soothed by subsection (b) of section 2 as proposed to be amended by the Senator, because it excepts the two laws. I think we will then have to look to section 4.

Mr. FERGUSON. We eliminate everything from subsection (b) except two laws, and then we say in section 4 that those two laws shall not apply until certain dates. I think the language now is very clear as to what we mean.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The fact remains that the Sherman and Clayton Acts are excepted by your amendment, therefore they shall be construed to invalidate, im-

pair, or supersede any State laws enacted for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance, or which imposes a fee or tax.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then we say in section 4 that they shall not apply, and that is an all-inclusive application, that they shall no longer so apply.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is a conflict. I do not see the necessity for the amendment. It nullifies one of the purposes for which the bill is being enacted. Mr. President, I ask that subsection (b), as proposed to be amended, be now read and I will ask the close attention of Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

(b) No act of Congress, except the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and/or the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance, or which imposes a fee or tax upon such business, unless such act specifically so provides.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand the pending measure it has two main purposes: First. A declaration of policy by the Congress that the continued regulation and taxation by the several States of the business of insurance is in the public interest and that the States shall continue to regulate and tax it, unless Congress specifically legislates on the subject matter to the contrary. Second. A moratorium is declared making ineffective the Sherman and Clayton Acts for a time specified in section 4 (a) of the bill so that States can adjust their laws on the subject. The Judiciary Committee made a careful study of the problems involved and has reported the bill and I believe that the bill as it came from the committee is not ambiguous, but carries out the purposes above set forth by me.

The pending amendment, in my judgment, nullifies the first purpose of the bill. Although the Clayton and Sherman Acts are suspended by section 4 (a), they shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by a State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance or which imposes a fee or tax upon such business, if the pending amendment is adopted.

Many insurance companies refuse to pay licenses and taxes in many States, I am informed, because of the Supreme Court decision in United States against Southern Underwriters Association et al., and to now except those two acts, which formed the basis of the decision and, in effect, state that they shall be construed to invalidate State laws on the question of taxation and regulation of the insurance business is bound to lead to much confusion.

Mr. FERGUSON. I take it the language now used would be very confusing. The bill excludes all acts except those enumerated. We will have to change the language so as to make all other acts not applicable except the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act. Then we except those acts in the next section.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I return to my original suggestion. I do not think the words "shall not apply to such business and the acts or the conduct thereof" are as broad as section 2. It is said there specifically that these acts shall not apply to the insurance business, but that does not necessarily mean that the States might not be deprived also of the power of taxing or regulating because the insurance business is interstate commerce. I do not quite see why, in view of what the Senator now wishes to accomplish, he cannot add to his amendment at the end of section 2 the words I suggested, that no act of Congress shall apply to such business and shall not invalidate, impair, or supersede the law of any State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance. Then other acts are covered entirely and the Sherman and Clayton Acts are covered entirely in section 4 (a), and explained in detail.

Mr. ELLENDER. Such language put in the proper place would cover the objection I suggested to the pending amendment. However, I am not advocating it, because I think the bill as reported by the Judiciary Committee is clear. I think all of us agree that the States should retain the right of regulating and taxing the insurance business within their respective borders.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from Ohio move that the bill be amended as he has suggested? I have no objection to it.

Mr. TAFT. I do not want to move any further amendment until there is some general agreement as to what we are trying to accomplish.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is my opinion that the amendment which the Senator from Michigan has just offered has completely cleared up the situation, and that his comment in response to the Senator from Ohio is absolutely correct. The language in section 4, as the Senator from Michigan points out, says that these antitrust laws shall not apply to such business, which means the business of insurance. It would be perfectly impossible, it seems to me, under that language, for a court to say that the Sherman and Clayton laws, which Congress says during this period shall not apply to insurance, shall nevertheless apply to State laws affecting insurance. I think the Senator from Ohio is endeavoring to be oversecure in gaining the point which is covered, it seems to me, by the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan. The two sections are now drawn into complete harmony, as I see it.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. We have discussed changing language which has been very carefully studied with respect to the legislation on this subject, and each time a change is made or suggested we look farther down in the bill and we see a conflict with the suggested change. The bill was discussed at length in the Com-

mittee on the Judiciary of the Senate. It was unanimously reported. It has as its purpose giving to the States the control of insurance and creating a moratorium, so called, with respect to the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act, to fix dates of 1947 and 1948, respectively, and then it provides that nothing contained in this measure shall render the Sherman Act inapplicable if any agreement or act of the State or an insurance company under a law of the State creates a boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the bill is very complete. It was better worked out in committee than it can be here on the floor of the Senate, acting as we are now, almost as a committee. I hope the bill may be passed in the form in which it was reported from the committee after study, and without the shot-from-the-hip amendments which are being offered. I believe that a great mistake would be made if, after careful study of this proposed legislation and framing it in the language in which it was reported, these changes should be made. I hope that the suggested amendments may be rejected, and that the bill may be passed as it was reported to the Senate unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, if I correctly understand the amendment which has been offered, it provides that no act of Congress, with certain exceptions, shall apply to the business of insurance. Is not that equivalent to stating that the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act shall supersede any State laws?

Mr. FERGUSON. Except that in section 4 it is provided that those two acts shall not apply to insurance.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. First it is provided that they shall invalidate State laws. Then later it is said that there shall be a moratorium. That is not the most felicitous way of stating it. If it can be construed that section 4 clearly modifies section 2 (b), we are safe; but it seems to me that that is running a rather unnecessary risk, because subsection (b) of section 2 clearly states that those two acts shall invalidate State laws.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan a question. If what he says be true, why is it necessary to have an amendment to subsection (b) of section 2 at all? I think we could put both sections together and do exactly what is desired.

As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I am for the bill as it came from the committee. The reason I voted for it was that it would put the regulation of the insurance business in the hands of the States. That is the important thing in this bill. I believe that the amendments which have been suggested would be confusing and conflicting. In my judgment the bill would be better if it were left as it was reported from the committee than if we were to try to amend it on the floor of the Senate. I hope the amendments will be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered

by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In section 2, on page 2, line 4, after the word "Congress", it is proposed to insert the words "except the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and/or the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I urge the Senate to adopt the pending amendment. I do so for this reason: The Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Wyoming have given a great deal of time and attention to this measure. It is not a problem without difficulties. I am satisfied that the purpose of the Senator from Michigan and my purpose are identical. The purpose is to enable the States and the Congress to have time to adjust a very complicated business to a decision of the Supreme Court and to the antitrust laws. There is no purpose to issue an invitation from the United States Senate to the States to enact laws which would establish monopolies in this business.

The moratorium as proposed in the bill, and as now proposed by the Senator from Michigan in his amendment, covers the entire field, and does it in such a way that there can be no misunderstanding. We are extending to the States complete immunity for their State tax laws, and, as stated in section 4, we are granting a moratorium for the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made and legislation to be adopted by the several States and Congress. I believe the issue is quite clear. The purpose would be attained by the language of the bill together with the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, and I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for a division, Mr. President.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 340) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress hereby declares that the continued regulation and taxation by the several States of the business of insurance is in the public interest, and that silence on the part of the Congress shall not be construed to impose any barrier to the regulation or taxation of such business by the several States.

SEC. 2. (a) The business of insurance, and every person engaged therein, shall be subject to the laws of the several States which relate to the regulation or taxation of such business.

(b) No act of Congress, except the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and/or the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating the business of in-

surance, or which imposes a fee or tax upon such business, unless such act specifically so provides.

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, or the act of June 19, 1936, known as the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act, shall apply to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct of that business.

SEC. 4. (a) For the purpose of enabling adjustments to be made and legislation to be adopted by the several States and Congress, until June 1, 1947, the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, shall not apply to the business of insurance, or to acts in the conduct of such business, and until January 1, 1948, the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, shall not apply to such business or to acts in the conduct thereof.

(b) Nothing contained in this section shall render the said Sherman Act inapplicable to any agreement or act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect in any manner the application to the business of insurance of the act of July 5, 1935, as amended, known as the National Labor Relations Act, or the act of June 25, 1938, as amended, known as the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

SEC. 6. As used in this act, the term "State" includes the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 7. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], I give notice that when the Senate reconvenes next Monday the Senator from Alabama will move to take up Senate bill 338 to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, let me say to my distinguished friend from Arizona that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] gave notice earlier in the day that as soon as the Senate convenes on Monday it will be his purpose to move to take up the river and harbor bill. I do not think it will require very long to dispose of that bill, in view of the fact that all controversial matters have evidently been eliminated from the bill. After action on the river and harbor bill is completed, I know of no reason at this time why a motion should not be made to take up the bill referred to by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Such a motion will be made.

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 MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

H. Struve Hensel, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy;

Vice Admiral Frederick J. Horne, United States Navy, to be an admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Vice Chief of Naval Operations;

Capt. Frank G. Fahrion, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 21st day of February 1943;

Capt. Marshall R. Greer, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 28th day of August 1943;

Capt. Peter K. Fischler, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 11th day of May 1943;

Commodore Thomas P. Jeter, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, Battleship Squadron 2, and until reporting for other permanent duty, to rank from the 20th day of October 1944; and

Sundry aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve, and citizens, to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. GEORGE (for Mr. McCARRAN), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

T. Hoyt Davis, of Georgia, to be United States district judge for the middle district of Georgia, vice Bascom S. Deaver, deceased.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

William M. Payne, to be postmaster at Natchitoches, La.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edwin C. Wilson to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkey.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of Myrtus P. Spangenberg to be postmaster at Waymart, Pa., go over until the next session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that all other postmaster nominations on the calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, all other postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the Navy nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps. Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations be confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 29, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 25, 1945:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Frank C. Walker, of Pennsylvania, to be Postmaster General. (Reappointment.)

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Chester L. Summers, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Mississippi, vice James O. Day, resigned.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Leif John Sverdrup, Army of the United States.

To be brigadier general

Col. Courtney Whitney (major, Specialist-Reserve; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. William Hood Simpson (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, now invested with rank and title of lieutenant general by virtue of his assignment to command the Fourth Army.

Maj. Gen. Leonard Townsend Gerow (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Albert Coady Wedemeyer (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Anthony Clement McAuliffe (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. David Myron Schlatter (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Clarence Lynn Sturdevant (colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. George Dunbar Pence (major, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Alexander Russell Bolling (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Clarence Howard Kells (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Robert-Wilson Hasbrouck (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Elmer Edward Adler (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Paul Wilkins Kendall (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Philip Edward Brown (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Frank Augustus Keating (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Lester Johnson Whitlock (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. William Gaulbert Weaver (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Arthur McKinley Harper (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Otto Paul Weyland (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. William Caldwell Duncel (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. George Price Hays (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Vernon Evans (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. William Ord Ryan (colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Edmund Walton Hill (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Hammond Davies Birks (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Booth Spruit, Medical Corps.

Col. James Francis Collins (major, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. John Carroll Kennedy (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Royal Lehner (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Sabin Ferrin (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. William Lemuel Mitchell (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Francis LeRoy Ankenbrandt (major, Signal Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. George Windle Read, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Donald Fowler Fritch (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Selby Harney Frank, Ordnance Department.

Col. Harold Haney (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Rex McKinley McDowell, Dental Corps.

Col. John French Conklin, Corps of Engineers.

Col. Einar Bernard Gjelsteen (major, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Edwin William Rawlings (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. David Hazen Blakelock (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Thomas Sarsfield Power (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Thomas Merritt Lowe (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. William Archer Hagins, Medical Corps.

Col. Francis Hudson Oxx (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. John Brandon Franks (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Cornelius Edward Ryan (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Lotha August Smith (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Clarence Charles Fenn (lieutenant colonel, Judge Advocate General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Bernard Linn Robinson (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. George Francis Wooley, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Thomas Benton Catron 2d (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Benjamin Grant Weir, Air Corps.

Col. Robert Merrill Lee (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Ralph Townsend Heard (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Sherman Vitus Hasbrouck (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Cyrus Higginson Searcy (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. William Fulton McKee (captain, Coast Artillery Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Gustav Joseph Braun (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Pearson Mencher, Cavalry.

Col. John Hubert Davies (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Walter King Wilson, Jr. (captain, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Garland Cuzorte Black (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. James Roy Andersen (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Frank Denis Hackett (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. George Arthur Lincoln (captain, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. LeGrande Albert Diller (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Day Palmer (major, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. John Koehler Gerhart (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Keliher, Field Artillery.

Col. Harold Albert Nisley (lieutenant colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Frank Schaffer Besson, Jr. (captain, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Eugene Lynch Harrison (major, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. James Harve Johnson, Quartermaster Corps.

Col. Marion Van Voorst (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Archer Elmore (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Edward Ward Smith (lieutenant colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Augustus Milton Gurney (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Emons Bert Whisner (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Roy Victor Rickard (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. James Frederick Phillips (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Kenon Gailey, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Harold Quiskie Huglin (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Lawrence Edward Schick (lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Calvert Hinton Arnold (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Henry Irving Hodes (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Robert Clarence McDonald, Medical Corps.

Col. Ralph Parker Eaton (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Max Frank Schneider (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Eugene Ware Ridings (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Charles Eskridge Saltzman (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps, National Guard of the United States), Army of the United States.

Col. Edward Clark Rose (brigadier general, National Guard of the United States), Army of the United States.

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Victor Emile Bertrandias (major, Air Reserve; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Georges Frederic Doriot (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Reserve), Army of the United States.

Col. William Henry Draper, Jr., Infantry Reserve.

Col. Elliott Roosevelt (captain, Air Reserve; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Bernhard Alfred Johnson (major, Quartermaster Reserve), Army of the United States.

Col. Edward Courtney Bullock Danforth, Jr., Infantry Reserve.

Col. John Joseph O'Brien, Army of the United States.

Col. Gene William Hall, Army of the United States.

Col. George Hamden Olmsted, Army of the United States.

Col. William Herbert Eaton (temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Vincent R. Murphy, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 11th day of April 1943.

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

George O. Jaquith, June 14, 1943.

Philip H. VonFraenkel, June 22, 1943.

Adrian R. M. Sears, July 10, 1943.

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Evert R. Sharp, March 19, 1941.

David P. Andross, March 19, 1941.

John W. Simcock, June 19, 1941.

Edward D. Williams, September 24, 1941.

Daniel L. Martin, May 4, 1942.

William J. Whitehead, June 29, 1942.

Dan G. Frank, June 29, 1942.

Hubert P. Mills, June 29, 1942.

Charles D. Moody, July 23, 1942.

James M. McCracken, Jr., August 25, 1942.

John D. Miller, August 31, 1942.

Robert J. McDairmant, October 12, 1942.

Lt. Charles H. Kretz, Jr., United States Navy, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of July 1940.

The following-named ensigns of the line, United States Navy, to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Charles M. Quinn, Jr., February 7, 1941.

Solon G. Hale, June 19, 1942.

Ensign James V. Bartlett, D-V(S), United States Naval Reserve, to be an assistant civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 1st day of October 1944.

The following-named ensigns of the line, United States Navy, to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Waldron M. McLellon, February 7, 1941.

Thomas P. Cocke, February 7, 1941.

Robert E. Thomas, Jr., February 7, 1941.

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Wallace B. Chesterfield, March 31, 1941.

Edward J. Nemecek, February 1, 1942.

Milton Hausman, March 16, 1942.

Edwin A. Glasson, June 1, 1942.

Edwin J. Madden, June 8, 1942.

Earl V. Harrington, August 23, 1943.

William M. Marking, December 6, 1943.

Harold N. Klaser, December 20, 1943.

Frank W. Taylor, January 10, 1944.

Paul H. Wells, Jr., January 10, 1944.

Jack F. Flood, January 17, 1944.

Traver R. Hamilton, July 20, 1944.

James B. Lepley, February 2, 1944.

Ray E. Stevens, Jr., March 20, 1944.

John W. Hazlet, May 1, 1944.

Arthur B. Chevallier, May 15, 1944.

Arthur E. Gustavson, May 15, 1944.

Robert L. Holle, May 24, 1944.

Dennis H. R. Frutiger, June 1, 1944.

Wilbur O. Martin, August 6, 1944.

Don L. Maxfield, August 7, 1944.

Howard C. Hester, August 21, 1944.

Cozier W. Gilman, Jr., September 25, 1944.

Hugh A. Phares, Jr., September 25, 1944.

Edgar H. Lechner, September 26, 1944.

Richard K. Thompson, Jr., September 30, 1944.

William F. Cahill, October 31, 1944.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 25, 1945:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Edwin C. Willson to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkey.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

George F. Hussey, Jr., to be rear admiral in the Navy to rank from January 22, 1943.

Willard A. Kitts 3d to be rear admiral in the Navy, to rank from January 25, 1943.

James D. Boyle, to be a pay director with the rank of rear admiral in the Navy, to rank from April 18, 1943.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Charles R. Sanderson to be assistant quartermaster on the retired list, with the rank of brigadier general, from December 23, 1944.

William L. McKittrick to be a brigadier general, from June 3, 1944.

Lawson H. M. Sanderson to be a brigadier general, from June 5, 1944.

Christian F. Schilt to be a brigadier general from June 7, 1944.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

D. Luther Yarbrough, Athens.

Sadie B. Thomas, Citronelle.

ARKANSAS

Grace V. Webb, Plumerville.

CALIFORNIA

Eugene L. Graffenstein, Di Giorgio.

Charles A. Miller, Gridley.

Manuel C. Joseph, Irvington.

Walter C. Quigley, Mariposa.

William Lais, Perkins.

Joseph Venolia, Spadra.

FLORIDA

Herman E. Wattwood, Titusville.

KENTUCKY

Verdie Whitmer, Bremen.

Henry B. Rappolee, Smithland.

LOUISIANA

Esther B. Dunn, Slaughter.

Leola B. Parrino, Westwego.

MAINE

Susie O. Carver, Beals.

Lucy E. Wilson, Gray.

Albert H. Butterfield, Standish.

William P. MacDonald, Vassalboro.

MINNESOTA

Peter E. Kopacek, Danube.

Peter C. Gravel, Onamia.

Richard M. Odegard, Watson.

MONTANA

Alice A. Van Campen, Reedpoint.

NEBRASKA

Hazel L. Porter, Eagle.

Albin E. Rodine, Stromsburg.

NEW JERSEY

Mabel F. McGrath, Paulsboro.

NEW MEXICO

Gertrude E. White, Melrose.

NORTH CAROLINA

John S. Chapman, Grifton.

Allie Graham Carr, Watha.

OKLAHOMA

Walter W. Hunter, Checotah.

Walter J. Lundy, Forgan.

Hester E. Hathaway, Grant.

Juanita I. Taylor, Marland.

William M. Etter, Oktaha.

Sarah L. Stanton, Putnam.

PENNSYLVANIA

Stewart A. Heffley, Boswell.

Clifford F. Steinmetz, Catasauqua.

Elizabeth A. McBride, Centerville.

Margaret E. Walsh, Lopez.

Joseph Doyle, Mildred.

William A. Thompson, Waynesboro.

TEXAS

Maggie M. Burkett, Andrews.

Cecil R. Chamberlain, Goree.

Walter L. Taylor, Morton.

Jennie Joe Barnett, Paradise.

Leta B. Eldson, Stanton.

George L. Barber, Talco.

Bertha K. Martin, Tatum.

