

## SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 12, 1945

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

Our Father God, in a troubled time we turn to Thee with hearts that are heavy with anxiety and grief, with minds that are clouded with perplexity and doubt, with spirits that are dismayed and discouraged by the world's catastrophe. Even as we fight on and believe on with the thick mists about us, we seek in Thy presence, in whom is no shadow, the assurance that these clouds are lies and that the blue sky is the truth. May Thy completeness flow round our incompleteness, Thy strength be made manifest in our weakness, Thy forgiving mercy in our guilt, Thy reinforcement in our disappointed hopes and fruitless efforts. Send us forth against unnumbered foes with the whole armor of faith and righteousness, pledging our loyalty to Thy kingdom of love, never letting our confidence in it nor our devotion to it fail because of the fury of the wicked when they boast themselves in the day of their pride.

As Thy servants and the people's in this temple of democracy, save us from the perversion of power that has not Thee in awe. Upon the altar of our freedom may there ever be lifted the offering of an humble and a contrite heart. And in this day of destiny for us and for the world may we be worthy of our vocation as keepers of the sacred flame. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, March 8, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—  
APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on March 9, 1945, the President had approved and signed the following act:

S. 340. An act to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2348. An act to provide for the coverage of certain drugs under the Federal narcotic laws; and

H. R. 2404. An act to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes.

ANNIVERSARY OF DEATH OF DR. SUN  
YAT-SEN—EXCERPT FROM HIS WILL

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, today, March 12, is the twentieth anni-

versary of the death of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, founder of the Chinese Republic and the leader of the revolution against the Manchu dynasty. The Chinese, among our strongest allies at the present time, the world over are celebrating this day, following a custom which is a good one from the standpoint of history and morale building and one which they should be commended for following because of the ideals of the man who is responsible for what they have wrought. Wherever the Chinese meet today they will read Dr. Sun Yat-sen's will. I therefore, Mr. President, ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from his will be printed in the RECORD at this point and made a part of my remarks.

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

My life has been consecrated to the Chinese people, and my devotion to the tasks I set myself has remained unchanged during this long period. Neither the might of the Manchu dynasty nor all the misfortunes of my life availed to turn me aside from the aims I placed before me. I strove for what I aspired to; and the more failures I experienced, the more I yearned for the struggle. That is why I was able to raise the mass of the Chinese people to revolutionary action and thereby overthrow the monarchy and found the republic.

AWARD OF PHILIPPINE MEDAL FOR  
VALOR TO GENERAL MACARTHUR

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, President Osmeña, of the Philippine Commonwealth, has just given to Gen. Douglas MacArthur the first award of the highest honor created by the Philippine Commonwealth. I ask that the citation be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MANILA, March 10.—President Sergio Osmeña, of the Philippine Commonwealth, decorated Gen. Douglas MacArthur today with the Commonwealth's highest award, its Medal for Valor, the Philippine equivalent of the United States Congressional Medal of Honor.

The Medal for Valor was authorized in 1931, but had never been awarded prior to its presentation to General MacArthur. With the cabinet looking on, President Osmeña said: "Through this decoration, the highest in the power of the Filipino people to give, the Commonwealth desires to make patent for all the world to see our gratitude, our esteem, and our admiration for our true friend and courageous liberator."

Col. Tomas Cahili, Secretary of National Defense, read the citation, which said, in part: "His direction of, planning, preparation, and execution of the Philippines operation has been of such accuracy and thoroughness that the initial blow struck at the enemy with characteristic daring and swiftness has been most successful and is an infallible sign of the final victory now in sight."

General MacArthur, in response, said: "This is a signal honor from the Philippine Government. It will bring me ever closer to the Philippine soldier whose valor and courage I have witnessed so often in battle."

## TRIBUTE TO SENATOR BAILEY

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the

Charlotte (N. C.) Observer in its issue of March 10, 1945, commending the great speech delivered in the Senate by my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] when the work-or-fight bill was under consideration.

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

## BAILEY EXHIBITS THE PRIMITIVE VIRTUES

Senator BAILEY, of North Carolina, has consistently tried to convince his colleagues that the Nation needs an effective work-or-fight bill. He has failed in that undertaking.

Congress is still piddling around with this legislation. Its politically minded Members are too sensitive to the opposition which pressure groups have stubbornly presented against the enactment of a suitable measure which would draft available workers for war industry or place them in uniforms.

The House weeks ago passed a reasonably good bill designed to this end. The Senate refused to accept it. After weeks of more or less rapid and meaningless torrents of oratory, the Upper Chamber has finally enacted a milk-and-water bill of its own. Now the two measures, that passed by the House and that passed by the Senate, have been referred to a conference committee from both branches to reconcile conflicts and differences that exist in their respective bills.

Senator BAILEY deserves well of his constituents in North Carolina and of his supporters all over the Nation for the fine fight which he has made in behalf of a work-or-fight measure which would have accomplished the purposes for which the President and the Nation's military leaders demanded this legislation.

The Baltimore Sun speaks with eulogy of the courageous and aggressive fight which the North Carolina Senator has made for this cause.

That newspaper contends that if anyone in the United States is looking for the phenomenon of the primitive virtues, such a one could find them in the statesmanship which has been exhibited by Senator BAILEY.

The Sun singles out this excerpt from the Senator's powerful speech in favor of a work-or-fight bill for which the administration has asked:

"Some have said that they would beat us for office. Well, what if they do? Are not Senators expendable? Think about the country. Think about the boys. Think about the generals who are responsible, who are begging us for men, who are begging us for arms and ammunition."

"What are the primitive virtues?" asks the Baltimore Sun and forthwith makes answer: "Well, among them is courage, honesty, faithfulness to trust and duty; contempt for evasion, for deviousness, for fraud in any degree. These were on view in Senator BAILEY's speech on manpower."

STREAMLINING THE FEDERAL  
BUREAUCRACY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be privileged to address the Senate for 5 minutes in order to present certain statistics and facts regarding surplus pay-roll costs under the Federal Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin that he be allowed to address the Senate for 5 minutes? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Wisconsin will proceed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has stated that the annual pay-roll cost of the estimated 300,000 Federal workers who are

holding surplus and artificial jobs is \$700,000,000. This figure would pay the annual interest, computed at a rate of 2 percent, on \$35,000,000,000 of our national debt. Some of the astronomical spenders in our Government might disparage this \$700,000,000 figure as a comparatively small sum; yet I invited their attention to the fact that this interest would be paid to our 85,000,000 citizens who have invested their savings in Government War bonds, either directly by individual purchases, or indirectly through their profit-making or eleemosynary institutions.