UTAH

Emma M. Russell, Roy.

VIRGINIA

Mabel C. Crockett, Bishop.

Emma P. Heath, Esmont.

Lulu L. Griffs, Midway Island.

WEST VIRGINIA

Ruth E. Thornton, War.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Infinite and eternal Spirit, deepen our reverence for Thee and increase the divine within us that it may dominate all evil tendencies. Strengthen us for any duty and prepare us to deal justly and walk uprightly each day. We would that our affections and ambitions be hallowed as ladders by which we may reach the throne of grace. Grant that our labors in this Chamber may reveal Thyself from whom cometh the power to do wisely, justly, and well.

We praise Thee that Thou dost not pluck away our joys when we forget the Hand that gives them, but with patience Thou dost preserve us from wandering desire and disobedience. O God, we are living and dying through most difficult times; days in which men are shedding their mad blood; we wait and pray for that day which shall bring in the federation of all mankind. O Thou who didst touch nothing Thou didst not adorn, who held against every plea of station, race, or condition, in Thee were blended power and pity. In this world of madness, whose fortunes are dust and will soon crumble beneath the heavy tread of mortality, O gird the souls of men everywhere and subdue the murderous conflict between right and wrong. No shadow is so dark, no ignorance is so dense, and no sin is so base but that Thou canst meet and conquer it. In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

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

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 104) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives.

Accounts: Max Schwabe, Missouri; Robert F. Rich, Pennsylvania.

Agriculture: Clifford R. Hope, Kansas; J. Roland Kinzer, Pennsylvania; August H. Andresen, Minnesota; Anton J. Johnson, Illinois; Reid F. Murray, Wisconsin; Cliff Clevenger, Ohio; George W. Gillie, Indiana; Edwin Arthur Hall, New York; Ross Rizley, Oklahoma; William S. Hill, Colorado; John Phillips, California; Charles B. Hoeven, Iowa; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Appropriations: Walt Horan, Washington; Dean M. Gillespie, Colorado.

Banking and Currency: Jesse P. Wolcott, Michigan; Fred L. Crawford, Michigan; Ralph A. Gamble, New York; Jessie Sumner, Illinois; Frederick C. Smith, Ohio; John C. Kunzel, Pennsylvania; Henry O. Talle, Iowa; Frank L. Sundstrom, New Jersey; Clarence E. Kilburn, New York; Howard H. Buffett, Nebraska; D. Emmert Brumbaugh, Pennsylvania.

Census: J. Roland Kinzer, Pennsylvania; C. W. (Runt) Bishop, Illinois; William H. Stevenson, Wisconsin; Charles M. LaFollette, Indiana; Marion T. Bennett, Missouri; Hadwen C. Fuller, New York; Albert M. Cole, Kansas; James G. Fulton, Pennsylvania;

Civil Service: Edward H. Rees, Kansas; Charles M. LaFollette, Indiana; Christian A. Herter, Massachusetts; Charles W. Vursell, Illinois; James G. Fulton, Pennsylvania; Augustus W. Bennet, New York; John W. Byrnes, Wisconsin; Clifford P. Case, New Jersey.

Claims: J. Parnell Thomas, New Jersey; William A. Pittenger, Minnesota; John Jennings, Jr., Tennessee; J. Edgar Chenoweth, Colorado; Homer A. Ramey, Ohio; Errett P. Scrivner, Kansas; John W. Byrnes, Wisconsin; Albert M. Cole, Kansas; Clifford P. Case, New Jersey.

Coinage, Weights, and Measures: Chauncey W. Reed, Illinois; August H. Andresen, Minnesota; Joseph Clark Baldwin, New York; Rolla C. McMillen, Illinois; T. Millet Hand, New Jersey; James G. Fulton, Pennsylvania; Robert K. Henry, Wisconsin;

Disposition of Executive Papers: Bertrand W. Gearhart, California.

District of Columbia: Everett M. Dirksen, Illinois; George J. Bates, Massachusetts; Joseph Clark Baldwin, New York; Jay LeFevre, New York; Sid Simpson, Illinois; J. Glenn Beall, Maryland; Joseph P. O'Hara, Minnesota; P. W. Griffiths, Ohio; Gordon L. McDonough, California.

Education: George A. Dondero, Michigan; J. Edgar Chenoweth, Colorado; Edward O. McCowen, Ohio; Walter H. Judd, Minnesota; Max Schwabe, Missouri; Hubert S. Ellis, West Virginia; Ralph W. Gwinn, New York; Clifford P. Case, New Jersey.

Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress: Ralph A. Gamble, New York; Karl M. LeCompte, Iowa; Harris Ellsworth, Oregon; Charles W. Vursell, Illinois; Leon H. Gavin, Pennsylvania.

Elections No. 1: Clarence E. Hancock, New York; James V. Heidinger, Illinois; John Jennings, Jr., Tennessee;

Elections No. 2: Gerald W. Landis, Indiana; Rolla C. McMillen, Illinois; Augustus W. Bennet, New York; Sherman Adams, New Hampshire.

Elections No. 3: Charles A. Plumley, Vermont; Ralph A. Gamble, New York; Angier L. Goodwin, Massachusetts; Homer A. Ramey, Ohio.

Enrolled Bills: B. Carroll Reece, Tennessee; Samuel K. McConnell, Jr., Pennsylvania; Edgar A. Sharp, New York.

Expenditures in the Executive Departments: Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; George H. Bender, Ohio; Ralph E. Church, Illinois; Walter H. Judd, Minnesota; Charles M. LaFollette, Indiana; Robert F. Rich, Pennsylvania; Henry J. Latham, New York; Robert K. Henry, Wisconsin.

Flood Control: Charles R. Clason, Massachusetts; Earl Wilson, Indiana; Max Schwabe, Missouri; P. W. Griffiths, Ohio; J. Glenn Beall, Maryland; Edward O. McCowen, Ohio; Charles R. Robertson, North Dakota; T. Millet Hand, New Jersey; Sherman Adams, New Hampshire.

Foreign Affairs: Charles A. Eaton, New Jersey; Edith Nourse Rogers, Massachusetts; Robert B. Chipfield, Illinois; John M. Vorys, Ohio; Karl E. Mundt, South Dakota; Bartel J.

Jonkman, Michigan; Frances P. Bolton, Ohio; James W. Wadsworth, New York; Charles L. Gerlach, Pennsylvania; Lawrence H. Smith, Wisconsin; Chester E. Merrow, New Hampshire.

Immigration and Naturalization: Noah M. Mason, Illinois; Edward H. Rees, Kansas; Hubert S. Ellis, West Virginia; Bernard W. (Pat) Kearney, New York; Lowell Stockman, Oregon; Edward O. McCowen, Ohio; Wat Arnold, Missouri; James I. Dolliver, Iowa; Edgar A. Sharp, New York; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Indian Affairs: Karl E. Mundt, South Dakota; Robert F. Rockwell, Colorado; Hal Holmes, Washington; Wat Arnold, Missouri; Charles R. Robertson, North Dakota; Edgar A. Sharp, New York; George B. Schwabe, Oklahoma;

Insular Affairs: Richard J. Welch, California; W. Sterling Cole, New York; Fred L. Crawford, Michigan; Karl M. LeCompte, Iowa; Chester H. Gross, Pennsylvania; Walter H. Judd, Minnesota; Jay LeFevre, New York; Leon H. Gavin, Pennsylvania; P. W. Griffiths, Ohio; A. L. Miller, Nebraska; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Charles A. Wolverton, New Jersey; Pehr G. Holmes, Massachusetts; B. Carroll Reece, Tennessee; Charles A. Halleck, Indiana; Carl Hinshaw, California; Clarence J. Brown, Ohio; Evan Howell, Illinois; Leonard W. Hall, New York; Thomas D. Winter, Kansas; Joseph P. O'Hara, Minnesota; Wilson D. Gillette, Pennsylvania.

Invalid Pensions: J. Harry McGregor, Ohio; Charles M. LaFollette, Indiana; Robert Hale, Maine; Leon H. Gavin, Pennsylvania; Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; T. Millet Hand, New Jersey; Edward J. Elsaesser, New York;

Irrigation and Reclamation: Dewey Short, Missouri; Robert F. Rockwell, Colorado; William Lemke, North Dakota; Chester H. Gross, Pennsylvania; A. L. Miller, Nebraska; Lowell Stockman, Oregon; John Phillips, California; Frank A. Barrett, Wyoming; Hal Holmes, Washington;

Judiciary: Clarence E. Hancock, New York; Earl C. Michener, Michigan; John M. Robison, Kentucky; Chauncey W. Reed, Illinois; John W. Gwynne, Iowa; Louis E. Graham, Pennsylvania; Raymond S. Springer, Indiana; Joseph E. Talbot, Connecticut; Frank Fellows, Maine; Earl R. Lewis, Ohio; John Jennings, Jr., Tennessee; Angier L. Goodwin, Massachusetts.

Labor: Richard J. Welch, California; Fred A. Hartley, Jr., New Jersey; Gerald W. Landis, Indiana; Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; Joseph Clark Baldwin, New York; Samuel K. McConnell, Jr., Pennsylvania; Sherman Adams, New Hampshire;

Library: C. W. (Runt) Bishop, Illinois; John W. Heselton, Massachusetts.

Memorials: James V. Heidinger, Illinois.

Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Richard J. Welch, California; Fred Bradley, Michigan; Gordon Canfield, New Jersey; Alvin F. Weichel, Ohio; Christian A. Herter, Massachusetts; Ralph E. Church, Illinois; Ellsworth B. Buck, New York; Robert Hale, Maine; Samuel K. McConnell, Jr., Pennsylvania; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Mines and Mining: John M. Robison, Kentucky; Fred Bradley, Michigan; Gerald W. Landis, Indiana; C. W. (Runt) Bishop, Illinois; Robert F. Rockwell, Colorado; Harris Ellsworth, Oregon; Walter E. Brehm, Ohio; Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; George B. Schwabe, Oklahoma.

Naval Affairs: Harry L. Towe, New Jersey; Patents: Fred A. Hartley, Jr., New Jersey; Leslie C. Arends, Illinois; Charles A. Wolverton, New Jersey; Robert K. Henry, Wisconsin; George B. Schwabe, Oklahoma; Howard E. Campbell, Pennsylvania; Augustus W. Bennet, New York;

Pensions: William H. Stevenson, Wisconsin; Hubert S. Ellis, West Virginia; Hal Holmes, Washington; Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin; Rolla C. McMillen, Illinois; William Lemke, North Dakota; Alvin F. Weichel, Ohio; Howard E. Campbell, Pennsylvania; Henry J. Latham, New York.

Post Office and Post Roads: Fred A. Hartley, Jr., New Jersey; Noah M. Mason, Illinois; John C. Butler, New York; William C. Cole, Missouri; Harold C. Hagen, Minnesota; William H. Stevenson, Wisconsin; Walter E. Brehm, Ohio; Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; John W. Heselton, Massachusetts; Edward J. Elsaesser, New York; James I. Dolliver, Iowa.

Printing: Robert F. Rich, Pennsylvania. Public Buildings and Grounds: Pehr G. Holmes, Massachusetts; J. Harry McGregor, Ohio; Robert L. Rodgers, Pennsylvania; Earl Wilson, Indiana; Wat Arnold, Missouri; Hubert S. Ellis, West Virginia; Rolla C. McMillen, Illinois; Charles R. Robertson, North Dakota; Ralph W. Gwinn, New York.

Public Lands: Karl M. LeCompte, Iowa; J. Edgar Chenoweth, Colorado; William Lemke, North Dakota; Frank A. Barrett, Wyoming; Hal Holmes, Washington; Harris Ellsworth, Oregon; Robert F. Rockwell, Colorado; Lowell Stockman, Oregon;

Revision of the Laws: John M. Robison, Kentucky; John C. Kunkel, Pennsylvania; William Lemke, North Dakota; Homer A. Ramey, Ohio; Howard E. Campbell, Pennsylvania.

Rivers and Harbors: George A. Dondero, Michigan; William A. Pittenger, Minnesota; Robert L. Rodgers, Pennsylvania; Homer D. Angell, Oregon; George H. Bender, Ohio; Sid Simpson, Illinois; James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey; John C. Butler, New York; William C. Cole, Missouri; Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin; Gordon L. McDonough, California; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Roads: Jesse P. Wolcott, Michigan; James W. Mott, Oregon; Paul Cunningham, Iowa; J. Harry McGregor, Ohio; J. Glenn Beall, Maryland; Leon H. Gavin, Pennsylvania; Dean P. Taylor, New York; Hadwen C. Fuller, New York; Albert M. Cole, Kansas.

Territories: Homer D. Angell, Oregon; Paul Cunningham, Iowa; Dean P. Taylor, New York; A. L. Miller, Nebraska; Marion T. Bennett, Missouri; Harold C. Hagen, Minnesota; Charles R. Robertson, North Dakota; Gordon L. McDonough, California; Henry J. Latham, New York; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

War Claims: Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; Earl Wilson, Indiana; Chester H. Gross, Pennsylvania; Wat Arnold, Missouri; Ralph E. Church, Illinois; Walter E. Brehm, Ohio; John W. Byrnes, Wisconsin;

Ways and Means: Charles L. Gifford, Massachusetts; Carl T. Curtis, Nebraska.

World War Veterans' Legislation: Edith Nourse Rogers, Massachusetts; Paul Cunningham, Iowa; Bernard W. (Pat) Kearney, New York; Marion T. Bennett, Missouri; Errett P. Scrivner, Kansas; James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey; Charles W. Vursell, Illinois; Homer A. Ramey, Ohio.

Un-American Activities: J. Parnell Thomas, New Jersey; Karl E. Mundt, South Dakota; Gerald W. Landis, Indiana.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a table relating to State aviation laws.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by Judge Moscovitz of Brooklyn, N. Y. I am advised by the Printing Office that this will make about 2½ pages and will cost \$130. I therefore renew my request at this time to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include Judge Moscovitz's speech, notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of January 21 by W. G. Vorpe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

MANPOWER PROBLEMS CONFRONTING AMERICA

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the draft boards in Ohio's Twenty-second District in a very critical industrial area has voiced a very thoughtful opinion on the manpower problems confronting America, through one of its members who happens to be an effective feature writer on our largest paper, the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

I submit this article for the consideration of the Members and will insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD, with the hope that they will want to read this considered opinion of a draft board long experienced in the problems of industry.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Polish Welfare Council of Schenectady, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a department on the abolition of daylight-saving time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

HOUSING FOR CONGRESSMEN AND THEIR SECRETARIES

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce again that at 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon there will be a meeting in the committee room of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, in the Old House Office Building, to discuss the bills that are under consideration relative to trying to get places for Congressmen and their secretaries to live.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. RICH. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I wish the new Committee on Un-American Activities would investigate the request of California's attorney general, Robert W. Kennedy, to the President of the United States and the Attorney General, Francis Biddle, relative to permitting the dropping of the deportation charges against Harry Bridges.

It seems to me that if we permit these radicals to remain in this country, the first thing we know we will be taken over by them. It is time now, and I give you warning that if you do not do something to prohibit the radicals in this country from getting hold of this Government we are going to be engulfed in the greatest calamity that ever happened to this Nation of ours and the things the boys are fighting for in Europe are going to be lost here at home. Let this Committee on Un-American Activities get busy and get busy at once.

Stiffen the backs of the President and Attorney General that they do not permit Harry Bridges to remain in America. We have had enough troublemakers and rabble rousers. Now we should get rid of one radical, put him on a boat and send him to his native land.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROGERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. Skeffington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter

from a boy overseas to his father and mother.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] and in reply to the propaganda that is now going through the press, I want to serve notice now that the Committee on Un-American Activities means business. We are going to expose those subversive activities in this country from now on. I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania will stand by us and help us to get the money, since he is on the Appropriations Committee.

We are not going to permit these subversive elements that are surreptitiously organizing their underground opposition to this Government to continue without going after them with all the power we can muster.

I do not care whether they are on the Supreme Court, in the Cabinet, in Congress, in the bureau, or in private life. We are not going to permit them to destroy this Government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on January 23 I was granted permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article. I am informed by the Public Printer that this exceeds the space permitted under the rule and will cost \$104. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. HOFFMAN. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to what was said by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], permit me to express the hope that he knows what he is talking about. I have heard a lot of language since I have been here about what was to be done, and all too often I find that nothing comes of the hope. I know the gentleman means every word he said, but I wonder if he

knows what he is up against? If even he realizes how strong are the forces which are opposed to exposing un-American propaganda I hope that he overcomes the obstacles. I hope that he goes through with what he suggests. I am waiting to see. I do not come from Missouri, but still I want to be shown before I begin to cheer or relax. The opposition is sly, it is cunning, it is unscrupulous, it is determined.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan that I have realized at all times what we were up against in this fight against un-American activities. I knew what we were up against from the beginning.

Mr. HOFFMAN. May God help you. You will need His help for the Devil himself is on the other side. I hope you succeed.

Mr. RANKIN. The fight has just begun. We are going to succeed.

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

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Resident Commissioner from the Philippines [Mr. ROMULO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, Little Rock, Ark., may not rank among the larger American cities, but it holds an important place in American history. Sixty-five years ago tomorrow there was born in Little Rock an American, now in his prime, whose life story is already deathless. Gen. Douglas MacArthur is body and soul of America, but we in the Philippines lay claim to a share of his heart.

Today, on his birthday, he is in Luzon. Manila is only a long-range gunshot away. From Manila and back to Manila again—that was his pledge of faith made to 18,000,000 Filipinos, and he has kept that rendezvous.

Whatever the rest of the world may have thought when Douglas MacArthur made the promise, "I will return," in Filipino minds there was no misunderstanding. They knew he would be back.

To them, in the Philippines, he was the living symbol of the integrity of America. He had won their confidence and their trust through his faith in the Filipinos' ability to take their place among the free nations of the world.

That faith was inherited from his father, Arthur MacArthur, who as Military Governor of the Philippines in 1900, instituted the writ of habeas corpus while martial law was still in force.

Douglas MacArthur carried the precepts on—to Bataan. When comparatively few Americans believed in the ability of the Filipinos to govern themselves, MacArthur came out openly in his faith in us. When, in his own country, many considered it foolish and even dangerous to give arms to the Filipinos, he gave up all America held for him to help us, in the Philippines, to organize our army.

In 1934 he came to Manila and surrounding him then like a halo were the glories of five campaigns in World War No. 1, the Rainbow Division triumphs

in France, his career as superintendent at West Point and as Chief of Staff of the United States. He began the work of forming half a million men into an army that could, if need came, be the vanguard of American freedom in the Far East.

He remained in the Philippines to see the job of defense through. What held him there? His knowledge of the true character of Japan. He knew that the day would come when his America would need a loyal Philippines that had been trained to fight America's way. He was convinced that the Philippines could be defended.

It was not easy to arm a subject people. He had, too, to meet with the scoffers who opposed all he tried to do, who spoke of the Philippine Army as "MacArthur's Boy Scouts," who laughed at the theory that America might some day require a base in the Pacific, because that delightful little island, Japan, would never dare attack America. And there were those representatives of imperialism who said "the Filipinos will yet turn these guns against Americans."

Douglas MacArthur knew the Filipinos. He was their friend; they were his. He answered his critics, "You are talking nonsense; the Filipinos will use their guns, yes; for America, if ever the time shall come."

Thank God, when the time came, enough Filipinos were trained and armed to help him hold until the last words came from Corregidor:

Men fighting under the banner of an unshakable faith are made of something more than flesh, but they are not made of impervious steel; the flesh must yield.

All he believed in has been vindicated by time. All he has done has been justified.

For years he had said that when Japan did strike, it would be treacherously. He was justified when Japan launched aggression in Indochina and the mobilization of his Philippine Army was ordered, and President Roosevelt placed him in command of the United States Army Forces in the Far East. He was justified 6 months later when, with no announcement of war, with peace words on their lips and their fingers on the trigger, Japan struck at Pearl Harbor, halfway between San Francisco and Manila.

The strategy he followed is history. It is almost personal history, for much of it was done at the beginning without defenses and with empty hands. The enemy had a hundred bombers to one of ours, and a thousand fighters to our one. They had equipment and all the panoply of war. The Japanese had everything they needed to drive democracy out of the Far East.

We who saw him on Corregidor, with that worn, embroidered, much-maligned cap pushed back, no protection under that lethal sky, counting the Japanese planes dropping their bombs over our ravaged Rock—there on that nub of stone in Manila Bay stood America, endangered, entrapped, but indomitable.

We knew, in the Philippines, how at first he could not bring himself to leave Corregidor even under orders. We heard of that strange imperiled journey by PT boat and by plane to Australia, and

how, landing there, he sent back his pledge: "I will return." In these words we heard America.

That pledge was spoken for the world to hear, but in the Philippines my people took it as a promise and a command. Japanese propagandists dinned into their ears that America had forgotten them. But they knew MacArthur would not forget. They knew America would not let them down. They knew the American people would back him up with men and materials. Once America was aroused, the enemy's doom would be sealed. On his word, they began fighting.

The guerrilla movement began on that promise. The Filipinos gathered up their remnant belongings and scraps of metal and took to the hills and made their own guns, ammunition, and knives. They had no leaders in the beginning. Only his promise.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMULO. I yield.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. A corollary to the gentleman's statement that the Filipinos would not let America down, which has been a great satisfaction to all America, is that America knew the Filipinos would not let America down.

Mr. ROMULO. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

But behind that promise were the words of their steadfast friend, President Roosevelt, addressed to the Filipino people: "Your independence will be established and protected." That galvanized Filipino resistance. It led them through the jungles and along the cliffs, and into attacks on the Japanese that continued unceasingly for 2½ years.

The promise of a man separated from them by 2,000 miles of sea held them together, and the assurance given them by the President of the United States regarding their freedom led them on, while everywhere else, in the Far East, natives turned against the white man who had lost face and power.

Two and a half years went by while they kept on fighting and their faith continued. They knew MacArthur, the man. They knew his word was his bond.

While they kept the faith with him, what was he doing in Australia?

He had been sent to Australia with orders to hold that endangered continent. Without MacArthur, without American power, Australia might have become a second Bataan. The Australians knew that. They hailed him as a savior. Australian soldiers were fighting elsewhere; white interests were fighting on European land, and the continent down under was practically undefended.

All this time Japan was growing richer and huger and more terrible.

General MacArthur prepared to hold Australia, while Corregidor collapsed, and in Melbourne, we saw one another's tears. Again, he was building bricks without straw.

Men, equipment, guns, planes—all these were lacking. The vast distances out there were his enemies. How could his frail defenses span and hold.

Again, he not only held, he attacked. At first the faint pattern of his offensive may have been imperceptible from Amer-

ica, but the Southwest Pacific area felt the shape of it as mighty pincer arms, built out of practically nothing in the beginning, began stretching out over hundreds of miles.

He had to make every man and every mile count. Not a man died without need. Fighting an entrenched and powerful enemy, MacArthur's lines cleared the air, sea, and jungle ahead mile by mile, cut supply lines, sucked in the invading forces, felt their way through starvation, blockade, and superior forces past the Japanese objectives: Gona, Buna, Lae, Salamaua, Finschhafen, New Guinea, Kolombangara, Rabaul, Hollandia, Biak, and then Leyte, Mindoro, Marinduque, and Luzon—where in history has one man done so much with so little?

When on Christmas he sent his message to his men, he revealed a source of his power: "On this Christmas Day, the anniversary of the birth of our Lord, Jesus Christ, I pray that a merciful God may preserve and bless each one of you."

That came from a deeply religious man who regarded the protection of every man set under him as a holy responsibility.

We saw that on Leyte. He had come back to the Philippines, with all the might of America at his back, with President Sergio Osmeña at his side, into whose hands he was delivering the liberated Philippines, a freed land turned over to a freed people. The guerrillas, without distinction, rallied behind their beloved President, and we have in the Philippines today one united people synchronizing their efforts with those of the American forces to expel the hated enemy.

Did General MacArthur value this unparalleled military power given him by his America? God knows he has, for it has held the answer to his prayers. But he valued, too, the little crosses and the unmarked graves all over the Philippines where Filipinos lie who trusted him, fought for America, died for freedom. America gave him its might. To the Filipinos he has said, as a friend speaks: "Give me your tears."

Now he was back on Leyte, its liberator. There he spoke the first words: "I have returned. By the grace of Almighty God our forces stand again on Philippine soil—soil consecrated in the blood of our two peoples."

Words spoken for Filipinos echoing a promise, "I have returned." In Tagalog: "Bumalik ako." Words that reached into the barrios and jungle hiding places all over the Philippines.

He said, on Leyte, when matters progressed with apparent slowness, "I could take Leyte in 2 weeks. But I will not take by sacrifice what I can win by strategy. I owe too much to the mothers and wives in America to risk needlessly the lives of their men."

And he pointed out a Filipino guerrilla and an American soldier walking arm in arm, and said, "See, in Washington the Filipino patriots fought for equality. You won social equality on Bataan."

Mr. Speaker, today he is on Luzon and what can be said of him? He is a soldier, and as a soldier, he is one who apparently destroyed. He has not destroyed; he has

built. Through his understanding of the simple faith of a simple people he has salvaged understanding between two worlds.

You of America, is it not a matter of national pride to know that in a section of the world where white men had lost dignity and were being trampled under the advancing juggernaut of Japanese destruction, that one American remained in the hearts of 18,000,000 Filipinos as an emblem of all they most admired? The gulf between Orient and Occident was cleverly widened by Japanese propaganda, but Douglas MacArthur, as an individual, bridged that gulf, with no sudden protest of friendship, but with a kindly faith expressed from the beginning in a nation and its people.

His sympathetic understanding of the aspirations of a people—it is that that has made him a great statesman as well as a great soldier. In the world today this is a vital demonstration of the strategy of faith. Those who are considered the leaders of thought in the powerful nations, let them show an understanding of the dreams of the oppressed minorities and build through that understanding the permanent rungs that lead to a permanent peace.

Little Rock, Ark. Honor that small American city. It gave the world Douglas MacArthur, who poured over a wounded nation the ointment of human understanding and healed a chasm between continents with a promise as well as a sword. Men like him gave democracy to the world. Men like him will eventually put an end to war.

Mr. Speaker, what can we say of him? Soldier? Statesman? Far-visioned fighter for the peace? Builder of the human values, keeper of the faith? We can sum this up in simpler terms. He is an American, born at Little Rock, Ark., trained by the finest American savants, reared in the simple American code, seasoned in peace and in war. To America he is the hero-strategist who held the Stars and Stripes in its prideful place in the Far East. To us in the Philippines, he is you. He is America.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight Saturday to file a report on H. R. 1752.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Philadelphia Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address on soil conservation delivered by Mr. George Ver Steeg.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include therein a tribute to General Chennault.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE LATE LT. CLYDE DOYLE, JR.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the House that the reason for the absence of our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] is due to the fact that on last Sunday his only son, serving in the Army Air Corps of the United States as an instructor in high-altitude flying at Myrtle Beach, S. C., met with a fatal accident in a crash of his plane. He never regained consciousness and passed away on Tuesday night.

Clyde Doyle, Jr., had served as a first lieutenant in the Army Air Corps for some years. He went through the Alaskan and the Aleutian campaigns, was twice shot down, was wounded, and was awarded the Air Medal. He served his country with courage, with devotion, and with distinction. He gave his life to his country's cause in line of duty. I felt it no more than right to state to the Members of the House the great loss that our colleague has suffered and to express, as I know I do, the sentiments of every Member here of the sympathy and solemn and humble honor that we pay both to him, to his wife, and to their gallant son for what they have given to this Nation.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I do this for the purpose of asking the majority leader what the program for next week is, insofar as he can now tell us.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is proposed to start the debate on House Resolution 107, for consideration of H. R. 1752, which is the bill reported out of the Committee on Military Affairs relating to the manpower situation, and to continue the consideration thereof until it is disposed of. There is nothing else on the program for next week that I know of at the present time. It is quite probable that the consideration of that bill will take the greater part of the week, if not the whole week. There is a bill which may be reported out of the Committee on Appropriations in connection with the Farm Census, and if a rule is reported on that bill, and if this manpower bill is disposed of in time to con-

sider it, that bill may come up next week. I assume the Committee on Rules will grant a rule on the May bill so that consideration of that bill will be in order for Monday. I have no knowledge as to how long general debate will take. That is a matter the members of the committee will have to agree upon, and whatever they do will certainly be agreeable to me.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman.

THE SIXTH ARMY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that this House welcomes the messages that every once and awhile come from General Romulo, the distinguished Delegate from the Philippine Islands. They give information relative to the war situation in the Pacific which is needed, enriching, and informative to the whole membership.

The other day I listened with a good deal of interest to a résumé of a trip to Italy and to the Italian front by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE], in which she very ably depicted the situation there and described what our troops are doing, and how they are feeling, and some of the sacrifices they are making. I could not help but feel, as she painted a very illuminating picture of the Italian front, that there was another front so often ignored and forgotten. Instead of the Fifth Army, which is holding forth so admirably and well in Italy, it is in this case the Sixth Army which is guarding the ramparts of the Pacific and is showing an increasing aggressiveness against the Empire of the Japanese.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thought I would rise today to pay a tribute to the men in the Pacific for what they are doing. It comes a little close to me—and I am sure you will admit that I am speaking in all sincerity—since my own brother is the Infantry captain who commanded the first company that landed on Leyte Island in that campaign. Prior to that, he had seen combat duty for over 2 years. He has since been wounded and removed from the scene of action. Therefore, it is with a particular interest that I rise today to pay tribute to the Sixth Army and to those valiant men who have gone forth from the west coast and who are scattered all over that broad expanse of water and of land guarding the ramparts of America to the west.

At this time I think it is only proper to say that the G. I. bill of rights which was passed last year, and which the House received great praise throughout the country for passing, is in a rather stagnant state of affairs. The Seventy-eighth Congress went home imbued with great satisfaction that they had given the returning soldiers of World War No. 2 all the rights and privileges they would ever need. Yet I think it is only right for us to pause today at the beginning of a new Congress and remark that unless a vigilant look-out is maintained the G. I. bill of rights will become only a scrap of paper. That great Magna Carta

for veterans which was passed by this House last year will sink into oblivion and will not be observed or followed and carried out as the last Congress really meant it to be carried out. We must continue the vigilance we have exercised in the past.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution directing the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to conduct a continuous investigation and study of the manner in which the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is being administered. My resolution provides that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation is authorized and directed to conduct a continuous investigation and study of the administration of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, which is the G. I. bill, with a view to determining whether such act is being carried out in accordance with the intention of the Congress, and make from time to time such reports thereon to the House as the committee deems advisable.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I am a member of the committee to which the gentleman refers, and I am interested in his resolution. I think it is perhaps a good idea. May I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that at our last committee meeting, which I believe was on Monday of his week, General Hines, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, appeared before the committee and promised us that within a few days we would have a comprehensive report from the Veterans' Administration as to what has been the practical effect of the G. I. bill of rights up to the present time. They are conducting a survey. It may be that after we get that we will see that some other things need to be done. I think perhaps it would be a good idea for the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to make some unannounced visits to some of these veterans' hospitals. That has not been done since I have been in Congress, and not within my knowledge. Some of us have individually done so, but without a great deal of effect.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is a distinguished member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, and is able to speak with some authority, since he served in the last Congress and had a lot to do with the passage of the G. I. bill of rights. May I ask him if he does not feel that continuous vigilance must be maintained on the part of this Congress in order to see that these three fundamental aims, namely, rehabilitation, hospitalization, and reeducation of the veterans, are put into effect?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I agree with the gentleman. Of course, that is true. There are some things about this G. I. bill of rights that are not working very well, especially the loan provision. No loan has been made in the State of Missouri, for example, from which I come.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is one reason, I might say to the gentleman, that I have introduced this resolution today, because I feel it is incumbent upon this new Congress, and upon the new Members who have just taken their oaths of office. It is incumbent upon the men who have just been elected and who will ably serve, to look into the situation and keep abreast of it.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have evidence that the G. I. bill of rights is not being administered in accordance with the terms of the bill?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes; I have a lot of evidence.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is the evidence in regard to the loan title of the bill only?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Not only from the loan standpoint but in a number of other respects. There has been increasing evidence in my own particular section, for example that the G. I. bill is not being adhered to in many cases. Let me give the gentleman an example. I visited one of the northern counties in my district and I talked with a man in a bank, a bank officer. I asked him if there had been any move on the part of the Government authorities to educate him along the lines of veterans loans and his answer was that he had not heard anything about it. He said that little attempt had been made in that direction, so far as he could understand, although he had had numerous inquiries on the part of veterans who had already been discharged as to their privileges and what they could obtain under the G. I. bill of rights. He said he could give them little information because he had no opportunity to be cognizant of the situation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am glad to get the information. I will say to the gentleman the only information I have had on it is that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is endeavoring to see that the veteran gets the loan. This complaint has come to me, however, that too much red tape and too many regulations have already been issued in regard to the loan provisions of the bill which discourage the veterans from even applying for the loan.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I thank the gentleman. I know that he had a lot to do with the passage of this bill. I know that I can count on him to keep a vigilant eye on the future situation. I am sure that he will be in sympathy with the provisions of this resolution.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would like to know if the gentleman has had any complaint or any inquiry in regard to the fact that the bill as it now stands provides that the boy who wants to take advantage of the educational title of the bill and also wishes to take advantage of the loan title of the bill cannot do so if he goes to college for 2 years or more because the loan must be applied for within 2 years after the date of discharge.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot mention any examples specifically as

far as that goes, but I think the veteran or the soldier as he is discharged from the service has absolutely no knowledge of the provisions of that bill or at least he does have very little knowledge of its provisions. I have had boys come to me who had no idea of what it was about. I do not know what the trouble is, perhaps it is because we need more people in the Veterans' Administration or perhaps it is because we need a better executive procedure. Whatever it is, I am not prepared to state at this time, but I am simply introducing this resolution to charge the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and also the House of Representatives to keep in touch with the veterans. I hardly need to point out that unless we do keep in touch with the returning veterans they are going to turn this whole House over, as well as the entire country, in another 2 or 4 years, because they are not going to permit the Nation to sink into the abyss it did as in 1919 and 1920.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield briefly to the gentleman, and then I would like to proceed.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members of the House as well as the members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation would appreciate any suggestion from the gentleman from New York to make the G. I. bill of rights more effective. I want to ask him what he would think about this proposal at the present time. As the bill left the House of Representatives and went to the conference all that the veteran would have needed to do under title 3 of the bill to get a loan was to go into the local bank, or the local lending agency, and lay down his papers and the date of his discharge, and if it was approved as a good loan they would make it immediately and it was guaranteed under the law. There was no contact which had to be made with Washington or the Veterans' Administration unless and until the veteran defaulted in the payment of the loan and then the Government was called upon to make good. When we went into conference we had to surrender that provision of the House bill and adopted the Senate version, which resulted, as I understand it, in two applications being necessary to be forwarded to Washington, involving two transactions costing \$15 each charged to the veteran before he could ever get that loan. Does the gentleman not believe that the Government in the long run would save money if we went back and adopted the original House version of that bill and that any extra amount that would be lost to the Government by the loans which were not well made by the local lending agency would be offset by the saving of the extra cost to the taxpayer because of the red tape with which the bill is now being administered?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I think the gentleman makes a very good point there. I decline to yield further for the reason that I have a number of subjects that I want to discuss. I only have a limited time.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will yield briefly.

Mr. KEARNEY. Has the gentleman received any complaints from his constituents on the operation of title II, I believe it is, the educational feature of the bill?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes; I have received a lot of complaints. I have not time to mention them now, except to say that the 24-year-old clause that was put into title II has proved very unpopular in some cases with which I have had to deal.

Mr. KEARNEY. Does the gentleman know how many students have entered college under that provision?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I have no way of knowing.

Mr. KEARNEY. For the gentleman's information, it is around 13,000.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I hope the gentleman is sure of that.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot resist yielding to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. The thought entered my mind that while eternal vigilance is very proper does not the gentleman believe that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation has done an admirable job?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Oh; I hope the gentleman will not think I am criticizing the committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman not believe they are capable without the powers of investigation to follow up and see that the law is administered as intended by Congress?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. No; I disagree with the gentleman; I feel that they should have the power.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman realize that his resolution constitutes a condemnation of General Hines and the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman tries to put words into my mouth that I have not uttered. I have the greatest respect in the world for General Hines. I believe he is doing a fine job. Maybe he needs more people to help him; I do not know. But I am saying that unless the House keeps a vigilant eye on what becomes of the G. I. bill of rights the returning veteran is going to lose the privileges which have already been accorded him by the Seventy-eighth Congress. I submit that it is going to take a lot of perfecting legislation, a lot of supplemental legislation. I do not know who is going to prepare it, whether it will be the World War Veterans' Committee or some other committee, but it must be brought out. I hope I may have the cooperation of the gentleman from Massachusetts in getting the matter before the House. I am going to count on him to do that.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman can rest assured that there are plenty of veterans of the last war in this House who will protect the interests of the veterans; and there are veterans of this war in the House already. The only thought I had in mind was whether or

not the gentleman believed this great committee of the House of which we are all so proud was incapable under its general powers as a standing committee to do the very thing the gentleman had in mind.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I hope the gentleman will not read into my remarks the idea that I am criticizing this committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not saying that; I am asking the gentleman a question.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I wonder if he saw the current motion picture *This Is the Army*. If he did he will remember a scene where a G. I. stood behind the curtain of the stage and presumably was looking at the President who was supposed to be speaking; and the soldier said: "I wish I could go out and shake his hand, for he is the man who raised our pay." I will tell you who gave him his raise, who it was that raised him from \$21 to \$42 and then to \$50; it was this House of Representatives who gave the boys their raise. I appreciate the fact that possibly we do not rate the same kind of propaganda that others or glorified buildings do. I see the gentleman from Mississippi on his feet. I know that he is the man who introduced the resolution to increase their pay from \$42 to \$50 a month; and I think a lot of the credit should go to him along with the rest of us.

Mr. McCORMACK. Sure, but—

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield further.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes, for one only.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I take it, my friend from New York is very well satisfied with General Hines' Administration, and he does not want General Hines investigated, does he?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is not the point, it is not the point at all. This resolution does not authorize any investigation of General Hines. The gentleman is well aware of that.