On December 31, 1944, \$230,500,000,000 of interest-bearing securities issued or guaranteed by the Government were outstanding. Of this figure, commercial and Federal Reserve banks held \$96,000,000,000 worth; individuals held \$52,000,000,000; insurance companies held \$19,500,000,000; mutual savings banks, \$8,500,000,000; State and local governments, \$4,000,000,000; Federal agencies and trust funds, \$21,750,000,000; and corporations, miscellaneous associations, and others, \$28,000,000,000.

Thus, every cent which might be saved, rather than go down the bureaucratic drain, could help to pay off the interest owed to these individuals and groups or, indeed, to begin to retire the Federal debt. This latter action would serve as a "shot in the arm" to the Nation and would reassure it of our country's financial solvency.

Is it not then the high obligation of every executive in the Federal service to cut corners insofar as possible, to conserve manpower, conserve funds, and maintain the self-respect and pride in honest workmanship of employees?

Is this high obligation not doubly heavy upon the shoulders of those executives who hold sway over the larger Federal departments and agencies? I refer in particular to such gigantic enterprises as the War Department with its 1,185,000 civilian employees within the United States, the Navy Department with its 693,000, the Post Office with its 372,000 employees, the Treasury with 95,000, and the Department of Agriculture with its 72,000 employees.

And, lastly, is not every holder of public office duty-bound to render to the public maximum service conducted in streamlined operations with conscientious thrift and sincere courtesy?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement which I made to the press on Friday, March 9. In this statement I called, as I have on many previous occasions, for a businesslike reduction of the Federal bureaucracy.

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

With our boys doing the impossible on every war front, it is an outrage that we should throw up our hands in helplessness while the bloated Federal bureaucracy continues to swell.

There are 3,372,000 civil service civilian employees here and abroad. Senator BYRD has estimated that at a minimum 300,000 of these are surplus. The existence of this sit-down army of seat-warmers and hangers-

on makes a mockery of every sacrifice by private enterprise on the home front and by the military services on the war fronts. It is a shocking testimonial to the inadequacy of the present administration in handling the wartime affairs of Government and the peacetime affairs to come.

The screws are being constantly tightened on industry and agriculture to force out needed manpower. The Senate has just passed a bill imposing stiff penalties on employers who willfully violate War Manpower Commission regulations. In my own State, manufacturers have been notified to list all of their employees between the ages of 18 and 29, and have been instructed by the Army that they may only retain 15 percent of these men. In the words of one manufacturer, "If the Army takes this many men away from industry, I fail to see how the men on the front line will be able to be supplied." In agriculture, our people are abandoning their life-long holdings or are working man-killing hours because their farms have been stripped of hands.

The war plants are crying for help. The farms are crying for help. The military services are crying for help. But at the same time, Government, "the greatest hoarder of them all," in the words of Senator BYRD, is obstinately refusing to release any help from its padded rolls. Indeed, there is barely a single Federal agency which contemplates any sizable reduction even after VE-day, let alone VJ-day.

In Heaven's name, when will the executive branch of the Government recognize its sacred obligation to the people not only to conserve manpower but to conserve funds? Federal officials are the trustees of every single penny appropriated to them by Congress and made available through taxation of the hard-earned incomes of the American public. The House has just raised the national debt limit to \$300,000,000,000. When we reach that limit, as we surely will, every man, woman, and child in this country will owe over \$2,000, in addition to bearing the crushing burden of interest upon that principal.

The particular Federal agencies empowered to take the lead in the economy drive have apparently folded their hands—the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the Budget (which were responsible for Federal manpower conservation), and the War Manpower Commission (which is responsible for all manpower conservation). They have set a terrible example for every bureaucrat to pass the buck on this issue. But if the afore-mentioned agencies will not spearhead the job, then it is up to every patriotic Cabinet officer, every patriotic agency head, and every patriotic bureau head to take and keep the initiative in economizing.

Any supervisor employed by the United States Government must answer to his conscience if he creates or maintains artificial jobs in order to bolster his prestige or salary. Any employee must stand accused in his own mind if he remains in a job which does not call for 8 hours of honest work in an 8-hour day. In these cases, the supervisors and employees are little better than slackers or war profiteers.

No business could long endure which encourages extravagance with stockholders' money and weakening of the moral fiber of its employees such as the United States Government does.

Therefore, I make this demand for the long overdue reduction in the Federal bureaucracy. I am not calling for an arbitrary slash, but rather for an introduction, with patriotic zeal, of business methods, business efficiency, business speed, and business conservation into every last Federal office. Only thus may the Federal Government be adequate to its responsibilities in these desperate days of the Republic.

#### TRIBUTE TO SENATOR VANDENBERG BY THE OMAHA WORLD-HERALD

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have in my hand a very short editorial which appeared in the Omaha Evening World-Herald on March 6, 1945, which makes very complimentary reference to the remarks recently made on the floor of the Senate by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and I should like to have it appear in the RECORD at this point.

I might say that the founder of this paper, the late Senator Gilbert M. Hitchcock, was chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations during the First World War, and the present editor in chief, Mr. H. E. Newbranch, occupied that position during the First World War.

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

#### JUSTICE AS THE BASIS

There is reason for deep satisfaction in Senator VANDENBERG's decision to accept membership in the San Francisco Conference.

And this not only because had Mr. VANDENBERG declined the President's invitation, the effect of his refusal would have been instantly chilling. The disturbing reaction would have been felt first among the American people, who hold the Michigan Senator in high respect. And later the Conference itself, and the nations of the world, would have been beset by a sense of doubt and fears concerning the existence of a nonpartisan American unity in the desire for a world security league.

Fortunately Senator VANDENBERG has been given the President's cordial assurance that at San Francisco he will enjoy the right to free action. In other words, he will be a freeman, speaking and acting as all freemen should, according to the dictates of conscience and judgment. It is on such a basis that honest and sincere men can hope to arrive at valuable agreements.

An even greater reason for gratification is that Senator VANDENBERG, announcing his acceptance, places emphasis where emphasis is needed. He calls for justice as a guiding objective in establishing a practical system of collective security. No permanent peace is possible except with justice as its basis. And so:

"It will be my prayer that the San Francisco Conference may be successful in promoting dependable peace, with organized justice, in a free world of freemen."

In that prayer every American not only, but every man and woman everywhere in the world, may well join. It is for this the conscience of civilization is yearning: "Organized justice in a free world of freemen." So vastly more important this than land grabbing, than spheres of influence, than boundary disputes, than commercial rivalries—the ghosts and evils that through the centuries have plunged the world into recurring wars. Never, so long as the material ponderables are permitted to trample the spiritual imponderables under heel, can the bright vision of enduring peace be realized.

In this Senator VANDENBERG speaks the quenchless idealism of his country. And with it he voices America's practical common sense: "Civilization cannot survive World War No. 3."

And so here is formulated the problem to which the San Francisco Conference must address itself. Another world war must be averted. But it cannot for long be averted except on a basis of justice in a free world of freemen.

Not an easy task. Rather it is one of exceeding difficulty. Certainly it will not have been achieved if justice, if honor, if morality are forgotten or surrendered to make a peace that is no peace.

#### REPORT OF THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In compliance with the provisions of section 10 (b) (4) of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12 (1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress, the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 10, 1945.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

#### SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY (S. Doc. No. 28)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1945, amounting to \$996,000 for the Federal Security Agency (with an accompanying

paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORT RELATING TO OIL AND GAS LEASES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, in relation to oil and gas leases issued prior to August 21, 1935, that have been included in approved unit plans of development, etc., and stating that no leases which expired during the calendar year 1944 were extended beyond their initial terms under the provisions of law; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

#### LEGISLATION BY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation enacted by the Legislative Assembly and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

#### LIQUIDATION OF FEDERAL RURAL REHABILITATION PROJECTS

A letter from the Administrator of the War Food Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, three statements constituting a report with respect to the progress of the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Letters from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, the Executive Director of the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, the Associate Director of the National Park Service, the Alien Property Custodian, Chairman of the War Production Board, Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and the

Secretary of the United States Employees Compensation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective department and offices for the quarter ending June 30, 1945 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

#### PERSONS EMPLOYED BY A COMMITTEE WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a report for the month of February 1945 from the chairman of the War Contracts Subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, being in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,  
March 1, 1945.

The VICE PRESIDENT.

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Pursuant to Senate Resolution 319, I am transmitting herewith a list of employees of the War Contracts Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs who are not full-time employees of the Senate. Included with this list is the name and address of each such employee, the name and address of the Department paying the salary of such employee, and the annual rate of compensation for each such employee.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,  
Chairman, War Contracts Subcommittee.

#### WAR CONTRACTS SUBCOMMITTEE, SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

| Name of individual | Address                                       | Name and address of department or organization by whom paid | Annual rate of compensation |
|--------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Kurt Borchardt     | 6007 34th Pl. NW., Washington, D. C.          | Smaller War Plants Corporation, Washington, D. C.           | \$5,600                     |
| Ann Cheatham       | 4000 South Capitol St. SE., Washington, D. C. | do  | 2,000                       |
| Bertram M. Gross   | 613 South Quincy St., Arlington, Va.          | Navy Department, Washington, D. C.                          | 8,000                       |
| Doris Phippen      | 40 Plattsburg Court NW, Washington, D. C.     | do  | 2,300                       |

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

#### "House Concurrent Memorial 1

"House concurrent memorial memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States of America to commit the United States to accept the principles of the federation of the world and requesting the President of the United States to call an international convention to formulate a constitution for the federation of the world

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):

"Whereas it is necessary at the present juncture of human affairs to enlarge the basis of organized society by establishing a government for the community of nations, in order to preserve civilization and enable mankind to live in peace and be free, the following principles and objectives are hereby enunciated in:

#### "THE DECLARATION OF THE FEDERATION OF THE WORLD

"Man, the source of all political authority, is a manifold political being. He is a citizen of several communities: the city, the State, the Nation, and the world. To each of these communities he owes inalienable obligations and from each he receives enduring benefits.

"Communities may exist for a time without being incorporated but, under the stress of adversity, they disintegrate unless legally organized. Slowly but purposefully through the centuries, civilization has united the world, integrating its diverse local interests and creating an international community that now embraces every region and every person on the globe. This community has no government, and communities without government perish. Either this community must succumb to anarchy or submit to the restraints of law and order.

"Governments can only be established through the deliberate efforts of men. At this hour two elemental forces are struggling to organize the international community: totalitarianism and democracy. The former, a recent version of repudiated militarism and tyranny, is predicated upon the principle of compulsion, rules through dictatorship, and enslaves men; the latter, a proved

bulwark of the rights of man as a human being and as a citizen, derives its authority from the consent of the governed, embodies the will of freemen, and renders their collective judgments supreme in human affairs. The cornerstone of totalitarianism is the ethnographic state, whose restricted interests define the scope of its favors; the foundation of democracy is man, whose integrity is inviolable and whose welfare is its primary concern. The motivating power of the former is violence; of the latter, freedom. One feeds upon unscrupulous ambition; the other upon an enlightened sense of obligation.

"One or the other of these forces will now triumph and govern mankind. The present conflict is irrepressible and decisive. It is the challenge of the ages to the generation of today, and represents those spiritually cosmic forces which visit the world at critical periods in human history to shape the destinies of men. This world cannot remain half slave, half free; half totalitarian, half democratic. The laws of civilized society prevent intercourse between slaves and free men from being either congenial or profitable. If totalitarianism wins this conflict, the world will be ruled by tyrants, and individuals will be slaves. If democracy wins, the nations of

the earth will be united in a commonwealth of free peoples, and individuals, wherever found, will be the sovereign units of the new world order.

"Man has struggled from time immemorial to endow the individual with certain fundamental rights whose very existence is now imperiled. Among those rights is man's freedom to worship, speak, write, assemble, and vote without arbitrary interference. To safeguard these liberties as a heritage for the human race, governments were instituted among men, with constitutional guaranties against the despotic exercise of political authority, such as are provided by elected parliaments, trial by jury, habeas corpus, and due process of law. Man must now either consolidate his historic rights or lose them for generations to come.

"The ceaseless changes wrought in human society by science, industry, and economics, as well as by the spiritual, social, and intellectual forces which impregnate all cultures, make political and geographical isolation of nations hereafter impossible. The organic life of the human race is at last indissolubly unified and can never be severed, but it must be politically ordained and made subject to law. Only a government capable of discharging all the functions of sovereignty in the executive, legislative, and judicial spheres can accomplish such a task. Civilization now requires laws, in the place of treaties, as instruments to regulate commerce between peoples. The intricate conditions of modern life have rendered treaties ineffectual and obsolete, and made laws essential and inevitable. The age of treaties is dead; the age of laws is here.

"Governments, limited in their jurisdiction to local geographical areas, can no longer satisfy the needs or fulfill the obligations of the human race. Just as feudalism served its purpose in human history and was superseded by nationalism, so has nationalism reached its apogee in this generation and yielded its hegemony in the body politic to internationalism. The first duty of government is to protect life and property, and when governments cease to perform this function they capitulate on the fundamental principle of their *raison d'être*. Nationalism, moreover, is no longer able to preserve the political independence or the territorial integrity of nations, as recent history so tragically confirms. Sovereignty is an ideological concept without geographical barriers. It is better for the world to be ruled by an international sovereignty of reason, social justice, and peace than by divers national sovereignties organically incapable of preventing their own dissolution by conquest. Mankind must pool its resources of defense if civilization is to endure.