Mr. McCORMACK. How can a resolution containing such investigatory powers as this be adopted and not result in an investigation of General Hines and the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If the gentleman will only read my resolution I shall be glad to talk it over with him later.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am in agreement with the gentleman's basic proposition.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. My only purpose is to take a step in the direction of protecting the veterans in their rights.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have more confidence in the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation than the gentleman has.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. I wish to make this observation: That regardless of the ability of the Veterans' Committee, which no one denies; regardless of the num-

ber of World War veterans there may be in the House; that this still might not prevent from happening in the future the same thing which happened at the time the Economy Act was passed. At that time, notwithstanding the fact that there were many veterans of the First World War in the House, they were not able to protect many of the veterans of that war from unjust treatment. The same thing could happen again under this administration. For this administration to deny thousands of World War No. 1 veterans their just dues under the guise of economy, would really be funny if it was not so tragic.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is absolutely right; and I continue to restate the premise I have stated before: That unless this House continues to be vigilant, unless they bring out perfecting legislation to extend, to increase and to augment the provisions of the G. I. bill, to see that the veterans' bill of rights, his Magna Charta of privileges is carried out, it will fail in its final program, and I know that the House will bear with me.

Now, let me continue.

I yield to no man in this House in the matter of interest in the veterans. I stand on my record of helping the boys in the service. I am happy and sincere in the hope and the thought that the future will paint a very glowing picture for them.

When they return they must be able to take advantage of these great educational, hospital, and other facilities which the Congress has provided. Unfortunately, however, there was proposed not long ago a project of such great international consequence that if it is carried through there will not be a single veteran in the country taken care of beyond being made a W. P. A. employee. I refer to the idea of constructing the St. Lawrence seaway. Take it from me, if that project ever goes into effect there will not be a veterans' hospital, there will not be a rehabilitation scheme put into effect, there will not be anything done in any small district in any section of the entire country. I submit it would be the greatest debacle, the greatest outrage, the greatest misfortune to the American people if the St. Lawrence seaway project is constructed, and I want to reiterate that at this time.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I suppose the gentleman alludes to the fact that if the St. Lawrence seaway is opened, it will permit the importation of cheaply made foreign goods into this country?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am not referring to that. I say to the gentleman that I am pointing out it would take millions of people to inaugurate the construction of that project and it would take away the feasibility of local projects, such as the construction of veterans' hospitals, rehabilitation schemes, or educational centers which have been proposed in the G. I. bill and all the other projects that the country

is so anxious to see put into effect after the boys get back again.

Mr. DONDERO. The cost of the St. Lawrence seaway to the United States Government would be equal to the cost of 1 day for running this war.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That may be true, but I am not arguing that point. What I am pointing out is that if the St. Lawrence seaway project goes into effect we might as well kiss the G. I. bill good-bye because there will not be enough men or enough personnel to do anything else.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I wonder if the gentleman will agree with me that the moving picture, "*This Is the Army*," would be much more true to life if there were a picture of our colleague from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] put in there instead of a picture of the President of the United States when that soldier thanked him for what has been done for the American servicemen?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes. I will add to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] a number of other distinguished men in the House who I think should be recognized also.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know just exactly how the gentleman got the disabled soldiers mixed up with the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Of course, the gentleman comes from Mississippi and he is probably interested in the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I am.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is where we differ.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] that I am a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and I am afraid I know as much about the St. Lawrence project as he does.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I think so.

Mr. RANKIN. The St. Lawrence seaway would not cost the Government \$1 in the long run. It would pay for itself out of the revenues derived from power.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I did not say a word about cost. What I am talking about is the personnel necessary to construct it. I come from the southern part of New York State and there would not be a single person left there. They would all be taken out in order to construct the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. RANKIN. The people the gentleman refers to, the people of New York, are overcharged for their electricity \$195,000,000 last year.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I hope the gentleman will not get into rural electrification.

Mr. RANKIN. The St. Lawrence seaway project would relieve the people of New York of that overcharge.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I want the farmers of my district to get rural electricity.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the recent candidate of his party for President has come out as a strong advocate of the St. Lawrence seaway?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am not arguing for the candidate of the Republican Party. I am talking for my own district down in southern New York.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, excuse me.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Would the gentleman mind advising the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the candidate was not elected? Evidently he does not know that yet. That whole doctrine was repudiated.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman does not know that there was an election.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Aside from Mr. Dewey as candidate on the Republican ticket for President, as Governor of the State of New York he has come out for the St. Lawrence seaway project.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am sorry the gentleman brings the Governor into this. I am talking about my own section.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In his capacity as Governor of the State of New York he advocates this.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. This discussion has wandered far afield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. It certainly has.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. There is one thing that has not been mentioned here and that is the progress of the Hall Furlough Clubs. I call the attention of the House to the fact that the gentleman has manifested his friendship for the veterans long before he introduced this resolution because up in his district in New York, whatever the number is, there are a lot of veterans who are aware of that fact and they are organizing.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, and I represent the Thirty-seventh New York District.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Does the gentleman from New York admit that Governor Dewey is his leader?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. He is my leader; yes.

Mr. MCCORMACK. On this occasion the gentleman is with the leader until the vote comes.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I do not know anything about that. If he will examine my record the gentleman will find it reflects the strength of my convictions. That is how I vote, always have voted, and expect to vote as long as I am in Congress.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am not so sure but what Mr. Roosevelt is in accord with the gentleman's ideas about the St. Lawrence waterway, because during the first 8 or 9 years of his administration, when he had a rubber-stamp Congress, he could have put the St. Lawrence waterway through Congress and put it into operation. But he did not do it, so I am rather inclined to believe he is with the gentleman.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That may be, that is his privilege, but that is not the point. I am with my district. I am sure about that.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well now, the gentleman said he was with his district. I hope the district is with the gentleman, too.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is the best way to have it, I think.

We are getting quite a distance from the veterans. No veterans' hospitals will be built anywhere in the country unless we provide in this House for the adequate construction of rehabilitation and medical centers for the veterans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. Does the gentleman know that the so-called G. I. bill of rights in its very first title covers an appropriation of \$500,000,000 for rehabilitation purposes?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Nevertheless, the gentleman knows that the request for these moneys will have to come continually before this House, and the House will have to remain in a friendly atmosphere and have due regard for the veterans in order to put these moneys through. Further, as perfecting legislation is required to help in these projects, to give every man a college education to assure every returning veteran of proper medical care, to assure every boy who returns and takes off the uniform that he will get a square deal and a good job under the sun, there will have to continue to be in this House a vigilant attitude on the part of the membership. Otherwise, the rights and privileges which have been given him un-

der this bill will slip into oblivion and will cease to interest the country.

I submit that if the forces of reaction ever raise their ugly heads as they did after the last war to cause the veteran once more to slink about the streets of every city in the United States in a jaded uniform, selling apples and looking askance at every citizen, it will be one of the most disastrous days that this Nation has ever known. If it stalks the Nation again, disaster and trouble and future misfortune will be the lot of America.

Let me point out what happened in Germany after the last World War when those in power, those who were charged with the employment of the veterans, met the challenge of a returning army of several millions of men with nothing but bread lines, and unemployment. They took the matter into their own hands and gave ear to the dangerous and diabolical ideologies of nazi-ism and fascism that swept over Europe.

The refusal of those in authority to recognize any G. I. bill on the continent of Europe after the last war was the cause of the rise of the hydra-headed viciousness which we are fighting in this war to put down and to conquer for all times.

I hope and pray sincerely that this will never happen again in Europe or anywhere else. I hope that the farsightedness of the House of Representatives, upon whom the responsibilities will have to fall, will prevent the repetition of such a condition.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. Is the gentleman contemplating an investigation of the hospitalization of World War No. 1 veterans and the hospitalization facilities for the veterans of World War No. 2?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. This resolution, I will say to the gentleman from Indiana, simply contemplates a vigilant and a continuous investigation on the part of the World War Veterans' Committee to assure the returning veteran a square deal, of a place in the sun, of an opportunity to earn his daily bread, to raise a family, and to have a chance to enjoy the beneficences of America, and of a just and durable peace. God grant this great Nation of ours can take her place once more in the world, in a world of peace, to assure a course which will guarantee to all nations the spirit of fraternal love which will insure peace, liberty, equality, and fraternity to unborn generations and to millions yet to come.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL] be permitted to extend his remarks in the Record and include a speech delivered by the Honorable Robert C. Moore, of Carlinville, Ill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. IZAC). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the *RECORD* and include a news story entitled "Labor" from the *Birmingham News*.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the *RECORD* and include an excerpt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the *RECORD* and include an article from the *Philadelphia Record* by the Reverend Daniel A. Poling.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for today. I desire to relinquish that time, and ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Bryson] is recognized for 20 minutes.

RATIFICATION OF TREATIES BY MAJORITY VOTE

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, several times since the Constitution of the United States was originally adopted fundamental changes have been made by amendments. More than a century and a half ago by the original terms of our Constitution it was provided that treaties should be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the United States Senate. That clause in the Constitution remains the same as the day on which the organic law of the new Republic came into being. Twenty-one times by as many amendments has the original instrument been altered. But one-third and one of the membership of the Senate can still reject a treaty negotiated by the Executive, even if it be wholeheartedly approved by the vast majority of our people.

The Judiciary Committee of the House in the last session of the Seventy-eighth Congress held extensive hearings on House Joint Resolution 320, introduced by the able chairman of that committee, the Honorable HATTON W. SUMNERS, of Texas. Similar resolutions introduced by a number of our distinguished colleagues were also considered involving the same subjects. After painstaking consideration of the voluminous testimony presented by distinguished historians, scholars, and publicists, the committee favorably reported the resolution

with a recommendation that it do pass. Unfortunately the measure died on the calendar due to the expiration of the session. Our chairman has now introduced a new House resolution designated as House Joint Resolution 60, followed by a number of other similar resolutions introduced by as many of our colleagues, proposing a like amendment to the Constitution.

Briefly, the resolution proposes to amend the Constitution so that treaties may be ratified by a majority vote of both the Senate and the House. Before such a change can be made the resolution must also be passed by the Senate and approved by the States. That is the process laid down by the Constitution itself to govern proposed changes. It is a wise provision, since it affords ample time for deliberation and debate in the legislature. With a majority of State legislatures meeting in 1945, this is a particularly appropriate time to submit the proposed change in the Constitution for their consideration.

We may expect to hear arguments against the proposed change in the method of ratifying treaties. Some such arguments will be presented on this floor. Others will be heard in the Senate, whose Members naturally are jealous of their prerogatives. Difficulties stand in the way of the proposed constitutional change, or reform. But, my friends, the fact that resistance may be expected in the other branch of the Congress should not discourage any Member of the House who feels that this outmoded clause of the Constitution should be altered and the power of life and death over treaties removed from a minority of the Senate.

Every good American is proud of the Constitution of the United States. As a whole it has long been accepted as a model by free people everywhere. Any attempt to weaken this great instrument would be widely and properly resented and opposed by thinking citizens from the Atlantic to the Pacific and the Great Lakes to the Gulf. By the same token, any sincere effort to strengthen the Constitution by making it more responsive to the will of the rank and file of Americans would be welcomed and supported. The change now proposed definitely is designed to strengthen the Constitution. Otherwise I would not today be giving my support to this joint resolution and urging with the earnestness of which I am capable that the House pass it by a resounding majority.

A very casual search of the history of the Constitution and conditions which prevailed at the time of its adoption leaves no room for doubt that the clause denying to the House of Representatives a voice in the ratification of treaties and requiring a two-thirds vote of the Senate was the result of compromise. It was a question whether the new Republic could have a Constitution without this provision governing the ratification of treaties. The Original States were jealous of each other on the one hand and jealous of the Central Government on the other hand. The smaller States were fearful lest they be too greatly dominated by the larger States. All expressed fear lest the Federal Government be made so strong as to endanger or

unduly limit the rights of the several States.

When the Constitutional Convention met in 1787 controversy was rife not only on this particular matter, but on other major issues coming before that great assembly. Months were required to bring into being an instrument which a majority of the delegates were willing to sign. Indeed controversy over various issues became so heated at times that members of the Convention despaired of arriving at agreement. Fortunately for that generation and those which have followed, all the States sent as delegates to the Convention outstanding men endowed with the wisdom to know that a compromise was justified when unanimity could not be attained. Otherwise, the new Republic must have waited for years longer to acquire a workable fundamental law.

One issue raised in the Constitutional Convention was that it was called for the sole purpose of amending the Articles of Confederation, which had not been working satisfactorily either from the standpoint of the States or the Federal Government. The wiser men among the delegates demonstrated that the writing of a new Constitution amounted to nothing more than the amending of the Articles of Confederation. A few diehards grew weary and returned to their homes and therefore were not present when the final draft of the new Constitution was signed.

I was greatly interested to learn that the clauses of the Constitution governing the election of Members of the United States was the subject of much controversy in the constitutional convention. Strong men earnestly urged that Members of the other branch of the Congress be chosen by the people directly, just as Members of the House of Representatives are chosen. This issue was the subject of much debate and deliberation and like the clause governing the ratification of treaties, threatened to split the assembly wide open. Ultimately the delegates determined to have Senators chosen by the legislatures of the several States. Senators were so chosen until comparatively recent years, when as a result of the adoption of the seventeenth amendment they were elected directly by the people.

Why was that change made? Primarily because the direct election of Senators by vote of the people of their respective States was the more democratic method of procedure. Who will say that in submitting to the States a joint resolution providing for the direct election of Senators, the Congress sought to weaken the Constitution? Who will rise today and seriously tell the American people that we should return to the original method and have Senators chosen only by the legislatures of the States? That question answers itself. The people of the United States feel that the Constitution was strengthened when the seventeenth amendment gave them the right to determine directly by their votes who should represent the States in the United States Senate. The world and society move forward, not backward.

Today we are asked to vote for submission to the States a proposed amendment to the Constitution providing that treaties shall be ratified by majority vote of the membership of both the Senate and the House. Why is it proposed that the House have a voice in treaty ratification? The reason is not far to seek. Members of the House of Representatives are closest to the people for the simple reason that every other year they must give an accounting to their constituents, while Members of the Senate need give an accounting only every sixth year. Since Members of the House must maintain closer touch with the people in their respective districts, they necessarily are in position better to know what the people are thinking concerning major current issues involving the welfare of this great Nation of ours.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, very recently the people of the United States went to the voting places and chose the President who shall preside over the Nation for the next 4 years. They voted to keep in office during that trying period in our history the man who had carried the burdens of that high office for 12 long years. Not a few Members of the House thought there should be a change at the head of the Government and that a younger man should take over the heavy burdens of the Presidency. A majority of the people determined otherwise and voted to keep Franklin D. Roosevelt in the White House. Those who honestly felt that a change was in order and even overdue were not happy over the result of the voting. But, my friends, they accepted that result without question. Why? Because a majority of the sovereign voters of this great country had expressed their will.

We elected our President by majority vote. Members of the House of Representatives were chosen by majority vote. The one-third of the membership of the Senate were elected by majority vote on that same November day.

It is interesting to note in this connection that a majority of the men and women in uniform, whether in training camps in this country or in combat zones overseas, who could not get home to vote, cast their ballots for the reelection of President Roosevelt, and, by the same token, for the election or reelection of many Members of this body.

And while we are speaking of women in uniform voting it is well to recall that the members of the Constitutional Convention in their wisdom made no provision for the participation of women in political affairs. But for the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution women would still be denied the vote in this great and free land, and we would not number among our Members the gracious and able women who now sit with us on equal terms and help make the laws of the land.

My friends, a fundamental change in the Constitution was required before Members of the Senate could be elected by direct vote of the people. An equally fundamental change was required to bestow the right of suffrage upon the women of America.

Every Member of this body recalls vividly that the Bill of Rights—the first 10 amendments—was not in the Constitution as originally drafted and ratified. Every Member likewise recalls that the Bill of Rights embodies reservations insisted upon by the Original States in certifying their ratification of the Constitution. No Member of this Chamber or of any other legislative body would have the temerity to rise today and say the addition of the Bill of Rights weakened the Constitution or to advocate the repeal of the first 10 amendments to that great instrument.

Yet today when supporters of this joint resolution seek further to strengthen the Constitution by modernizing the machinery for the ratification of treaties and make it more responsive to the will of the people of the United States we find some voicing objections. To my mind they are merely conjuring up mental ghosts. They forget that when the Constitution was adopted most of the continent was little known to a majority of the relatively small population of the young Republic. Communications were meager and slow, not only between the States but between the Federal Government and the governments of other nations.

Times have changed since those rigorous early days. We have the railroad, the telegraph, the telephone, radio with television just around the corner, and aviation, of which few even dreamed in 1787. Verily the world has grown smaller. Space has been annihilated. We know within hours—sometimes within minutes—happenings in countries separated from us by oceans thousands of miles wide. Every day untold numbers of our military airplanes cross those oceans, many of them raining death and destruction on countries whose tyrannical governments sought to deny Americans the right to continue to live as a free people.

Millions of the flower of American youth face ruthless enemies in combat zones literally all over the world, fighting to preserve the citadel of liberty—fighting to put an end forever to the danger of military aggression which 5 years ago plunged the world into the bloodiest holocaust in all history.

Yet some Americans—not all of them Members of the United States Senate—tell us that we must not tamper with the Constitution by attempting to modernize the machinery for the ratification of treaties. When final victory is won over our enemies the millions of men—and women—in uniform who have repeatedly risked their all will want to know that their sacrifice has not been in vain. They will want assurance that their sons and daughters will not be called upon to undergo the terrible hardships which they faced on land, on the seas, and in the air in order that freedom and decency might not perish from the earth. The loved ones of those who gave their all—and the number promises to be shockingly large—demand assurance that it shall not happen again to the sons and daughters of America and other lands.

What we seek to do is to so alter the machinery of ratification that a minority

of the other branch of the Congress shall not have the power to reject a treaty designed to make the world secure against future military aggression. There is nothing sacred or complicated about the ratification machinery, any more than there was about the machinery originally set up for the election of Senators by the legislatures of the States. The latter machinery was changed—modernized to bring it into closer harmony with democratic processes. That is precisely what the pending joint resolution proposes to do with the machinery for ratification. If there ever was any justification for placing the power of life and death over treaties in the hands of one-third and one of the Members of the Senate, the period of justification has long since passed. As stated at the outset, this machinery was set up as the result of compromise in order that we might have a Constitution. We can concede without a moment's hesitation that that compromise was warranted under conditions which prevailed at the time of its adoption. Seriously to contend at this late day that the method of ratification must remain intact regardless of world developments is to stultify ourselves as thinking citizens and Members of the Congress of the United States.

Permit me to say right here that my remarks are not intended to be critical of the United States Senate. My criticism goes to the machinery for the ratification of treaties set up long ago when the Nation was young and conditions wholly different from what they are today. Members of the Senate as now constituted had nothing whatever to do with the clause in the Constitution requiring a two-thirds vote of that body to ratify treaties and denying to Members of the House, the legislative body closest to the people, any voice in ratification. What is true of the Senate today has been true of that body down through the years. Ratification was made a senatorial prerogative by the Constitution. I do not blame Members of the Senate today or in past years for zealously guarding that prerogative.