"History has revealed but one principle by which free peoples, inhabiting extensive territories, can unite under one government without impairing their local autonomy. That principle is federation, whose virtue preserves the whole without destroying its parts and strengthens its parts without jeopardizing the whole. Federation vitalizes all nations by endowing them with security and freedom to develop their respective cultures without menace of foreign domination. It regards as sacrosanct man's personality, his rights as an individual, and as an individual and as a citizen and his role as a partner with all other men in the common enterprise of building civilization for the benefit of mankind. It suppresses the crime of war by reducing to the ultimate minimum the possibility of its occurrence. It renders unnecessary the further paralyzing expenditure of wealth for belligerent activity, and cancels through the ages the mortgages of war against the fortunes and services of men. It releases the full energies, intelligence,

and assets of society for creative, ameliorative, and redemptive work on behalf of humanity. It recognizes man's morning vision of his destiny as an authentic potentiality. It apprehends the entire human race as one family, human beings everywhere as brothers, and all nations as component parts of an indivisible community.

"There is no alternative to the federation of all nations except endless war. No substitute for the federation of the world can organize the international community on the basis of freedom and permanent peace. Even if continental, regional, or ideological federations were attempted, the governments of these federations, in an effort to make impregnable their separate defenses, would be obliged to maintain stupendously competitive armies and navies, thereby condemning humanity indefinitely to exhaustive taxation, compulsory military service and ultimate carnage, which history reveals to be not only criminally futile but positively avoidable through judicious foresight in federating all nations. No nation should be excluded from membership in the federation of the world that is willing to suppress its military, naval, and air forces, retaining only a constabulary sufficient to police its territory and to maintain order within its jurisdiction, provided that the eligible voters of that nation are permitted the free expression of their opinions at the polls.

"It being our profound and irrevocable conviction:

"That man should be forever free and that his historic rights as an individual and as a citizen should be protected by all the safeguards sanctioned by political wisdom and experience.

"That governments are essential to the existence of communities and that the absence of government is anarchy.

"That there exists an international community, encompassing the entire world, which has no government and which is destined, as a consequence of the present war, either to be ruthlessly dominated and exploited by totalitarianism or to be federated by democracy upon the principle of freedom for all nations and individuals.

"That all human beings are citizens of this world community, which requires laws and not treaties for its government.

"That the present conflict is one whose issue involves the survival of free institutions throughout the world, and that it is morally incumbent upon all free peoples, before this war proceeds further, to write the definite treaty of peace in terms of the constitution of the Federation of the World in order that those who are called to give their lives and fortunes for the triumph of democracy may have positive knowledge of the incorruptible utility of their sacrifice and in order that this conflict may not be fought to found a new world order at the conclusion of hostilities, but to defend the existence of one already established by the Federation of the World: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):*

*"SECTION 1. That the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring) does hereby solemnly declare that all peoples of the earth should now be united in a commonwealth of nations to be known as the Federation of the World, and that to that end it hereby endorses the declaration of the Federation of the World as is specifically set forth in the preamble hereof and makes said declaration a part of this memorial in the same manner as if same were recited herein and requests the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in the United States Congress assembled to introduce and*

secure the passage of a resolution in the Congress of the United States committing the United States to the acceptance of the principle of the Federation of the World and requesting the President of the United States to call an international convention to formulate a constitution for the Federation of the World, which shall be submitted to each nation for its ratification, and that the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, respectfully requested and urged immediately to call such a convention.

"SEC. 2. That when the said international convention is called it be urged to select a territory for the seat of government for the Federation of the World, and that the nation in which the said territory is located be requested to withdraw its jurisdiction over this area and cede it to the Federation of the World for its capital, with all the prerogatives and attributes of sovereignty, in order that there might be built in this area a city symbolic of world unity adequate for the needs of the nations and worthy of the aspirations and destiny of mankind.

"SEC. 3. That a certified copy of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative of the United States Congress from the State of Utah."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of South Dakota, memorializing Congress not to increase the Federal gasoline tax and lubricating oil tax and also to discontinue such taxes as soon as possible; to the Committee on Finance.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. GURNEY on the 6th instant, p. 1754, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by Local Union No. 127, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers of America, of Alameda County, Oakland, Calif., favoring reduction of the present age limit of 65 to 60 years for persons to be eligible to receive old-age pensions under the Social Security System; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Christian Danielsen, of New York City, N. Y., favoring the removal of the words "Without revealing the nature or source of its evidence" from the War and Navy Departments restrictive circular entitled "Discharge of Subversives from Private Plants or War Department Plants Privately Operated of Importance to Army Procurement," dated February 8, 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Joint Memorial 4

*"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:*

*"We, your memorialists, the Forty-third Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, convened in regular session, respectfully represent that:*

*"Whereas timber stands in the Pacific Northwest, both public and private, are being cut at an accelerated rate, far beyond the natural growth of the timber; and*

*"Whereas in converting timber to lumber less than one-third of the tree is utilized as lumber. About a ton of wood per thousand board feet of lumber is left at the sawmill as sawdust, slabs, and edgings, while about 3 tons are left in the woods as tops, limbs, broken and cull logs, cull trees, and non-commercial species. Such wood is perfectly good chemical raw material; and*

*"Whereas diversified utilization of timber, taking the forest crop as it comes and using*

those portions of it for those uses to which they are best suited will eliminate this extravagant waste of a dwindling natural resource; and

"Whereas the full utilization of timber products and waste material not only means the answer to future employment but the maintaining of many important communities as well: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring), That the Forty-third Regular Assembly of the Oregon Legislature petition the Congress of the United States to appropriate an additional \$50,000 to the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station for the establishment of a Forest Utilization Services unit to bring the results of wood utilization research to the forest industries of the Pacific Northwest; to take the problems of industry needing solution to the Forest Products Laboratory of the United States Forest Service and to conduct other urgently needed work such as participating in local pilot plant demonstrations of promising new processes and products; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That adequate Federal appropriations be provided the Forest Products Laboratory of the United States Forest Service which would enable it to make full use of its present facilities; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to both branches of the Congress of the United States, the Department of Agriculture, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Oregon."*

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Finance:

"Enrolled House Resolution 24

"Resolution expressing commendation and approval of Hon. PAUL STEWART for introducing H. R. 1831; commending the Oklahoma delegation in Congress for their support thereof

"Whereas Hon. PAUL STEWART, Member of Congress from the Third District of Oklahoma, has introduced H. R. 1831, which has for its purpose the granting of old-age assistance when an applicant is a citizen of the United States, is 65 years of age, and residence requirements conform to the provisions of titles 1 and 4; and

Whereas this is a great improvement over the present old-age assistance program and will have a tendency to eliminate so much case work and expense on account thereof, and reduce materially, if not eliminate, case workers; and

"Whereas this is the program that many of the old-age societies have urged and pleaded for; and

"Whereas Congressman STEWART has shown himself farsighted and ready and willing to cooperate with the old people for their betterment and happiness, and

"Whereas the entire Oklahoma delegation in Congress has endorsed Congressman STEWART's bill: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, That Hon. PAUL STEWART, Congressman from the Third District of Oklahoma, who served for 6 years as a member of the house of representatives in the Oklahoma Legislature and 16 years in the State Senate of Oklahoma, be highly commended for his splendid record in Congress and especially for his introduction of H. R. 1831; and be it further*

*"Resolved by the house of representatives, That the entire delegation in Congress from the State of Oklahoma be commended for their loyal support of H. R. 1831 and that this body go on record expressing their*

wholehearted approval and thanks, especially to Congressman STEWART and to the entire delegation in Congress from Oklahoma, and respectfully urge that the Congress of the United States approve at an early date said H. R. 1831; be it further

*"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives forward, by air mail, certified copies of this resolution to each Member in Congress from the State of Oklahoma."*

"Passed the house of representatives the 1st day of March 1945."

By Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

"Enrolled Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relating to public lands in, and funds and other relief due, the State of Wyoming from the United States of America

"Whereas lands now constituting the State of Wyoming were acquired largely under treaties with France and Mexico, that with Mexico having provided that the territory embraced under such acquisition 'Shall be formed into free, sovereign and independent States and incorporated into the Union of the United States of America as soon as possible, and the citizens thereof shall be accorded the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages and immunities as the citizens of the original States', and said Louisiana Purchase Treaty with France having contained almost identical requirements; and

"Whereas in the early days of the public domain none questioned but that it should and soon would pass to the several States within which it was situate, the then excuse for withholding such action having been that it was pledged to secure a national debt created by the Revolutionary War but after said debt was paid, such lands having been retained by the Federal Government and funds rapidly accumulated from disposal thereof, with a relatively minor exception, having been loaned to and among the then 26 States of the Union, most of which had never contributed toward such fund, and which fund with accumulated interest is now reported to be in excess of \$2,000,000,000, distribution thereof being equitably due to said public land States; and

"Whereas although the act admitting Wyoming into the Union, approved by the Federal Congress on July 10, 1890, included the express provision that 'The State of Wyoming is hereby declared to be a State of the United States of America and is hereby declared admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever \* \* \* and although the United States never asserted ownership of the lands, minerals, or waters of the original States and by paragraph 17 of section 8 of article I of its Constitution, the Federal Congress was authorized to exercise authority over, in addition to the District of Columbia, only such places as the Nation might purchase, by and with the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same are located, for specified purposes not including forests, minerals, monuments, or waters; and

"Whereas instead of vesting in the State of Wyoming, full title to all public land within its borders, as legally and equitably due said State under the treaty and constitutional provisions aforesaid, the Federal Government has followed a program of executive withdrawals under which there have been eliminated from the tax rolls and control of this State, more than one-half the lands within its borders, which program has included recent administrative set-up of the so-called Jackson Hole Monument, covering several hundred thousand acres of Wyoming land, portions

thereof being privately or State-owned, and the will of Congress in setting aside such autocratic executive action having been defeated by Presidential veto: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming (its house of representatives concurring), That the Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, the Honorable EDWARD V. ROBERTSON, and the Honorable FRANK A. BARRETT, Senators and Representative respectively from Wyoming in the Congress, and the Honorable Lester C. Hunt, Governor of this State, be and they are hereby requested, first, to continue their efficient, past action in opposing establishment of said so-called monument; second, to have initiated and diligently prosecuted, appropriate legislation by the Congress, looking to early restoration to this State, of full title to all public lands inside its boundaries, and third, to initiate and prosecute in like manner, action looking to recovery by this State, of all moneys properly payable to it on account of lands and minerals previously and improperly withdrawn from it or from private ownership, including, but not by way of limitation, the proportionate amount due said State on account of the one specific fund previously mentioned; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Federal Congress, the Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, the Honorable EDWARD V. ROBERTSON, and the Honorable FRANK A. BARRETT, Senators and Representative respectively, in said Congress from Wyoming, and to Honorable Lester C. Hunt, Governor of Wyoming."*

"Approved 4:55 p. m. February 13, 1945.

"LESTER C. HUNT,  
"Governor."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.)

Two joint memorials of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Finance:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to consider and pass legislation to amend the Social Security Act

*"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Wyoming (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized as follows:*

"Whereas the present social-security law does not provide for retirement before the age of 65: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the State of Wyoming (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and is hereby memorialized to amend the Social Security Act to provide that the retiring age be 65 years for workers in covered employment, and to provide that employees who have worked for 30 years or who have been disabled and are unable to work be retired with full payment as provided by the United States Social Security Act; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to United States Senators, JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and E. V. ROBERTSON, and Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT."*

"Approved January 31, 1945.

"LESTER C. HUNT,  
"Governor."

## "Enrolled Joint Memorial 2

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation relating to employers' sinking funds and reserves and taxability thereof

"Whereas sound and patriotic efforts by employers to set aside sinking funds and to establish other reserves for employment of returning veterans, for the taking care of necessarily deferred maintenance, for plant and other industrial reconversions and for current or post-war business adjustments and as a precaution against otherwise required payment of interest in the future of money which must be borrowed if present surpluses are dissipated and present market conditions or income levels become depressed, are now impaired if not completely frustrated by United States Treasury Department regulations under which the Internal Revenue Bureau assumes arbitrary authority to decide whether or not such reserves and funds are so unduly accumulated as to require their being either distributed or taxed out of existence, thus defeating experience-based plans of employers to safeguard the future welfare of their employees and resulting in present unnecessary and unwarranted spending of funds which should be preserved to accomplish the future purposes indicated and to preserve a stable, tax-producing structure: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-eighth Legislature of the State of Wyoming (its house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to promptly enact suitable legislation as required to eliminate or appropriately modify the criticized regulations, to expressly permit and encourage accumulations by employers of sinking funds and other reserves for the objectives stated and to provide that while set aside as such, they shall not be so taxed as to defeat their intended purposes; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Hon. EDWARD V. ROBERTSON and Hon. FRANK A. BARRETT, Senators and Representative respectively in the United States Congress, from Wyoming.

"Approved February 20, 1945.

"LESTER C. HUNT,  
"Governor."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate two joint memorials of the Legislature of Wyoming identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.)

Two joint memorials of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

## "Enrolled Joint Memorial No. 1

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States that all presently proposed Federal irrigation projects and all such which are proposed in the future, for construction in the State of Wyoming, be continued in all stages under the direct supervision of the United States Bureau of Reclamation.