But, my friends, I do most earnestly appeal to the Senate as now constituted to pass upon this proposed change in the national interest—in the interest of all humanity—as the time approaches for the consideration of treaties to make the Nation and the world secure against future military aggression. I advance no contention that by and large the Senate has abused its constitutional prerogative in passing upon treaties submitted by the Executive. But I do contend most emphatically that in certain predominantly important crises a minority of that body has rejected treaties which might well have changed the course of history and averted the conflagration now sweeping the earth.

I have particular reference to the Versailles Treaty. We all know what happened to it. While a majority of the Senate in that day favored ratification of that treaty and the active participation of the United States in the League of Nations, more than one-third of the Members of that body voted against ratification. The United States emerged from World War No. 1 the most powerful

among the nations of the world. Yet by rejecting the Versailles Treaty a minority of the Senate made it impossible for the Nation to assert its leadership.

Some ask why it is proposed to make the House of Representatives a part of the machinery for ratifying treaties. The answer is clear. The House is closest to the American people for the simple reason that its Members must face their constituents every other year. There is another reason. All legislation enacted by the Congress must be approved by the House. Most treaties require legislative implementation. Such implementation would be more readily approved by the House if its Members shared the responsibility for ratification. Certainly the House would withhold necessary legislative support with great reluctance if it had an active part in ratification. No Member of either body can seriously question the power of the House to vitiate a treaty which the Senate has ratified by refusing to pass necessary supporting legislation. In my judgment, the House would take such a position with reluctance, but the power to do so unquestionably exists. I, for one, would be greatly distressed if the House found itself impelled to adopt such a course.

While feeling very strongly that the House should have a voice in treaty ratification and that ratification should be had by majority vote of both branches—the democratic way—I would be willing to agree to a compromise and permit the Senate alone to approve or reject treaties by majority vote. This would deprive a minority of the Senate of the power of life and death over treaties. Should such a compromise be necessary in order to insure a partial reform in the machinery of ratification it would have my support, in the confidence that at some later time a further change could be effected giving the House its rightful part in the machinery of ratification.

It is my earnest hope that no such compromise will be found necessary. I feel very strongly that if Members of both branches of the Congress give this grave matter the objective study its importance demands no question of compromise will arise and the American people, through the legislatures of the States, will have the opportunity to make effective this long overdue constitutional reform.

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

Mr. BRYSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. I wish to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina, upon the most excellent presentation that he is making of this subject. It seems to me that it is fundamental and one of the most important single steps, perhaps, aside from winning the war, that has come before this Congress.

With reference to the statement that he made on the Senate action of the Versailles Treaty, may I ask this question. Does the gentleman feel that there is much chance that we shall have an enlightened foreign policy, and that we shall build an organization to preserve the peace of the future if we continue this two-thirds rule?

Mr. BRYSON. I do not believe so. I believe it would be greatly to the advantage of the entire country if the ratification machinery was altered or changed as suggested.

May I say also, in response to the compliment paid me by the distinguished colleague, that I read with deep interest his own speech made in this Chamber some weeks ago on this all-important subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

PREVENTION OF INFLATION—CRISIS FACED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Government's effort to control inflation we are facing a very serious crisis. While our sons are meeting the supreme test on the battle fronts of the world, we are meeting the supreme test here in our efforts to control inflation. The people who have fixed incomes, fixed salaries, fixed wages, or a fixed amount that they must live on each year, will be the first sufferers from inflation. The first time in history a major power has attempted to control inflation during war time was attempted by our Government and has been attempted by our Government during this war. It has never been controlled before in the history of the world.

ACTUALLY WORKED

Price control has actually worked in our country. We have evidence to substantiate that statement. It has not worked in some other countries, as you know. If we had had no control this time and prices had been left to rise as they did in World War No. 1 when we had no control, our national debt today would be \$80,000,000,000 more as of December 31, 1944, by reason of the cost of the war alone. It is an easy matter to determine how much has been saved. Just determine how high prices of certain things were during the first war and how high they have gone during this war, how well they have been kept down, determine how much the Government has purchased from money borrowed by the Government from its citizens, and you can easily determine how much has been saved. Eighty billion dollars saved on the war alone to date is a lot of money, interest on that amount for 1 year is much more than has been spent by O. P. A. and economic stabilization since the war commenced.

The price of steel, for instance, has not gone up 1 penny in 5 years. The price of

The price of steel, for instance, has not gone up a cent. The line has been held on those things that enter into the cost of the war in the greatest way.

By reason of holding down those prices, the cost of the war is \$80,000,000,000 less today than it would have been. In addition, the savings to the consumers of America have been \$56,000,000,000. So there is a big difference in what we actually have and what we would have had if prices had been unharnessed or uncontrolled.

I could pick out a few commodities, but take sugar, for instance. Its price just after the First World War was five times as high as it is now. Sugar is a

very scarce, a limited commodity, one that is much sought after. Imagine how much the price of sugar would go up now if people could just go in and bid against one another for that scarce commodity. Thirty-five cents would not be a good start for the price that would certainly be paid without any controls.

MUST HAVE SUPPORT OF PEOPLE

So O. P. A. has actually worked; price control has actually worked. We have the proof of it. Will it continue to function? Yes; if it has the support of the American people and the American Congress. But we cannot expect it to work unless it has the support of the American people.

GREAT CRISIS FACED

At the end of this year, the people of the United States will have \$38,000,000,000 more money earned this year than they have been able to spend for all the goods and services they could obtain. Those dollars are considered dangerous dollars. People would use them to get out and bid against one another for anything they want, to the extent that the prices would go sky high, if permitted. That must not be permitted for their own sake.

May I call your attention to one single thing that represents a great danger in addition to what I have said. The inflation of 1920 was caused when we had no more than 25 percent as much actual money in the hands of the people as we have today. Then the inflation was caused when there was about \$53 per capita in circulation. Today there is well over \$200 per capita in circulation or almost 300 percent more. There is over \$25,000,000,000 in the pockets and tills of the people, in the mattresses, and hidden in the different places where people hide money. That money makes a situation where price control is most difficult and where black markets are encouraged to flourish, with that much money. So I repeat, we are facing the greatest crisis we have ever faced here on the home front.

I know orders are issued which we do not like and which we do not see the necessity for, but I do not care how annoying and irritating an order may be that is issued by the agencies that deal with price stabilization, it is unimportant in relation to the importance of saving this country from inflation. So I take this time today to invite the attention of the Members of Congress to the fact that if the Congress does not encourage price control and stabilization in every way there is a possibility that we shall face the same kind of inflation that people are facing in other countries of the world.

NO POLITICS IN PRICE CONTROL

This is a time when there should be no politics in price control. It is unpopular to advocate price control, it is an unpopular thing to say when you say that we should have rules and rationing of commodities, we should have fixed prices, and things like that. People do not like it. It is unpopular. That is the reason I say it is time that we should rise above politics, not have it in politics, but do everything that is necessary to back up and support this program

against inflation. This is no time for criticism that is not the constructive type of criticism. I do not blame anyone for uttering constructive criticism, but nothing can be accomplished by the type of criticism that is not constructive and does not serve any particular purpose. It is not helpful in this fight for price stabilization. So I appeal to the newspapers, the commentators, the public speakers, and those who are constantly before the public with their writings and with their words, to cooperate with their Government in this greatest and most supreme effort that has ever been made to control prices, to the extent that we will save our country from inflation.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIZLEY. I am sure we all appreciate the interest the gentleman from Texas has demonstrated in the past in connection with this problem. There is a question I would like to ask the gentleman. It may not be exactly in line with what he is saying here, but I think it is, because the gentleman touched upon the fact that price control is not in itself a very popular thing. Of course, in peacetime I do not think we would want it to become a popular thing because it is a little out of line with our conception of a free economy.

Mr. PATMAN. No; when we are back to full peacetime production there will be no need for it and it should be entirely taken off.

Mr. RIZLEY. Yes; but I just received a letter this morning from a constituent of mine who is in the retail gasoline business. I want to get the benefit of the knowledge which the gentleman possesses about this thing and I would like to have his idea on it. This constituent tells me in analyzing his business he saw his costs had increased more than he thought they should have increased in the handling of his business. So, in the course of his investigation he found out that the refinery from whom he had been buying his gasoline, perhaps through an honest mistake, had increased the price of gasoline to him 1 cent per gallon. When he found that out he made an application to the O. P. A. to increase his retail price since he felt that increase was coming to him. So they sent their auditors out and they went through his books and found out that the refinery had increased the price. They took it up with the refinery and had them make a substantial remittance. However, they made the remittance to the O. P. A., but he cannot get that money.

Mr. PATMAN. There is a law on that.

Mr. RIZLEY. Those are things which happen.

Mr. PATMAN. There is a law on the statute books which permits your retailer to sue in the courts if it is necessary and recover three times the amount that he was overcharged.

Mr. RIZLEY. I am familiar with that law.

Mr. PATMAN. I am sure the gentleman is.

Mr. RIZLEY. There is no argument between the refinery and the retailer. The retailer does not want to recover three times the amount that he was overcharged.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, that is an individual case.

Mr. RIZLEY. I know, but there are many individual cases.

Mr. PATMAN. However, we are not willing to destroy price control because of that.

Mr. RIZLEY. Certainly not.

Mr. PATMAN. We do not want to destroy price control just because of some isolated case which we will admit for the purpose of this discussion does represent an injustice. You see, there are 8,000,000 different commodities and different prices.

Mr. RIZLEY. I understand, but it seems to me that in the administering of the law a lot of these things could be avoided.

Mr. PATMAN. Why certainly, and they are being avoided. Mistakes are being corrected every day. I venture to say they made every effort to correct that mistake.

Mr. RIZLEY. Well, there was not any trouble about it at all. They simply wanted to call it to the attention of the refinery. They paid the money.

Mr. PATMAN. That is an isolated case and I am sure it must be an isolated case. I am not willing to destroy the whole price-control program and I know the gentleman is not willing to destroy the whole price-control program because there might happen to be certain cases of injustice.

Mr. RIZLEY. No; of course not.

Mr. PATMAN. I believe you will find that under Mr. Chester Bowles' administration every effort is being made to correct mistakes which will occur. In times gone by charges were made that the O. P. A. was not making a very strong effort to correct the known obvious mistakes. But that charge cannot be made at the present time. I think they have done a wonderful job, considering that they are dealing with 8,000,000 different commodities and with about 138,000,000 different people. It is a tremendous task. A certain number of mistakes, of course, are to be expected. At the same time, when they are pointed out they should be corrected and corrected quickly. I hope that they will be corrected quickly in the future.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star paying tribute to the rural free delivery man.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Gibson] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, if the progress of time has ever brought this

Nation of ours to the place in its history where plain talk is needed, that place has now been reached.

It is agreed by all clear-thinking Americans that the recent removal of Jesse Jones as head of the Department of Commerce is a national tragedy. Much has been said pro and con on this subject, but as yet I have neither seen nor heard any plain talk. If I have a virtue, it is a courage strong enough to stand up over any personal or political expediency and speak my convictions without fear of their results. Before I would be directed in my thoughts and expressions, I would retire from political life.

I want it clearly understood that I realize and concede that it is the right, privilege, and prerogative of the President to select his own Cabinet with the advice and consent of the Senate, and I further realize and concede that it is his responsibility. I equally realize and concede it is my right as a citizen of the United States and as a Member of this House to have and express an opinion with regard to the exercise of that right and privilege.

I think one of the first and most sacred duties of any public servant is to impart facts to the people whom he has been privileged to represent. One of the reasons our country is in its present condition is that on too many occasions those representing the people in different positions of trust have for various reasons failed to disclose facts within their knowledge and permit propaganda to go to the public upon which it forms its opinion. This Nation is under a debt of lasting gratitude to that great American, Jesse Jones, for bringing this matter in its real colors to the attention of the public. Let the public form its own opinions, but let those opinions spring from truth and fact and not from a group of hypocritical, sugar-coated statements that have not even been dipped into the trough of truth.

The President gave over his own signature the following reason for replacing Jones with Wallace:

Henry Wallace deserves almost any service which he believes he can satisfactorily perform. I told him this at the end of the campaign, in which he displayed the utmost devotion to our cause, traveling almost incessantly and working for the success of the ticket in a great many parts of the country. Though not on the ticket himself, he gave of his utmost toward the victory which ensued.

He has told me that he thought he could do the greatest amount of good in the Department of Commerce, for which he is fully suited. And I feel, therefore, that the Vice President should have this post in the new administration.

It is for this reason only that I am asking you to relinquish this present post for Henry, and I want to tell you that it is in no way a lack of appreciation for all that you have done, and that I hope you will continue to be a part of the Government.

After assigning affirmatively the payment of a political debt as the sole reason for the appointment of Wallace, he very forcibly expressed his full confidence in Jones and complimented in high tones his management of the heavy responsibilities the trust carried.

Let us first consider what the duties of this position are. It is the management of the largest financial institution in the world, the control of many billions of dollars in money and property. The economic structure of this Nation rests clearly on this Department, and with the proper management of this Department we survive as a free and independent Nation. With improper management the economical structure of the Nation perishes and the greatest democracy ever enjoyed by a free people likewise perishes. The independence of man will perish and die.

The only source that has questioned the ability of that great American, Jesse Jones, to successfully handle this great task has been that notorious ally of the Communists, who are boring into this Government, that slander sheet known as PM printed in New York City. The only reason it gives for knowing Jones is not competent to handle these billions of the taxpayers' money is that if he lets a dollar out he is going to be assured he can collect it with interest. In other words they want it thrown away. Have we reached such an era of deterioration in this generation that we are simple enough to say that the only branch of our Government that is in business must abandon all rules of business policy and administration?

Now let us analyze this political pay-off and see just who has been paid off. It is well known that at the convention in Chicago the Democrats of the Nation repudiated Henry Wallace and all his revolutionary philosophy, all his zeal for regimentation and Government ownership and control of American enterprise. It was definitely seen that he was a political liability instead of an asset, save and except with the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, and its Sidney Hillman and his communistic cohorts, and for this reason he was dropped from the ticket over the protest of Sidney Hillman. The only votes that Wallace could control were radical labor, the C. I. O. gang, and the Communist.

This is common knowledge and no man who is fair and informed will question this statement. Therefore, when Wallace is given the machine to control every heartbeat of American enterprise, who is being rewarded? None other than Sidney Hillman and his C. I. O. gang and brother Communists. God forbid that this gang has placed in its lap the control of this Nation by placing this power in its hands to regiment, socialize, and take over free enterprise and burn from the dreams of those who love America the last hope of maintaining a free state.

Had any of you considered how quickly this great stroke followed the actual taking of the oath of office by the President? The social features of the inauguration could not have been over before this history-making letter was on its way to Mr. Jones. Now be fair with yourself, when did all this happen, before or after the inauguration, at the convention in Chicago or after? You may answer for yourself.

I want to commend our senior Senator from Georgia, the Honorable WALTER F.

GEORGE, for introducing a resolution, which if successfully passed would at least preserve part of the resources of our Government, and to state that I shall vigorously support the same when it reaches the House. It is, however, a pitiful spectacle when you are forced to move the dog from the kennel to keep his life's blood from being sucked out by the fleas. It would have been so much better to have killed the fleas, as would have been done by the patriots who built the structure of this great Republic. The courage of the personnel of the Congress, Senate and House, must now undergo the supreme test. Will we cast aside thoughts of favors, hopes of political advancement, and serve as the saviors of this Nation, for which our positions were created; or will we permit the destruction of the bulwark of American liberty and permit the ideals for which our boys are fighting to be sold for a mess of political pottage and then to come back to a land where opportunity exists no more, where individual initiative is scorned and anarchy rules? You must answer for your own soul. Will you permit the will of the people to be defeated by powerful minorities and ignored by the servants of the Government?

When the legislature ceases to protect the property or betrays the liberty of the people, then free government is at an end. Freedom is based on reason, knowledge is clearness of thought. Liberty is correlated to the advancement of culture and the progress of civilization. Men can govern themselves by reasoned virtue. To be freemen we must be reasonable. There must be independence of judgment. Is it reasonable to turn these billions of dollars and the power they carry, over to one so totally void of ability to master such a task. If there is anyone who questions the inability of Mr. Wallace to discharge these great responsibilities let them look into his personal business career. It speaks for itself. His total lack of business ability is the least argument against him. It is universally known that he is a dreamer that has never awakened. An idealist who has never had a practical thought. A man who has consistently agreed with and sponsored the ideals and the theories of the C. I. O. and Communist element of this country whose every thought is foreign to, and destructive of, American ideals. He is the man who at every opportunity has taken a broadside at free enterprise, who has consistently sought to regiment our people as a theme and theory of government, and not for emergency reasons. He is the man who not so long ago advanced the idea of abandoning agriculture in the United States, and looking to South American countries for our food supply, taking from us our greatest stronghold of independence. He seeks a social revolution, dreams of setting up a parental government. He boasts of being a liberal. He is the kind of liberal that will give everything possessed by our people away, and leave us perished as a Nation, and our people in a state of serfdom. When our Nation is reduced to this status, you will see Christian religion

perish from the world and civilization thrown back bordering on the dark ages.

If you are not convinced get the issues of all the Communist papers for the past few days and see if they are not all supporting him. See if every big boss of the C. I. O. has not endorsed him, save and except the big chief, Sidney Hillman, which, within itself is proof that Sidney has a definite reason for keeping quiet. The PM further boasts that all the big-shot Negroes of New York are supporting Wallace.

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

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In the list of those who have endorsed Mr. Wallace, it might be well to put in Mr. Kaiser and Mr. Higgins, two of the outstanding industrialists of our Nation.

Mr. GIBSON. Would the gentleman like to put in Earl Browder and Harry Bridges, too?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It would not be the first time that Earl Browder or Harry Bridges had supported a good cause.

Mr. GIBSON. The gentleman possibly thinks that their entire theory is for the betterment of American life.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will be responsible for what I think. I would like the gentleman to state what he thinks.

Mr. GIBSON. If the gentleman is not willing to answer questions, for God's sake keep your seat and do not ask them.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think I can answer them in my own time.

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

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SAVAGE. Is the gentleman one of those who criticized Henry Wallace for advocating a quart of milk a day for each child?

Mr. GIBSON. That is so childish I would not connect it with the name "child." Is that a sufficient answer?

Mr. SAVAGE. I think so.

Mr. GIBSON. Who is going to milk the cows? Does the gentleman want the job?

Mr. SAVAGE. Does not the gentleman believe that the policy of Mr. Wallace is pretty close to the policy of the administration and would carry out the policies of the administration as well as Mr. Jones?

Mr. GIBSON. I think it is pretty closely related to the policies of the administration, and I may say further that I want every person in the world to have a quart of milk who has got energy enough to milk a cow, but I do not want to send the gentleman out to do that.

Mr. SAVAGE. I believe he was the first man to advocate that. Does the gentleman know that at the inaugural dinner, where the electors of the United States were present, Henry Wallace received a much greater and a much longer ovation than any other of the dignitaries present?

Mr. GIBSON. Greater than the President?

Mr. SAVAGE. The President was not there; Mrs. Roosevelt was.

Mr. GIBSON. Does the gentleman know why he was not? The gentleman seems to be pretty well informed. Why was the President not there?

Mr. SAVAGE. I think that is irrelevant to the question, but I doubt if Mr. Wallace would receive a greater ovation than the President. Nevertheless, there are people throughout the United States who believe that Wallace stands for the things and the hopes for the kind of administration they want, and it seems that the people believe that the only man qualified to take part in government should be—

Mr. GIBSON. I do not yield to the gentleman to make a speech.