"Whereas the United States Bureau of Reclamation has had many years of, and the only, experience in initiation, construction, maintenance, development, and operation of all Federal irrigation projects in the West and in such matters has been and is required by laws of the Nation to comply with all affecting State laws: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-eighth Wyoming Legislature (its house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to promptly and effectively enact such legislation as may be appropriate

to vest in said Bureau beyond any possibility of judicial doubt or Executive evasion concerning congressional intent, continued and direct supervision of the initiation, construction, maintenance, development, and operation of all Federal irrigation projects wholly or partially within the State of Wyoming, now or in the future proposed; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this joint memorial be sent to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of the Federal Congress and to the Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, the Honorable EDWARD V. ROBERTSON and the Honorable FRANK A. BARRETT, Senators and Representative, respectively, in said Congress from Wyoming.

"Approved February 13, 1945.

"LESTER C. HUNT,  
"Governor."

## "Enrolled Joint Memorial No. 2

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to consider and act upon legislation to remove or amend the excess land provisions of the reclamation act for lands receiving water supplies (in addition to their now existing water supplies) and relating to excess land provisions for new lands on future projects of the Bureau of Reclamation in the State of Wyoming.

"Whereas the agricultural economy of many existing irrigated areas in Wyoming is based upon the production of livestock, which requires large areas of irrigated pasture land and hay meadows; and

"Whereas the size of these existing farm units has been determined by each individual settler and has been dictated by the requirements of feed for livestock; and

"Whereas any reduction in the size of existing farm units would reduce the base acreage for allocation of public grazing land, which would work an undue hardship on the livestock producer; and

"Whereas the future economy of many new land projects will be based upon the production of livestock, and a farm unit of 160 acres has been found through past experience to be inadequate to maintain a sufficient number of livestock to support a single farm family: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, that the House of Representatives of the Twenty-eighth Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate concurring), That we hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to consider and act upon legislation to provide for removal of the excess land provision of the reclamation law for lands in future projects of the Bureau of Reclamation in the State of Wyoming already having partial water supplies; and be it further

"Resolved, That the determination of economic size of new land farm units on future projects of the Bureau of Reclamation in the State of Wyoming be left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, but in no case to exceed 320 acres under a single ownership; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States and to the United States Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and E. V. ROBERTSON, Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT, to the Honorable HAROLD L. ICKES, Secretary of the Interior, and HARRY W. BASHORE, Commissioner of Reclamation.

"Approved February 19, 1945.

"LESTER C. HUNT,  
"Governor."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.)

## REPORTS OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 8th instant,

The following reports of the Committee on Appropriations were submitted on March 10, 1945:

By Mr. McKELLAR (for Mr. GLASS):

H. R. 1984. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 88).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

H. R. 2126. A bill making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 87).

## REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 686. A bill to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 89).

## CONTINUATION OF STUDY OF AUTHORITY FOR ISSUANCE OF EXECUTIVE ORDERS AND DEPARTMENTAL REGULATIONS

Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 98) and submitted a report (No. 90) thereon, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority contained in Senate Resolution 252, Seventy-eighth Congress (relating to a study into the legal and constitutional authority for the issuance of Executive orders of the President and of departmental regulations), agreed to March 30, 1944, and extended by Senate Resolution 16, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to January 29, 1945, is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress; and that the limit of expenditures thereunder is hereby increased by \$50,000.

## ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on March 8, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 177. An act for the relief of Oscar Griggs;

S. 211. An act for the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 212. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11-12, 1940," approved April 23, 1941;

S. 214. An act to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943;

S. 215. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval

auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944;

S. 217. An act 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;

S. 222. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Duke Power Co. a 180-foot perpetual easement across Camp Croft, in the State of South Carolina; and

S. 290. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Orange & Rockland Electric Co. a 150-foot perpetual easement across the West Point Military Reservation in the State of New York.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 719. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Peter N. Bragg, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 720. A bill to extend the benefits of the Emergency Officers' Retirement Act of May 24, 1928, to officers honorably discharged from the Army under Public No. 259 Sixty-seventh Congress, June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado also introduced Senate bill 721, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 722. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Alice Yarlott Othermedicine; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 723. A bill relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. CORDON (for himself and Mr. Morse):

S. 724. A bill to provide promotion of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who served during the War with Spain and World War No. 1; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. J. Res. 45. Joint resolution extending the effective period of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. J. Res. 46. Joint resolution to provide for the use of the words "Observe Sunday" in the cancellation of United States mail; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

#### FURLOUGHS WITH PAY FOR VETERANS UPON SEPARATION FROM SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, in the press of yesterday Admiral William H. Standley, former Ambassador to Russia and at one time Chief of Naval Operations, is reported to be urging Congress to provide a month's leave with pay and a ticket home for every overseas veteran before his discharge from the service. In the article the admiral goes on to give his reasons for this innovation, which seem to me to be very sound. I therefore introduce a bill which I send to the desk and ask to have appropriately referred. It is designed to do what the admiral suggests that Congress do.

I also ask that the statement as printed in yesterday's newspaper be made a part of my remarks at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 721) to provide for granting terminal furloughs with full pay and allowances to enlisted men upon separation from service, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The statement presented by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado is as follows:

#### STANDLEY URGES LEAVE WITH PAY FOR VETERANS BEFORE DISCHARGE

Admiral William H. Standley, former Ambassador to Russia and onetime Chief of Naval Operations, is on record as urging Congress to provide a month's leave with pay and a ticket home for every overseas veteran before his discharge from service.

Offering the suggestion "as a first step" to help "our boys readjust themselves to changed conditions and viewpoints" on their return, Admiral Standley likened his own feeling of frustration at the time of his first leave from the Naval Academy to the problems returning veterans will face.

Writing in the Army and Navy Journal, he said:

"Throughout my plebe year at the academy I was looking forward to the grand time I would have when home again with friends. The reunion was all that I anticipated, \* \* \* but in a few days something seemed out of adjustment. My friends were all busy, and in the main pursuing the same objectives they were before I left. \* \* \*

#### TELLS OF LONELY TIME

"In the daytime I was unoccupied and lonely and \* \* \* had passed out of their orbit of activities and interests. \* \* \*

"Many of our boys will be in exactly the same status as I was when I had my first leave from the academy. A month's leave at home while still in uniform will not only help them toward a realistic readjustment but will prevent them from squandering whatever bonus they may receive on discharge."

The retired naval officer, now serving with the Office of Strategic Services, recalled that during the last war "political pressure" for release of servicemen "became very heavy," and that this "upset the order of discharge and resulted in discontent all down the line, usually causing displaced boys to write home about it, and then would come more special-order discharges. Because of this many youngsters left the service with feelings of disgust and bitterness."

#### LEAVE WOULD AID ADJUSTMENT

"All this would have been avoided and can be avoided," Admiral Standley said, by a month's leave "immediately after their services can be spared—a month's leave to go home in uniform and with full pay to see their wives, their children, their mothers, and their sweethearts."

"Such a respite would give them a chance, without the necessity of trying to plunge right back into civilian life, to see what conditions are, what has to be done, what they can do, so when they do get their discharge they will be far better fitted in every way to resume their places as useful citizens."

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 2348. An act to provide for the coverage of certain drugs under the Federal narcotic laws; and

H. R. 2404. An act to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes.

#### NOTICE OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO IN- DEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the Appropriations Committee I desire to submit several notices in writing in accordance with rule XL of the standing rules of the Senate, that it is my intention to move the suspension of paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing that the bill (H. R. 1984) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, be amended.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the Senate rule I believe that a motion to suspend a rule must lie over 1 day.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would make it impossible to take up the bill today.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think we could take it up. There is considerably more to do with it. We could finish with everything except the particular question which I have raised.

Mr. BARKLEY. We could not conclude consideration of the bill today.

Mr. McKELLAR. We could do so unless some Senator objected. Under the Senate rules consideration could be completed if no Senator objected.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

The notice in writing submitted by Mr. McKELLAR is as follows:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 1984) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purpose, the following amendments, namely:

On page 19, line 13, before the period insert "Provided, That of the \$35,000,000 appropriated in this paragraph, \$5,000,000 shall be available for loans or advances without matching under the provisions of said title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, but the remaining \$30,000,000 shall not be available for obligation or expenditure under said title V except to make loans or advances in cases in which sums at least equal to such loans or advances shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, their agencies or political subdivisions for the purposes set forth in said title V."

On page 22, line 9, before the period insert "Provided further, That the Commissioner of Public Buildings may, in his discretion, upon such terms and conditions as he may deem to be in the public interest, with the approval of the Federal Works Administrator, accept on behalf of the United States for installation in the United States Post Office Building at Kennebunkport, Maine, a mural, contributed by public-spirited citizens of the town of Kennebunkport, Maine, depicting, historically, the shipbuilding and seafaring activities of that community."

On page 30, line 7, before the period insert "Provided, That no part of the appropriation made in this paragraph for use in any cooperating country shall be available for obligation or expenditure unless said cooperating country executes a written agree-

ment that it will impose no restrictions on the use of the highway, nor levy directly or indirectly any tax or charge for such use, by traffic or vehicles from any other country that do not apply with equal force to the like use of the highway by traffic or vehicles of the cooperating country."

Page 55, line 10, after the word "field", strike out the following: "\$9,648,000, together with the unexpended balance on June 30, 1945, in the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1945", to remain available until June 30, 1946, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1945," and insert in lieu thereof \$59,701,000."

Page 55, line 24, after the word "hostilities", insert the following: "Provided further, That the Tennessee Valley Authority shall pay all its receipts into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, except the continuing fund of \$1,000,000 provided in section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act."

Mr. MCKELLAR also submitted several amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1984) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of the amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and myself give notice in writing that, in accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, we hereby move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to House bill 1984, the independent offices appropriation bill, an amendment, which I send to the desk, ask to have printed, and lie on the table until it shall be called up.

The notice in writing submitted by Mr. WHERRY for himself and Mr. MAYBANK is as follows:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is the intention of myself and Mr. MAYBANK to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 1984) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"Sec. —. In order to enable persons who have served 90 days or more in the land or naval forces during the present war, and who have been honorably discharged from such service, to obtain materials required for the construction, alteration, or repair of dwelling houses to be occupied by them, any department or agency of the Government, in allocating or granting priorities with respect to any materials, shall give to such persons a preference over all other users of such materials (except to the extent such materials are needed by such other users to meet actual military needs), without requiring any showing of hardship or other necessity for the construction, alteration, or repair of such dwelling houses."

Mr. WHERRY (for himself and Mr. MAYBANK) also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them jointly to House bill 1984, the independent offices appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

#### INVESTIGATION OF CONDITIONS AND PRACTICES IN THE PRODUCTION, ETC., OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I submit a resolution which I ask to have referred to the proper committee. It has to do with an investigation of the production, distribution, and transportation of livestock, and so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 96) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

*Resolved*, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with a view to determining:

(1) The conditions prevailing in the production, processing, and marketing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, feed, poultry and eggs and the products thereof;

(2) The effects of regulations, orders, and directives issued by governmental agencies upon the production, processing, marketing, distribution, and supplies of such commodities;

(3) Adverse effects upon meat supplies of maladjustments in maximum prices established on different grades of meat and particularly because of an inadequate allowance on the better grades of meat to encourage the feeding of livestock; maladjustment in prices of feed grains for livestock result from maximum prices established for such commodities or products thereof;

(4) The practices of purchasers of livestock for slaughter and the effect of such practices upon producers, processors, distributors, and consumers;

(5) Any practices wherein processors of livestock are circumventing the purposes and objectives of price floors, price ceilings, and subsidies at the expense of the producers and the Public Treasury;

(6) Reasons for the failures to support prices to farmers as required by existing law;

(7) Procedures followed by the Office of Price Administration, the War Food Administration, and the Director of Economic Stabilization in the issuance of regulations, orders, and directives relating to maximum prices, rationing, production, processing, and marketing of agricultural commodities and products thereof and the extent to which conflicts of policies and recommendations have occurred;

(8) Improvements in conditions which could be effected through consolidation of all activities pertaining to food production, marketing, processing, distribution, rationing, and price control, under one agency.

Such committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendation for any necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of

the committee, which shall not exceed \$10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

#### INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION CONFERENCE—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY FROM CONVENTION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate remove the ban of secrecy with regard to the convention which has been sent to the Senate, Executive A, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, relating to the International Civil Aviation Conference which was held at Chicago in December. The convention was signed in the English language by the respective plenipotentiaries of the Governments of the United States of America, the Philippine Commonwealth, and certain other countries.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the ban of secrecy is removed from the convention and it will be published in the RECORD.

The convention, with accompanying papers, is as follows:

[Executive A, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session]

#### To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of a convention on international civil aviation, concluded at the International Civil Aviation Conference, at Chicago, on December 7, 1944, and signed in the English language by the respective plenipotentiaries of the Governments of the United States of America, the Philippine Commonwealth, and certain other countries, as explained more fully in the report by the Acting Secretary of State, which report I transmit herewith for the information of the Senate.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 12, 1945.

[Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State. 2. Convention on international civil aviation—certified copy.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, March 5, 1945.