Mr. SAVAGE. A businessman, and we are looking for a human administration as well as a business administration.

Mr. GIBSON. A human administration! Would the gentleman on his own time explain what it takes to make a human administration? Is that that dream world that you folks are thinking about where nobody works and where everybody slides through, on a path of roses?

Mr. SAVAGE. It is a world where we will have 60,000,000 jobs so that everybody has an opportunity to work.

Mr. GIBSON. That is right. Now we have the information before us.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Has the gentleman read the very fine editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch in support of Mr. Wallace?

Mr. GIBSON. I have not. Who wrote it?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. The editor, I imagine.

Mr. GIBSON. The gentleman imagines?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. The trouble with you folks is that you imagine too much and know too little. I ask the people of this Nation is it reasonable to think that the C. I. O., the Communist, and the class of Negro leadership that has been a millstone around the necks of the decent Negroes of this Nation, has the best interest of the destiny of this Commonwealth at heart, or are they motivated by selfish and sinister purposes. If these are the people who are to direct the future of the Nation built by the brains of such statesmen as Washington, Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and the blood of all the heroes who have made the supreme sacrifice that freedom may live, God pity your children. They do not think in terms of liberty and freedom, of individual initiative, of reward in proportion to effort, but in terms of regimentation, collectivism, and destruction of every principle that has made America great. This is the crowd that Wallace has lived with, thought with, and worked with, and is the crowd that he will continue to work with, or better said, for. It is said that to the victor belongs the spoils, and truly if this crowd is permitted to be the victor in this matter they will spoil everything held dear to the heart of every true American.

Do you think he will desert them? He certainly should not, for with them he has stood at all times and they have been his chief support in all his efforts.

It is generally said even by those who oppose Wallace that he is sincere and we will concede that this is true. Generally sincerity is a virtue, but it is doubtful in this case. If he were not sincere we could entertain hopes of reforming him and bringing him back to the good old American way of doing things, but the light has ceased to burn and I see no hopes that the sinner may return.

As said before, the George resolution is meritorious. It will save some of the resources of the Government; but it is not enough. With all these vast sums taken from his control he would still have access, as Secretary of Commerce, to much information from the files and records of all businesses of the Nation. You and every informed person knows what that would mean. Nothing more or less than that Philip Murray, Dan Tobin, Harry Bridges, and other labor racketeers in the country will have access to information from records of every business firm in the Nation that they want.

I hope that the Senate will refuse to confirm his appointment so that those who are fighting on the many battle fronts of the world may at least have hope of returning to a country with a few of the ideals remaining for which they fought.

There is no need for any one to mince words on this subject, as it is commonly known that Wallace is the brains of all the forces who have and are trying to tear down every American tradition and establish total regimentation of man and property in this country.

They shout from the housetops the terrors of a capitalistic form of government. Yet our youth has been told, and properly so, that they should be proud to die for this great country of ours. They know that it has been built from a wilderness to its present greatness under a capitalistic form of government, but yet, while 10 percent of our people are away fighting and dying to protect it, they are trying to destroy it by condemning the system by which it was made great, and a haven for men who love freedom and justice. If this Congress does not stop this crowd, the same bunch that was responsible for strikes and shut downs when our boys were dying for munitions and fighting equipment, and who have become rich out of this racketeering, before they destroy this country, we will not be worthy of our returning heroes.

If this crowd is permitted to socialize this country and my children have to live under the whims of an anarchist, the pages of history will disclose that I opposed the march of destruction that we see every day and fought for the preservation of democracy and the liberties of man in the Nation where civilization has been a symbol of American life.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] is recognized for 1 hour.

REPORT ON HOUSE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE TRIP TO EUROPE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today to report on the recent trip of the Committee on Military Affairs overseas. In making this report I do it personally. It is not a committee report but a personal report. I want to take the first part of the time in narrating briefly the course of the trip, the chronological sequence of our trip overseas, and then, in the last part, I shall make some observations and recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, some time last summer a number of Members of this House felt that a committee from this Congress should visit the battlefields of Europe. We felt that this should be done at the proper time and in such a way as not to disturb the commanding officers, whose minds should be on their work, and, at the same time, we could gain first-hand information as to conditions in our armies abroad. We gained the consent of the War Department, and, as guests of the Department, on November 23, at 3:20 p. m., we left the national port of aerial embarkation at Washington.

The party consisted of 17 members of the Military Affairs Committee, together with accompanying officers and crew from the War Department. Col. C. J. Hauck, Jr., was in command of the party for the War Department. Most of the trip was made in C-54 Army planes, which are the regular four-motored Army carrier planes, and the only alteration made on the planes was the addition of seats for our committee.

This inspection trip lasted from November 23 to December 20—4 weeks, to be exact. During this time the committee traveled some 15,000 miles by plane, several thousand miles by automobile, and several hundred by train. We visited installations in England, France, and Italy, and battlefields in France and Italy. We also inspected the bomb damage in parts of England as a result of the earlier blitz and as a result of the V-1 and V-2 bombs. We talked with most of the high-ranking officers of our Army and discussed their problems with them.

After we left the airport here at Washington on the way over, we landed at Bermuda and the Azores, each for a few hours; and then proceeded to London, arriving at an airport about 30 miles outside of the city, Saturday noon, November 25, 1944. After clearing customs and going through the customary greetings, we obtained a hotel room and spent the night in London. On Sunday morning, some of the party went to church and following this, we drove on an inspection trip of the bomb damage of this great city. Our party was especially impressed with the tremendous amount of damage being done to the buildings and the people by the V-1 and V-2 bombs. We especially examined the devastation from one of the V-2 bombs which had fallen just recently and which had destroyed several blocks of flats and apartment houses in a densely populated part of London. Workers were still probing the ruins, looking for the bodies of the dead at the time our party inspected this

scene of brutality. The effects of the earlier blitz bombing was not so apparent as that of the later blitz bombing, although whole blocks which at one time had contained buildings, were cleared away for several miles and at the time we saw them, were smooth as the palm of the hand.

After only 1 day in London, the party boarded a special train which had been prepared for General Eisenhower's use in England and traveled from one place of inspection to another. The train was built along the English plan and contained facilities for the use of the general and his staff while traveling. By using this train, we were able to travel at night and inspect during the daytime.

We first inspected the docks and wharf facilities of Liverpool, watching some of our boats unload their cargoes. It so happened that the Army transport *Chateau Thierry* was there, tied up at the docks, loaded with wounded soldiers returning home. We visited it and fully inspected its accommodations for the wounded.

Following this, in rapid order, the committee visited Speke Field and saw the work being done in assembling our planes and putting them in condition to fly. The work of the British girl mechanics and helpers on the planes was especially interesting to me; and I was told that these British girls are hired by our Army and turned out excellent work for us, saving the armed services of many men for duty at the front.

We then visited the Three hundred and Twelfth Station Hospital and the Three Hundred and Fifth Station Hospital, the latter of which is known as rehabilitation center No. 1, both being located in southern England. At the former hospital, mild psychiatric cases are being treated with most excellent results obtained. In fact, something like 30 percent of these patients are returned to their former combat units within a few weeks and practically 100 percent of them are returned to duty, following about 27 to 35 days' treatment. At the rehabilitation center No. 1, we saw men who had received bone injuries, such as broken arms and legs, in the process of being given special exercises and treatments to restore to the injured member the full and normal use of it. These patients were going thru all kinds of exercises for the purpose of giving suppleness and agility to the injured part of the anatomy. In one instance, we found that some of them were engaged in a simulated attack with rifles firing and guns barking and men running and hugging the earth, all for the purpose of restoring to them the normal use of their bodies.

While in the United Kingdom, we visited two general depots and one quartermaster depot. One of the general depots was devoted to the stocking of an enormous number of automobile parts of every conceivable kind and character. Another one was devoted to salvage operations. In this plant millions of articles such as field ranges, lanterns, helmets, office furniture, typewriters, calculators, adding machines, duplicators, all types of tentage, army shoes, gloves, and

all kinds of wearing apparel were being mended, reconditioned, and put in excellent shape for future use by our troops. The chart for this depot shows that materials having a replacement cost of \$1,293,186.54 had been completely salvaged at this depot from May 15 to November 24, 1944. In these operations, Italian "cooperatives" and British women are doing valuable work in assisting the soldiers in this important work. Prisoners of war, also, are being used effectively.

On the last day of our stay in England, the committee witnessed a bombing mission take off from one of the Eighth Air Force fields for operations over Germany. On the day we were there the specific target was an oil refinery over Germany; and 1,400 bombers participated in this mission. When they were out of sight, General Doolittle, who is in command, escorted our party to the fighter field, and we witnessed our fighters leave the ground about 1 hour after the bombers had left. There were about 600 to 800 fighters in this operation. One of the features of this mission, which impressed everyone very much, was the early morning briefing—it was 4 a. m.—of the pilots and crew of the bombers. We heard them discuss the mission, refer to the difficulties of terrain and the enemy flak and air opposition, the weather conditions over the target, the place of rendezvous with the fighter planes, and many other things of fascinating interest to every member of the committee. Out of this mission on this day, the Eighth Air Force lost only 4 planes.

On the morning of November 30, the committee flew to Cherbourg, France. We arrived there in time to spend the afternoon visiting the scene of the D-day operation on the Normandy coast. We stood on the beach where the initial landing had occurred, and Col. Eugene M. Coffee, who was one of the first Army engineers to set foot on French soil, pointed out to us just how the operation was handled on Utah beach. He explained how the initial landing occurred, the blasting of great gaps in the anti-tank wall, the scraping of the bottoms of many small boats on the beaches, the noise of infantry storming ashore, and the withering cross-fire of the enemy's big guns. He explained how a score of large ships were brought over from England loaded with ballast and sunk offshore to form a breakwater harbor for our ships to unload, the constant and unrelenting efforts to rush men and equipment forward to back up the beachhead once it was established and the spearhead as it moved inland. The cemeteries located at Eglise attest in mute language, only too well, to the ferocity of the struggle to gain possession of the Normandy peninsula.

On the following morning our committee flew over the harbor of Cherbourg, which is being used extensively by our Army and Navy, and witnessed from the air the studied and effective work of the German demolition squads. Installations and dock facilities of all kinds had

been destroyed beyond hope of salvage or use.

As we flew along the coast we observed the effect of the terrific battle for possession of the Normandy peninsula—the contact point between the British and American forces—upon the small coastal towns, especially at Caen, where it reached its terrible crescendo. At Le Havre we inspected the water front. We saw the German strong points and pill boxes with reinforced concrete many feet thick imbedded deeply in the sands of the beach; saw the many ships sunk in the harbor in such places as to give our people the greatest possible trouble; observed the efforts of our engineers to bridge over the sunken ships and to build suitable temporary port facilities; watched the unloading of ships to the Army docks and from the docks to the shore; drove through the warehouses being restored to use; and commented on the tremendous amount of civilian destruction of houses and places of business on the Le Havre water front. It is said that 6,000 civilians perished in the bombing and shelling of the Le Havre water front, before its final liberation.

From the port of Le Havre the committee proceeded to Paris, where rooms were obtained which we used as long as we were in France. On Sunday, December 2, at the E. T. O. U. S. A., with General Lee and his staff, we were briefed on all matters connected with the communications zone. At this point I want to pay a compliment to the general and his staff upon the thorough and most courteous manner in which they gave the committee full information on the conditions prevailing in the communications zone and the many problems which the Army must meet and solve. I am sure that after almost 12 hours of this briefing our committee left headquarters with a far greater appreciation of the tremendous job the running of a war 3,500 miles from home has turned out to be. The tremendous problems of supply and of communications especially impressed many members of the group.

Early the next morning our committee proceeded by automobile to the advanced section of the communications zone and visited a large supply depot there. The impressive thing at this depot was the use of Russian women who had been brought to France by the Germans in doing much of the repair work there. At the same time, we visited a medical depot where a large stock of captured German medical supplies was being assorted by our men. The German names on the boxes and the supplies were being changed for American names and they were all being properly assorted under their American names.

Operating from headquarters, the advanced section of the communications zone, the committee visited a field hospital in Belgium, a heavy automotive maintenance company and certain other advanced section installations. At the same time some of the members of the committee visited the Albert Canal, driving up and down the canal and watching the work of the Army engineers in clearing the canal of heavy obstacles to traffic placed in the canal by the Germans,

rebuilding the many bridges over the canal and repairing the destroyed locks of the canal. This canal is very important to our transportation system in Belgium and France as it connects with the harbor of Antwerp. This part of the committee also visited Aachen, examining its ruins and proceeded up to the front.

The committee left the advanced section headquarters on December 5 and proceeded by car to visit Gen. Omar Bradley at his headquarters. We remained with him for a briefing there and then took lunch with him. The committee stayed 2 nights at Verdun, the place where 750,000 men lost their lives during the First World War. Operating from there, we visited Gen. George S. Patton at his headquarters, discussed his problems with him, and proceeded to drive through an area near Chateau-Saline which had recently been the scene of one of the really bloody battles of the war. Fox holes by the thousands, cross trenches, vacated gun emplacements, destroyed guns and equipment, dead animals, especially horses still in harness, great shell craters, destroyed farmhouses and buildings, deserted villages, all attested to the full fury of the recent attack necessary to liberate this portion of Alsace-Lorraine.

This interesting but gruesome trip ended when we reached Metz. At the time we were there, four German forts were still holding out against us, although our front lines had already moved on to Strasbourg. It is significant to note that on the day of our inspection another one of these forts surrendered. We watched one of our large guns—a 155 millimeter—fire on one of the forts and talked to members of the gun crew. Our committee then returned to Verdun by car. During the course of this trip, at several places the committee passed points where they were under observation of the German guns.

Returning to the Paris area, the committee visited Chartres, France, inspecting a prisoner-of-war enclosure in this vicinity. The purpose of this visit was to satisfy the members of the committee on the handling of German prisoners overseas.

On Sunday, December 10, the committee proceeded to visit General Eisenhower's field headquarters. The general looked the picture of perfect health. He gave us a short briefing on conditions at the front and then proceeded to answer questions. Most of them dealt with lacks and shortages; and I will take the opportunity of discussing them later in this statement. We stayed to dinner with the general and he asked about home and the conditions back here.

This trip required a full day and upon return to the Paris area, on the next day, we visited the Ninth Air Force, planning to witness medium bombers take off from the field on a battle mission. The weather was so bad, however, that the mission was called off and our work was confined to inspecting the landing field, landing strips, planes, and headquarters buildings. After this inspection, later in the evening, we visited General Spaatz

at his headquarters. I can recall that while the general received us in a large officers' club, his headquarters was a portable one, located in a large trailer. It had full outside connections and was furnished with office equipment to permit the usual headquarters operations.

The committee left Paris on the morning of December 12, and after spending the night at Marseilles, France, we proceeded to Naples, Italy. Upon arriving there we were received by General Aaker, senior officer present. General Alexander was unable to be present and General McNarney had gone to the front to replace him. We made a brief inspection of the Naples Harbor and noticed the very fine work which had been done by Army engineers in rebuilding wrecked docks over the hulls of sunken ships in the harbor. Loading and unloading was proceeding there at rapid rate.

We proceeded by air to Rome flying over Monte Cassino pitted on all sides by countless shell and bomb holes and circled over the poor and crumbled rubble of what had at one time been the cloistered sanctuary of religion and of learning known to the ages as the Benedictine Monastery. We skirted along the coast and saw the point of landing on the Anzio Beach, the devastation of what had once been the supreme test of Nazi strength and resistance to our victorious armies coming northward from Sicily. The Apian Way, the Pontine Marshes, the wrecks of Nazi planes, equipment, and material—they were all there.

From Rome as a base, we visited the United States Army rest center in Italy. It is located on the spot designated by Mussolini as the location for the 1940 Olympic games and the buildings there are in perfect shape and condition for our use as a rest and recreation center for battle-fatigued soldiers from the front. It has stadia for athletic contests, gymnasium with fine equipment, indoor and outdoor swimming pools, and other equipment. It has a capacity of 3,500 men and 300 officers at one time. We inspected the Sixth General Hospital, a large and well-run institution and then visited the First Replacement Center. At this last-named place, the committee saw the wonderful use being made of buildings and facilities constructed by the Italians and intended for use by Mussolini as a part of his military training. We are using these facilities effectively as an infantry replacement depot.

From the Rome area, the committee moved northward along the coast, passed the Island of Elba where lived the great Napoleon, flew over the leaning tower of Pisa, and stopped at Florence, Italy. We inspected a large, well-equipped, and efficiently operated ordnance depot being used to repair automotive equipment, artillery, tanks, field glasses, range finders, and almost any other type of metallic equipment. Fifty-five hundred Italian civilians were being employed by our Army in this depot in addition to the 5,000 of our own soldiers who are working there.

On the day after our arrival at Florence, the committee proceeded to the front. On the way up we met Gen. Mark

Clark, who escorted us to his headquarters just behind the front lines. Since the day was Sunday the committee stopped on the way for the purpose of attending a short church service in a badly shelled and damaged building behind the Italian front. The service was the regular Sunday service scheduled for the men of the Ninety-first Division, and we joined them in the observance. In jeeps spaced 200 feet apart for safety, we proceeded over a U-shaped road, rough and muddy by constant use, to a point where we could see our artillery strafing the enemy positions on a distant mountain peak, the enemy occasionally replying with a burst of shrapnel or high explosive in the field to the left of us.

Leaving this area, the committee visited the Fifteenth Air Force located in south Italy. At one of these bases the enlisted men took entire charge of the party. Under their direction we ate chow with them, accompanied them to their recreation center, which is splendidly built in an abandoned underground quarry and talked to them of their complaints. The last point of inspection of the trip was the headquarters of the Fifteenth Air Force; and on the afternoon before our committee left Italy, we sat in the headquarters and witnessed the operation of tabulating the results of one of our air missions from Italy into southern Germany. As the planes were checked into their bases upon their return, the great blackboard in headquarters tallied the news. It reported weather conditions in Germany and along the route, enemy resistance, and flak conditions; it reported losses and results from the bombing, whether a hit or miss was obtained. I can recall that everyone left this meeting with a heavy heart; over 40 of our heavy bombers had not returned from the mission. At breakfast, the next morning, we were gladdened by the happy news that 20 of these 40 missing bombers were reported to have landed at other fields during the night and were safe.

At 9 a. m. on December 19, the committee left Bari, Italy, by plane and proceeded to Washington by way of Casablanca, the Azores, and Bermuda. We arrived here at the National Airport, December 20, 1944, at 5:20 p. m.

OBSERVATIONS

Mr. Speaker, I have laboriously plotted the major activities of your committee on these 4 weeks of overseas inspection, that you may know of our full efforts to obtain and bring back all facts available to us during this brief time. In summarizing the results of the trip, I want to say that we think it was a most worth-while inspection trip. Your committee talked to hundreds of officers and enlisted men on this trip. We slept with them and ate with them. We feel that we now have first-hand information of their complaints and their problems. We have information we can and will give to you from time to time bearing upon problems vital to the continued conduct of the war.

WEATHER

"Mud, mud, mud," is the way that I would describe the conditions on the win-

ter battlefields of Europe. It is in camp, on the highway, in the fox holes, gun positions and on the front. A high, dry place is chosen today, for an ordnance, ammunition, or supply depot. Turning wheels and falling rain tomorrow turn the place into a quagmire of mud. At times, nothing with wheels can move, and men sink almost to their knees in thick, black, creamy mud as they try to progress. The snow falls, and if weather freezes, conditions improve for a time, only to revert to mud when the thaw comes.

This mean, inclement, but typical French and north Italian weather is one of the greatest obstacles in our advance. I have heard men say, at times, it was harder to fight than the enemy. It certainly is our second problem on the front lines and first with our transportation system. The tremendous job of supplying our armies impressed every member of the committee. The long miles of roadway from the port to the front, cratered with bombs and shells, rough and worn-out with constant use, is a real challenge to our engineers and their fine equipment. It makes necessary the constant use of hundreds of thousands of soldiers to man the long supply lines, rebuild the bridges, maintain the roads, provide gasoline, tires, repairs and parts, for a countless number of trucks and cars.

PILFERING

Then, too, the long supply lines make it necessary that our convoys be guarded to protect them from pillage by civilians, who, themselves are suffering from shortages very acute at times and in many items. In some places, as soon as the head is turned, the pillagers are at work—cigarettes, gasoline, and food—these are the most desirable items. They disappear like a morning mirage unless carefully protected. To punish civilians, cooperation from the local governing authorities is necessary. To protect these supplies initially, many M. P.'s and careful handling of them are necessary. In places in Italy our Army has gone to the length of placing signs on highways warning our soldier drivers not to leave their trucks unattended for a minute, as they may be stolen or pillaged during their absence.

SHORTAGES

The committee studied Army shortages and our "lacks." They found we lacked such things as very heavy tanks, robot bombs and jet-propelled planes. We are short such things as heavy artillery and heavy artillery shells, tires, trucks, and tenting—all known to our Army. In some places, we have been short at times of whole blood.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman speaks of a shortage of heavy tanks. Is the gentleman referring to heavy tanks comparable to those in use by the Germans?

Mr. BROOKS. It is the extremely heavy tank that we do not have. We have a light and we have a medium tank,

and they are excellent and do excellent work, but we do not have available for use there the very heavy tanks. The Germans have used some of them.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am sure the gentleman, being a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, can advise the House whether or not we have in production tanks comparable to those the Germans are using, if it is not a military secret.

Mr. BROOKS. That is not a part of this trip, of course. However, I call the attention of the gentleman to a press article which I saw recently to the effect that the Army is engaged in producing very heavy tanks. That report is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I saw that in the press, and I thought perhaps the gentleman would confirm it.

AMMUNITION

Mr. BROOKS. We found that, on November 30, the Secretary of War was asked at press conference, "Can you give us information on the present ammunition situation?" To this, Mr. Stimson, Secretary of War, replied:

This situation has been, and is, extremely complicated and equally critical and bids fair to be more so, unless production rates in the United States are greatly increased. In brief, last April—following our experiences in the mountain warfare in Italy where artillery consumption tremendously increased beyond all previous estimates of theater commanders or the War Department—a careful survey of the entire situation was made and it was then decided to increase greatly the heavy artillery, both as to guns and as to ammunition, and to make general increases in artillery ammunition throughout, anticipating an approach to a trench warfare situation during periods of stalemate in the campaigns which had been decided upon, notably the landing in France.

Rail deliveries were partially responsible—port limitations were principally responsible. As both these two factors improve, we are reaching another limitation and that is the availability of ammunition in the United States. We could disembark more if it were available and we could transport across France more if it were available.

We insist on an overwhelming artillery power for the support of our infantry, not merely to gain success in battle, but more particularly to hold down the number of casualties. We foresee still further increased requirements and it is for that reason that every possible measure should be taken to stimulate production in this country.

Soon after this release from the Secretary of War, we all recall that Gen. Dwight Eisenhower made public a plea for more ammunition which, he said, was badly needed by the armies to take care of the fighting to come within the next few months.

Mr. Speaker, when a part of our committee was at the front near Duren, Germany, we encountered five artillerymen engaged in wire-laying operations. They pointed out to us that the enemy was in a little village about one-half mile ahead and had a lookout post in a church steeple. They said, "If we had ammunition, we would take care of that German lookout post." These same men wrote me on December 25, telling me

that they had captured this "German lookout and had used it as our own." They again made a plea for increased ammunition, when they said: "We sincerely hope that you have been successful in convincing the people back home that we are in dire need of more shells."

The full text of this letter is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD January 8, 1945, page 124.

I think these statements show conclusively that shortages of heavy ammunition exists, and I am sure that shortages of other items mentioned may be equally well established. These shortages are intolerable and present a challenge to the Army ordnance and to the home front which must be met.

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

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. In the first place, I want to compliment the gentleman for his very fine report on the inspection trip made by this committee. I believe part of the statement which the gentleman just read from Secretary of War Stimson answers in part, at least, the question I was about to ask which was whether transportation was available to take care of the shortage provided the material was there? In other words, is the transportation set-up sufficient to relieve the condition of shortage at the front?

Mr. BROOKS. Of course, at first, as the Secretary intimates, transportation was a major problem. It still is a real problem, but quoting his own words, the real problem now has come back to us in the United States of America, and it is our duty here and in our arsenals on the home front to produce the shells that these men who are on the firing line today need in order to protect their own lives and push on to victory for the United States.

Mr. PRIEST. I felt that was true. I just wanted to emphasize that because I do not think we can excuse ourselves here for lack of production on any ground or on any theory that it could not be transported even if we had had the material. I wanted the gentleman to emphasize that and I emphasize it myself. I would like to ask the gentleman a further question specifically with reference to transportation. I have been very much interested in knowing or learning, if possible, to what extent the railroad system in France now being used by the Allies for transportation has been put back into operation following all the bombing which has occurred?

Mr. BROOKS. Of course, the bombing knocked out the railroad system there. The main thing is the reconstruction of bridges. The rail and cross ties can be put into place in quick order but when it comes to building bridges, the problem is far more difficult and, of course, the larger rivers, like the Seine, present a major obstacle. But the Army engineers are doing a magnificent job in replacing those bridges as quickly as possible. But the gentleman knows to set up a fully working and efficiently operating railway system is a matter not of days but of

months. The railways there are not operating on an efficient basis yet.

Mr. PRIEST. But considerable progress has been made compared to the destruction that was everywhere in evidence?

Mr. BROOKS. Progress is being made and the waterways are being used to a very substantial extent. I might say that in those countries in Europe they are far ahead of us in the use of water channels. Even a small stream is dug out and used for water navigation. So water navigation there is a far more important matter in the way of transportation than it would be, proportionately, in the United States.

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

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I noticed that the gentleman referred to the visit to Aachen. Of course, we who remained behind know very little of what actually transpired except what we read in the newspapers. But it strikes me very forcefully that our military authorities have permitted great numbers of Germans to remain or return to their homes behind our lines. It may run into the hundreds of thousands and before this war goes very much further as we advance it may amount to millions, of hostile German civilians, men, women, and children, who will be permitted back of the American lines.

What I am wondering about is why we do not try to press them forward, to make them become a problem for the Germans to feed and care for, instead of leaving them behind the line, where we have to care for them, feed them, and have to keep an eye on them, as they signal our enemies and maintain a German underground. I did not know whether that had come under the eye of any member of the committee or whether our military leaders have taken cognizance of the fact that to whip the German we cannot give him any advantage, and that they all ought to be driven forward.

Mr. BROOKS. If the gentleman refers to Aachen, I will tell the gentleman he need not worry about civilians being a problem. The destruction in that city of 165,000 is unbelievable. I did not see one single building there in the whole city which had not been touched to the point where it would be useless. I dare say in the whole city I saw not over one or perhaps two civilians, and what they were doing there may have been with the permission of the Army; I do not know.

Mr. DINGELL. But is it not logical to presume that the newspaper reports were correct that a great portion of the Aachen population remained back of the American lines instead of being compelled to move forward further into German held territory?

Mr. BROOKS. Perhaps that may be so, but I do not know. I can tell the gentleman that they are not living in the city of Aachen.

Mr. DINGELL. I hope they are not living on this side of the line, either. They should be compressed into a shrinking Germany as the Russians are doing.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I also wish to compliment my distinguished colleague on the splendid report he has made. It is very interesting and very instructive. I am wondering if the gentleman's committee had the time to mix and mingle with the civilian population to understand what sort of cooperation we are getting from the civilian population in France and also in Italy.

Mr. BROOKS. We are getting very good cooperation from both. I mentioned a moment ago in this talk the fact that there was one arsenal in Italy employing 5,500 Italians; and even in England we employ what we call there the Italian cooperatives, that is, the would-be Italian prisoners of war, but we are at peace with Italy. They are doing good work.

In France there is a reservoir of manpower which might be tapped to our benefit, and the Army is proceeding to use this reservoir, encountering great difficulties there in the matter of obtaining raw materials to use to fashion the things we need, and great difficulties in the matter of transportation. These factors limit our use of the manpower which might otherwise be available.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. One further question, if the gentleman will permit: We have of course a number of French helping us in actual combat. I wonder how many if any we have of the former Italian soldiers helping us in combat?

Mr. BROOKS. I cannot give the gentleman any figure on the number of Italian soldiers aiding us.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Do we have any?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, we have a few. It may be interesting for the gentleman to know that in France we are getting more volunteer Frenchmen than we are able to equip. We have equipped a number of divisions of French soldiers who are doing fine fighting there on a front in Alsace Lorraine; and we are able to obtain more by volunteer means. They are ready and willing to fight the Germans but we do not have the equipment for them. I dare say that answers the gentleman's other question in reference to the Italians, because if we do not have the equipment for the French soldiers, we do not have it naturally, for the Italians.

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

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. In further reference to what the gentleman has said about the French railroads, we must bear in mind that the Germans carried away or destroyed a great part of the French rolling stock and that the Americans and British destroyed more during the process of liberation. The fact remains, however, that where rolling stock is available on the railroads in France it is being used almost exclusively by the American forces and has rendered a very valuable contribution in the transportation of our supplies.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. If the gentleman will yield further, in connection with the matter of German civilians I believe it is true that only a very few thousands of the original 150,000 or 160,000 people who lived in Aachen have come back to their homes. I believe that in the main we have gained considerable by the fact that some of those civilians have come back, because we are learning something about the administration of civil government within Germany as a result of having those people to work with. We can be sure that most of those that did come back are anti-Nazi. We must remember also that we are not warring on civilians, that we have got to work with those people during the next generation while we try to get Nazi totalitarianism out of their systems and help in the process of reeducation of the German people along democratic lines.

May I say further, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Louisiana is to be commended highly for his report. I had many opportunities to observe and appreciate his fine work and this is presented on the same high plane. His committee did a valuable piece of work in visiting the fighting fronts. I have personal knowledge of their contributions to morale and of improvements in the service which they inspired. I think that the value of their work while at the fighting fronts will be seen time and again in the months to come.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman has just returned from a tour of duty overseas with the Army, and naturally has a keen insight into conditions existing in France.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield, or would he rather finish his general statement?

Mr. BROOKS. If the gentleman will agree, I should prefer to finish.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is a very fine report.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman.

FOOD

On the whole, our Army has done a fine job in providing our troops with good, wholesome food. As a rule, Army mess is good; and one eating in civilian places in France and Italy immediately becomes conscious of the inferior grade and quantities of the food served. As we moved among the troops, the complaints about the food were almost negligible which, in itself, is ample testimony of the fine work of the quartermasters in this respect.

HOSPITALS

As the committee proceeded with its inspection, we especially examined into the condition of our hospitals and hospital facilities. We saw the wounded soldiers brought from the front with nothing in the way of treatment, save the simplest form of first aid. We talked to those in the evacuation hospitals, who desired to talk and asked about those unfortunate men whose wounds placed them beyond the condition where lan-

guage was desirable. We saw them transported in ambulances from the evacuation hospital to the general hospitals in the rear. We saw the general hospitals turn them over to the special hospitals, such as those we saw in England; and finally we saw those permanently and seriously wounded on board our hospital ships, loaded and ready for return to the United States.

The evacuation hospitals were, of course, of a temporary nature and were often of frame construction and were even placed in abandoned factories or public buildings. The base hospitals in the rear were, however, of permanent construction and often were the long-established, permanent institutions of France, Italy, and England, efficiently run, modern in all respects and supplied with medical equipment, the delight of almost any doctor. We learned from our contacts the simple rule: "If the wounded man arrives at the evacuation hospital within 2 or 3 hours after he is wounded, his chances of recovery, regardless of the nature of the injury, are increased 90 percent. If he is lost on the battlefield or in the woods for as long as 24 to 36 hours after being wounded, his chances are reduced 10 percent for recovery."

The doctors and nurses at these institutions are doing a marvelous job. The percentage of recovery is twice as high as it has heretofore been the case in any war in which we have been engaged. These medical men and women, in many instances, are literally "cheating the grave" and are bringing back our wounded soldiers to life and health when by normal standards the accomplishment would be impossible. Long hours of labor makes the work exacting. A heavy shortage of nurses under these conditions makes the beneficent work of the heart of these young women the tender subject of one of the truly great sagas of mankind.

USE OF OVERSEAS MEN

The use of Italian cooperatives and local labor in France and the United Kingdom to assist in construction and maintenance work for the Army in Europe is saving the services of many soldiers. In England British girls are doing a fine job for the Army driving cars, doing mechanical work, repair work, and all types of work in the repair and assembly plants there. In France hundreds of thousands of people are unemployed and anxious to work. The Army program of utilizing these potential pools of labor should be continued with the view of relieving our soldiers for combat duty and other essentially soldierly duties. This program saves transportation and saves Army manpower, and it should be encouraged.

ISLAND BASES

In reference to the offshore island bases I wish to say, if anyone has failed to make up his mind as to the importance of the offshore bases which we have acquired in the Atlantic, a crossing of this great body of water will soon give him strong convictions on this subject. These bases are very important—in fact, vital to the future development of Amer-

ican aviation. Our airplanes fly always with special reference to the island bases in the Atlantic. They pause during a crossing for rest, fuel, and repairs. They chart their course by these bases, and they become necessary chains in the great skyways of the world. They, in fact, form the natural travel ways of mankind.

CONCLUSION

The other day my colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] presented to this body the story of Gen. Mark Clark's fighting Fifth Army. She presented the pageant of the indomitable courage and heroic hardships of the Fifth Army, especially the infantry, as they advanced from the toe, step by step, almost to the very top of the Italian boot. She showed their perseverance as they stormed rugged peak after peak of those mountains which in northern Italy hold themselves up like "sore thumbs," impregnable, yes, impregnable save to the courage, will, and resourcefulness of the American fighting man. I join enthusiastically with my colleague in what she has to say about the exploits of this Army and its fighting infantry, which truly reaches the outer fringes of the imagination of our people.

Taking not one jot or tittle from the glowing tribute which has justly been paid the Fifth Army of Italy, I would go further. I would cover, for instance, those who fight in France, as well as those who fight in Italy. Under this tribute, I would cover the battalion aid men of the medical department. I would cover those men who go out over the fields of battle with their stretchers and bring back to safety and hospitalization the injured and the wounded.

I would cover the Signal Corps men who lay the wires and maintain the communications so essential to the fighting men on the front, men who by day and night push through the muck and the mire of the road, the field, and the swamp in their efforts to maintain communications. And then there is the Field Artillery man—always maintaining contact with the enemy, always in shelled and bombed gun emplacements, sending over rolling cross-fire and all types of barrages; hitting, softening, and crushing the enemy; aiding, supporting, and protecting the Infantry. They, too, are doing a magnificent work.

And the Army engineers. I would include in this glowing picture of courage and gallantry the men who clear the harbor channels, rebuild the port facilities, maintain the interminable number of miles of roadway, reconstruct under fire the bombed and destroyed bridge spans which cross the major streams of Europe, build and maintain the hundreds of airports which our air forces use all over the world. Yes; I would pay tribute to that little band of engineers which the other day in Belgium lost 80 percent of their number while working under enemy fire, and to those engineers who landed on D-day well in advance of the others to bomb and destroy German coast defenses on the shores of Normandy that a successful landing might then be made.

Mr. Speaker, nor would I close this picture of Army achievement without mentioning the magnificent work of the Army Air Forces, the bomber and the fighter, those vikings of the twentieth century who course their paths across the skyways of Europe, braving the rough weather, ranging in temperatures as low as 40 degrees below zero, risking their lives as they fly in formation through the enemy flak, matching wits with the Nazi in the "dog fights" in the skies, thousands of miles from home, and giving support and strength and comfort to our ground forces, who gaze upon friendly planes as they do upon the benign gifts of heaven.

There are the paratroops, the airborne infantry, the antiaircraft, and a host of others, who are daily performing deeds of valor which make the childhood version of Aesop's fairy tales seem flat and uninteresting.

Mr. Speaker, every part of our Army is rendering real, efficient, courageous, and gallant service. I think every department and organization is entitled to its proportion of credit in the mighty drama which is moving on against tremendous obstacles toward Berlin and toward victory. American people have a right to be truly proud of the magnificent record of our armies. We have a right to be truly thankful that brave men by the tens of millions, under the Stars and Stripes, battle for our safety and our Nation. They should, in fact, daily be grateful to a half million of brave men who have received combat wounds. We should daily sanctify those tens of thousands of gallant men who have given their lives that this Nation might live.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has made a wonderful report and a very inspiring one. I am indeed privileged to hear it. It will be very valuable particularly insofar as legislation is concerned. The gentleman is a tireless worker for the defense of the United States and for the welfare of those in the armed services. Did not the gentleman find the morale of the soldiers amazing everywhere?

Mr. BROOKS. It is amazing to see those men out in the muck and the mire and the dirt of the winter battlefields of Europe, coming in spattered with mud from head to foot, and yet cheerful, realizing the task and the importance of fighting it through to the end. It is really and truly amazing.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In October I found every man said the same thing, "I want to get the job done and go home." That is the spirit that makes the American soldier the finest in the world.

Mr. BROOKS. They all want to get home, as the gentleman knows.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The American soldiers love their homes, but they did not ask to come home before the job was finished. It is we who are so

anxious to try to get replacements for them.

Mr. BROOKS. That is true.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Did not the gentleman find a great shortage of wire? I found that situation to be true in September and October. The War Department tells me that there still is a great shortage of communication wire.

Mr. BROOKS. This is correct. I thank the gentlewoman for that additional contribution.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is the only contact that the man in the lonely outpost has with the others of his company or his outfit; also positions can be held or lost if they have or do not have communication wire.

Mr. BROOKS. That is very important, and I thank the gentlewoman for a valuable contribution.

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

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Does the gentleman have any comment to make on the work of the Red Cross in Italy? I happen to be personally interested, since my only sister is in that service in Italy.

Mr. BROOKS. I have not covered it in this report, although we did see the work of the Red Cross at various times and in various places. I asked the troops about it, because I know in the last World War there was some criticism of the Red Cross. I found, however, that our troops speak a good word for the Red Cross. I visited what they call the Rainbow Center in Paris, and I saw literally hundreds of troops in there enjoying the advantages offered them by the Red Cross. I know for a fact that it is doing very fine work for our soldiers. I saw evidence, too, of the Red Cross at different points, some points far up along the line toward the front, where they were serving our troops very effectively and doing a splendid work.

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

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First I want to commend the gentleman for having made a very fine and a wholly objective report. It was my pleasure to be with the gentleman on this trip, and I have particularly enjoyed the thorough report he has given to the House.

I was going to ask the gentleman the very question the gentlewoman from Massachusetts asked, about the morale of our men. The thing that impressed me most on the whole trip was the remarkable morale of our men at the front. Their greatest concern seemed to be not their own welfare but an assurance to their people back home not to worry about them, that they were getting along all right.

I add my compliment to what the gentleman said about the Red Cross. He will recall that every place we went, regardless of time, day or night, and regardless of how far up it was, we found the Red Cross hut with the Red Cross girls there serving doughnuts and hot coffee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I was also one of those who had the privilege of visiting the European theater of war, and I would like also at this time to take this opportunity to make a few observations.

There is so much that might be said in making a report of this character, and my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks], who has just preceded me, has given an excellent picture of the situation in Europe, especially in regard to the men in the armed forces, and other matters. I will try not to cover any of the matters that have previously been included in the remarks referred to.

On the contrary, I will try to bring to your attention a few of my reactions in regard to the political and economic situation, obtained on my visit to England and France, where I contacted high-ranking military and government officials.

Europe regards the American election as a test of strength which will determine the attitude of the United States toward an international effort to maintain peace.

Europe was too far from this campaign to realize that there are many Republicans who are stalwart supporters of an international peace organization. The feeling there was that the defeat of Mr. Roosevelt would be the death blow to such an effort. Europeans are inclined to think in terms of votes of confidence. The defeat of Mr. Roosevelt would have been regarded as a no-confidence vote, and would have been the worst possible news that could have come to war-weary Europe.

In my opinion the European peoples have suffered such losses and have undergone so much in the way of privation and hardship that they can think only in terms of an effort to prevent the reoccurrence of the holocaust visited upon Europe by this war.

My view is that the United States and Great Britain must spearhead the international peace movement. I am positive the effort will have the cooperation of Russia and France, but I think the latter two nations will have such enormous domestic problems on their hands that they will not be able to concentrate on the United Nations organization in a way which Americans and British are in a position to do.

I was particularly impressed with the praise of General Eisenhower for our military forces. He attributed the high morale of our combatant troops to the fact that the troops know that they are the best equipped, best trained, the best clothed, have the best medical care, and the best weapons of any of the nations in the war. He was loud in his praise of the courage, accomplishments and spirit of all of the men and women in all branches of the armed forces, as well as

the backing of those on the home front who furnished the supplies, material, and money, to make it possible to do the job. It is impossible to discuss the military situation for security reasons, but General Eisenhower is highly pleased with developments and is most optimistic for the future, and notwithstanding the fact that winter is slowing up operations, he does not intend to slow up nor give the enemy any respite until a full and complete victory.

I was not surprised to see the results of the devastation done by the blitz of 1940 in London, as well as by the robot bombs which are still coming into London nearly every night. Continued bombing has not affected the great courage of the British people.

I went by automobile from Paris to the invasion beaches in France. No one can appreciate what was accomplished without actually seeing for himself what our forces had to overcome to make the landings. Anyone would marvel as to how it was possible in view of the obstacles, fortifications, concrete gun emplacements, concrete walls and installations all along the beaches.

I was told the Germans were of the opinion that a landing such as was made was impossible. This operation will go down in history as one of the greatest military feats in the history of the world. No other army has shown the courage and sacrifice which was necessary to accomplish this undertaking. The heroism of Allied troops and all branches of the amphibious forces engaged will live forever.

With the recognition of General de Gaulle as the provisional head of the French Government, order is being rapidly restored in the liberated towns and cities. It is my opinion if the Allied powers furnish de Gaulle with the necessary arms and equipment he will be able to establish a strong army and government in France. I have always contended that the peace, security, and economic stability of western Europe cannot be established without taking into consideration France and a strong Government.

Besides arms and equipment France will need fuel and food to carry the country through the winter, but economically France will come out of the war better than most of the nations engaged in this mighty struggle.

Although I am a loyal American first, being of French descent and representing a district that is largely of French descent, I have been particularly interested in France especially in view of the long standing friendship that has existed between the two Nations. You will recall that I have appeared on this floor and in the Record many times raising my voice on behalf of the consideration of that great nation.

France faces great internal problems but not insurmountable difficulties stand in the way of the gradual resumption in that country of a normal national life.

I am convinced that in Gen. Charles de Gaulle France has a leader equal to the occasion. I admit it is difficult for Americans always to understand the appeal of a man of General de Gaulle's

type! French people like an element of mysticism in their leaders.

General de Gaulle has the courage of his convictions and is practical in his administrative methods. It is true he thinks he is a man of destiny, but nearly all great leaders have been self-assertive. It is a historical fact that men of destiny do not get along well with one another which makes plain some of the antagonisms which have grown up against General de Gaulle.

France is very unlikely to go communistic. The regimentation of communism does not appeal to the Frenchman who is intensely individualistic.

This does not mean that there will not be a trend to the left and some resort to state socialism, particularly with respect to big business. Big business in France has not always been operated in the public interest. It frequently has been selfish and backward. This was particularly true of the airplane industry and the munitions industry. I will not be surprised to see government corporations take over some of the large private concerns.

The French people are keenly aware of the fact that they have lost prestige. They are very anxious to regain it. The people are almost obsessed with a desire to contribute importantly to the defeat of Germany.

One of the chief causes for dissatisfaction in France is the inability to start their own industries. One of the great needs is cotton. France has a sizable textile industry. An important section of the textile industry is equipped to produce tarpaulins, largely used in France in connection with railroad shipments.

A much larger proportion of freight movement is in open-top cars covered with tarpaulins. These plants were operated night and day during the German occupation but have been idle since the American occupation because of lack of cotton. The French also have tire cord plants which are intact but not in use.

The French prefer to operate these plants for the supply of their troops and feel that lend-lease cotton should be provided for that purpose.

Some of their textile capacity will have to be used for civilian supply. For that purpose they are prepared to pay cash for cotton which they would prefer to buy from the United States if an arrangement can be made under which they will not pay more than the world price. Unless some arrangement is made to that end, and in the near future, these purchases may be made in Brazil.

I was glad to see that President Roosevelt finally gave recognition to the government of General de Gaulle, and with the prestige and benefits which will come from this recognition France will be rapidly rehabilitated politically and economically, and will be able to add a large force to the armed services, and as a result, as I have said time and again before, she will do her part in participating in final victory for the Allied cause, and when peace comes will take her proper place among the great nations of the world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an expression of the American League for a Free Palestine which appeared in the New York Post on January 8, captioned "Britain writes new chapter in Hebrew martyrdom. Raise your voice against international intimidation."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE G. I. THINKS, TOO

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I claim no right to speak for the men and women in uniform. Already there are too many people who claim to be speaking for them, most of whom know little or nothing about them. But if I know anything about the way the soldier lives and the way he thinks, I am convinced that he is concerned with bigger things than most of us at home appear to be. I am convinced that his thinking is more statesmanlike than that of some of his Nation's statesmen, be they from Hog Heaven Branch or Washington, who still seek to cure all ills with appropriation measures.

The men who fight in the rain, the mud, the slush, the snow and ice of the western front do not discount the enemy, but they think the people back home do. Those cold and grimy G. I.'s who are never warm except in the sweat of battle want to know that the people back home—all of them, not just a few—realize they are in a war, too. Men who live out of a tin can with the stench of death forever in their nostrils wonder about waste at home; waste of manpower, waste of money, waste of the principles for which we fight.

When the word came to France that the United States was clamping down on manpower, that our Government had warned the American people in plain terms that the war is not yet won, that costlier and heavier sacrifices are yet to be made, I heard one American soldier after another say, "It is about time." These were the men from whose ranks were then being taken 5,000 casualties a day. They are the men who pay for mistakes in policy and strategy. They have learned a great deal about what it takes to win a war. They think it is about time the American people, clerks, bootblacks, and bankers, their representatives, their Government, and their generals, learn a little more about what it takes to win a war. This, I believe, is the No. 1 thought with the G. I. overseas.

The G. I. thinks it is about time for the people of the world to know whether the United States must stand alone in its search for a lasting peace which will insure democracy for the little peoples of the world. He wants to see demonstrated the spiritual courage to fight for the right, to rule out compromise. He wants to see relighted the fires of

idealism which inspired world faith in this Nation.

The disillusionment which swept over America about the handling of Poland and Greece is not confined to this country. It is felt in Britain. It is felt in France. It is felt by every soldier who fights under the American flag abroad. They fear the rise of those same sinister forces which wrecked the peace conference of 1919. To them it is time for realism now in our dealings with the powers which will be represented at the next peace conference. After the war is won it may be too late to ask about the future of Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Greece, Yugoslavia, the Ruhl Valley, Korea, or even that of our ally, China.

Those men on the fighting fronts, men whose service stripes show that they have been away from home 2, 2½, and even 3 years, think it is about time that they and their loved ones knew that there will not be a repetition of this horrible mess as soon as their sons are old enough to fight. They do not know it today. They are not convinced by the statements or the inferences from high sources that everything will be all right. They know that it is not all right today, after 3 years in which America as a good ally has sent the best that she has in men and material wherever they are needed, without regard to costs, either in lives or in dollars. They want to see the United States stand vigorously for a world partnership in which all nations, big and small, will operate through the orderly processes of international law. They think it will not be sufficient to depend upon British and Russian need for United States assistance after the war to insure their cooperation in the peace conference.

The G. I. in Southampton, St. Germaine, and Luxemburg wants the President of the United States to be practical, realistic, and if necessary, tough. He believes in his President. He is proud of him. He is proud of the regard which the peoples of the world have for President Roosevelt. The G. I. knows that his President is one of the great Americans of all time. He knows that in his hands, more than in those of any other man alive today, rest the chances of freedom, health, happiness, and opportunity for little people in our time. That is a fearful responsibility. And the G. I. is a little worried about Mr. Roosevelt's determination or lack of determination to out talk Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin on matters of world policy. He knows that Mr. Roosevelt seeks to advance American ideals and leadership by open and free cooperation with the other Allied powers, but he is beginning to wonder if the other powers are playing ball by those rules. He thinks the American team had better begin to think more about the final score and less about the rules.

These men know that many of their number will not come back, and that there will be others who will never be whole again. They know at what a terrific rate the attrition of the western front is burning out men, but they do not think of those things. They are not

afraid of those things. What they fear is futility. They fear that the great effort they and their Nation are making, that the great cost and waste of World War No. 2 may be futile. Their President can dispel that fear. We at home can help him dispel it.

Because of the things I have said, the inference may be drawn that I am concerned about the morale of the American soldier abroad. In answer to that I point simply to the fighting spirit of the men who stopped Rundstedt's breakthrough. Military men know that sheer will power and fighting hearts and those alone stopped Rundstedt. G. I.'s stood in their tracks and took the full weight of that armored onslaught with rifles and bayonets and hand grenades, or whatever weapons were at hand. They slowed it, and then they stopped it, when only a few miles farther lay the rich prizes for which Rundstedt had driven. A little less courage, a little less willingness to stand and hold and die, and disaster could have come to the Allied forces on the western front. It takes morale to do what those G. I.'s did. It takes G. I. guts.

All that I have said is in an effort to make them stronger, to help to pay the debt which I and every American owe to our fighting men.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHENOWETH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, January 29, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

137. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting an amended certificate from the executive of Arizona, certifying to the appointment of the electors for President and Vice President in that State on November 7, 1944, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 1760. A bill providing for Federal aid to States for the acquisition of toll bridges; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland:

H. R. 1761. A bill to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 1762. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 1763. A bill to provide for making certain surplus materials, equipment, and supplies available for soil and water conservation work through the distribution thereof, by grant or loan, to public bodies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 1764. A bill to amend the act known as the Insecticide Act of 1910 (36 Stat. 331), approved April 26, 1910; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 1765. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Iowa of the Agricultural Byproducts Laboratory on the campus of the Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1766. A bill to provide for retirement of reservists of the present war at the highest rank held in active service during such war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 1767. A bill to authorize the construction and operation and maintenance of the initial unit of the Mountain Home project; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 1768. A bill to authorize mining, milling, or smelting loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 1769. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines who have been killed in action in World War No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 1770. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 with respect to the retired pay of certain commissioned officers of the Army retired for disability during the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 1771. A bill to amend section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved August 29, 1935, relative to death benefits, and subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1772. A bill regulating the amount of interest to be paid by insolvent or alleged insolvent banks in liquidation or in the hands of receivers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1773 (by request). A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for the payment of monthly insurance benefits to widows of individuals who died before January 1, 1940; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 1774. A bill to provide for the location, survey, and building of a system of superhighways, three east and west and six north and south highways; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 1775. A bill to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WASIELEWSKI:

H. R. 1776. A bill to create uniformity in the application of revenue laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 1777. A bill to provide free transportation for parents or wives on Government-owned ships and aircraft to the graves of

veterans buried abroad; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 1778. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Smith River and its tributaries, California and Oregon, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation; and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 1779. A bill to provide for the regulation of civilian employment to aid in the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 1780. A bill to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to provide for the erection of a tablet in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution urging the institution of Americans All-Immigrants All program; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MASON:

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 105. Resolution authorizing expenses for the special committee provided for by House resolution 88; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. Res. 106. Resolution directing the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to conduct a continuous investigation and study of the manner in which the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is being administered; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. R. 1781. A bill for the relief of Candler Cobb; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 1782. A bill for the relief of Ida F. Braun, Alice Braun Menges, and Carl J. Braun, individually and as executors of the estate of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as legatees and beneficiaries of the will of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as the sole parties in interest by succession under the last will and testament of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and under the last will and testament of Herman W. Braun, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1783. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Edward C. Kavanagh; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1784. A bill for the relief of Jeannette C. Jones and minor children; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARLSON:

H. R. 1785. A bill for the relief of John Jehlik; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 1786. A bill for the relief of Kentucky-Illinois Hemp Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

H. R. 1787. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Hancock, administratrix of the estate of Arch F. Hancock; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1788. A bill for the relief of Conrad Newman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 1789. A bill to provide for the payment of \$20,000 to Clarence Leason Rounds, administrator of the estates of Gerald Rounds, deceased; Richard Gray, deceased; Virginia Grafton, deceased; and Geraldine Titus, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 1790. A bill for the relief of the widow and children of the late Charles J. McNeil; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 1791. A bill to alter the service record of the late Charles J. McNeil; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 1792. A bill for the relief of the White Van Line, Inc., of South Bend, Ind.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1793. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1794. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Micker; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1795. A bill for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1796. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Carolyn Lamb; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PIÑERO:

H. R. 1797. A bill for the relief of Arcadio Saldana Agosto; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1798. A bill granting a pension to Mary E. Carroll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 1799. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUNDSTROM:

H. R. 1800. A bill for the relief of Theodore R. Flohl; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 1801. A bill for the relief of Hanson, Orth & Stevenson, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WASIELEWSKI:

H. R. 1802 (by request). A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Weber; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

37. By Mr. FORAND: Joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing Congress in relation to the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

38. By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa: Petition signed by women of Waterloo, Iowa, protesting the ruling of the War Labor Board declaring the brewery industry essential to the war effort and protesting any form of peacetime conscription of youth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

39. By the Speaker: Petition of the Insular League of Parent Teacher Associations of Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the requested liquidation of the colonial system of government in Puerto Rico, and the right of Puerto Ricans to adopt their own form of government; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 1945

Rev. John R. Edwards, D. D., associate minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, infinite in power and wisdom, we make our approach this day as servants of the Lord Most High. We recognize with thanksgiving Thy claims upon us through the blessings of Thy providence and in the light of Thy great mercy. We would live and move where the nobler elements of life are at the fore, where the voice of life's higher values is distinctly heard, where human wisdom is subject in fellowship to the mind of God.

May the decisions amid the labors and responsibilities of this day be in right perspective in the lives of these Thy servants and of all related bodies of our Government. We would recognize as our chief task in life our part in the building of a better world. In this endeavor, we sense the need of God's creative touch, of His cleansing grace, of His guiding wisdom, and of His uplifting power.

We commit to our Father's care all who are this day in jeopardy by war's destructive agency. We bespeak for them the embrace of Thy strong, pure, and affectionate nature amid the challenges and perils of this hour of crisis and of destiny.

We commend to Thy fatherly care the family of the Secretary of the Senate, whose death brings to a close a life of great faithfulness in this body. Be gracious unto his colleagues in their loss, we pray.

In the name of the saving Christ and for the glory of God we make our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 25, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

DEATH OF EDWIN A. HALSEY, SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the untimely death of Edwin A. Halsey, the Secretary of the Senate, is a great shock and a deep personal distress to me, as I know it is to every Member of the Senate. Ed Halsey had the respect, the admiration, and the personal affection, and complete confidence of every Member of the Senate of both political parties.

He was the nephew of John W. Daniel, one of the greatest Senators in the history of Virginia. He was born at Tye River, Nelson County, Va., on September 4, 1881. He has never ceased to take a deep interest in all the affairs of Virginia. He was beloved and respected all through Virginia, as he was in the United States Senate.

He came to the Senate as a page nearly 48 years ago, and from that time to this was in intimate personal contact with the Members of the Senate, a record which I do not believe is paralleled in our history. With great tact, wisdom, and courage, he has at all times upheld the dignity and honor of the Senate. In speaking for both of the present Senators from Virginia, Senator GLASS and myself, I wish to express our deep sense of personal loss and our highest estimate of his public service. The loss to the Senate itself is irreparable, but to the people of Virginia it is the more personal loss of a real friend.

He was elected Secretary of the Senate on March 9, 1933, and has served in that important office until now, rendering a service of most complete satisfaction and usefulness. He performed all the duties assigned to him with the utmost efficiency and with complete impartiality. He had charge, in large measure, of the inaugural ceremonies at the White House on January 20 last. As chairman of the Inaugural Committee, time and time again when I saw the strain upon him in the performance of this duty, in addition to the others he had, I urged him, on account of his recent illness, to conserve his health, but he would not spare himself in performing the duties assigned to him.

I know that many Members of the Senate will desire to pay tribute to his memory—to express their deep affection and admiration for him and for his record of great public service.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, it is with a degree of sorrow and regret which it is wholly impossible to express that I have learned of Colonel Halsey's sudden and untimely death. He was with us in the full vigor of his splendid powers when last the Senate met. Now he treads the valley of the shadow and has been gathered to his fathers.

It would be impossible for me to imagine a more totally competent Secretary of the Senate than Colonel Halsey has been for many years. Indeed, his whole life has been a devoted consecration to efficient public service.

It would be equally impossible, Mr. President, for me to imagine a finer personal character or a more generous friend. Although he was an earnest partisan, he never for an instant failed to be the servant of all the Senate. Republicans as well as Democrats were always the unfailing beneficiaries of his constant courtesies and his superb capacities. He admitted us not only to his great office but also to his great heart.

We shall deeply miss and mourn this able Senate executive, this sterling public servant, this magnificent American, this priceless friend.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to join with the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in their expressions of regret over the death and loss of Colonel Halsey. I wish to join with them in their words of tribute to his memory and appreciation of his character and great ability. He entered the service of the Senate in 1897, nearly 48 years ago, as