The PRESIDENT,

The White House:

The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a certified copy of a convention on international civil aviation, concluded at the International Civil Aviation Conference at Chicago on December 7, 1944, and signed as of that date, in the English language, by the respective plenipotentiaries of the Governments of the United States of America, the Philippine Commonwealth, Afghanistan, the Commonwealth of Australia, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, China, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Syria, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain, and Northern Ireland, and Uruguay. The respective plenipotentiaries of the Governments of Guatemala and Norway signed the convention on January 30, 1945. The Minister of Denmark in Washington and the Minister of Thailand in Washington were present at the International Civil Aviation

Conference in their respective personal capacities and affixed their signatures to the convention.

The provisions of the convention are designed to give effect to certain principles and arrangements in order that international civil aviation may be developed in a safe and orderly manner and that international air transport services may be established on the basis of equality of opportunity and operated soundly and economically. The signatory Governments have, by this convention, indicated their recognition of the fact that the future development of international civil aviation can help greatly to create and preserve friendship and understanding among the nations and peoples of the world and, furthermore, that it is desirable to avoid friction and to promote that cooperation between nations and peoples upon which the peace of the world depends.

Attention is invited to the final paragraph of the convention. Although it is stated in that paragraph that the convention is "done at Chicago the 7th day of December 1944, in the English language," it is provided therein also as follows: "A text drawn up in the English, French, and Spanish languages, each of which shall be of equal authenticity shall be opened for signature at Washington, D. C." Under ordinary circumstances it would be considered proper, in view of a provision such as this, to delay the transmission of the convention to the Senate until there had become available for that purpose a certified copy of the convention as signed in all the languages which are to have equal authenticity. However, the Department of State is informed that the French and Spanish versions have not been completed and it is anticipated that it may be a considerable time before it will be possible to have the convention signed at Washington in the three-language text.

Considering that the English version to be signed at Washington will be the same in all respects as the English text drawn up for signature at Chicago, a certified copy of which is enclosed herewith, and considering also that the French and Spanish versions, when completed, are to correspond exactly as a matter of substance with the English version, it has been decided that it would be advisable to have the convention brought to the attention of the Senate without delay. It is believed that this action, while not strictly in accordance with the customary procedure in relation to the transmission of treaties to the Senate, will serve to expedite consideration of the convention by the Senate.

The convention is divided into four parts, part I relating to air navigation, part II relating to the international civil aviation organization, part III relating to international air transport, and part IV containing the final provisions. The convention likewise is divided into 22 chapters, dealing, in order, with the following matters: General principles and application of the convention (I); flight over territory of contracting states (II); nationality of aircraft (III); measures to facilitate air navigation (IV); conditions to be fulfilled with respect to aircraft (V); international standards and recommended practices (VI); the organization (VII); the assembly (VIII); the council (IX); the air navigation commission (X); personnel (XI); finance (XII); other international arrangements (XIII); information and reports (XIV); airports and other air navigation facilities (XV); joint operating organizations and pooled services (XVI); other aeronautical agreements and arrangements (XVII); disputes and default (XVIII); war (XIX); annexes (XX); ratifications, adherences, amendments, and denunciations (XXI); and definitions (XXII).

The articles of the convention which contain the specific provisions are numbered article 1 to article 96, inclusive. For the purposes of the present report, it is believed to be unnecessary to undertake a detailed analysis

of the provisions of the convention. A marginal note accompanying each of the articles indicates the subject matter thereof. Particular attention is given here to a few of the significant provisions.

The contracting states recognize that every state has complete exclusive sovereignty over the air space above its territory (art. 1).

The right of nonscheduled flight is extended to civil aircraft, subject to certain limitations (art. 5). It is provided, however, that no scheduled international air service may be operated over or into the territory of a contracting state except with the special permission or authorization of that state (art. 6).

The convention provides that each contracting state shall have the right to refuse to the aircraft of other contracting states the privilege of taking on in its territory passengers, mail, and cargo carried for remuneration or hire and destined for another point within its territory, and that arrangements shall not be made whereby any such privilege may be granted or obtained on an exclusive basis (art. 7).

Each contracting state reserves the right to establish prohibited areas for reasons of military necessity or public safety and, in certain circumstances and on a nondiscriminatory basis, to restrict or prohibit temporarily flying over the whole or any part of its territory (art. 9).

The convention contains provisions relating to the adoption of international standards and procedures with respect to aircraft, personnel, airways, and auxiliary services (art. 37).

Provisions relating to the establishment, objectives, and functions of the International Civil Aviation Organization, the assembly and council thereof, and the Air Navigation Commission, and to the personnel and finances of the Organization, comprise part II of the convention (arts. 43 to 66, inclusive).

As between the contracting states, this convention supersedes the Paris Convention of October 13, 1919, relating to the regulation of aerial navigation and the Habana Convention of February 20, 1928, on commercial aviation (art. 80). The United States of America is not a party to the Paris Convention of 1919, but is a party to the Habana Convention of 1928 together with certain other of the American republics. The Habana Convention of 1928 is printed in the United States Statutes at Large, volume 47, part 2, page 1901.

Aeronautical agreements in existence at the time the convention comes into force are to be registered with the council (art. 81).

The contracting states accept the convention as abrogating all obligations or understandings between them which are inconsistent with the terms of the convention, and undertake not to enter into such obligations and understandings (art. 82).

It is provided that contracting states may make arrangements not inconsistent with the provisions of the convention, and that any such arrangement shall be registered with the council (art. 83).

In case of war, or in the case of any contracting state which declares a state or national emergency and notifies the fact to the council, the provisions of the convention shall not affect the freedom of action of any contracting states affected, whether as belligerent or as neutral (art. 89).

The final provisions of the convention relate to ratification by signatory states, adherence by nonsignatory states, admission of certain other states to participation in the convention, the method for effecting amendments to the convention, and the right of any contracting state to give notice of denunciation 3 years or more after the convention comes into effect (arts. 91 to 95, inclusive). It is provided in paragraph (b) of article 91 that as soon as the convention has been ratified or adhered to by 26 states

it shall come into force between them on the thirtieth day after deposit of the twenty-sixth instrument, and shall come into force for each state ratifying thereafter on the thirtieth day after the deposit of its instrument of ratification. Under paragraph (b) of article 92 the convention shall take effect with respect to an adhering state as from the thirtieth day from the receipt by the Government of the United States of America of the notification of adherence.

Respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH C. GREW.

(Enclosure: Convention on International Civil Aviation—certified copy.)

#### CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION (Preamble)

Whereas the future development of international civil aviation can greatly help to create and preserve friendship and understanding among the nations and peoples of the world, yet its abuse can become a threat to the general security; and

Whereas it is desirable to avoid friction and to promote that cooperation between nations and peoples upon which the peace of the world depends;

Therefore the undersigned governments having agreed on certain principles and arrangements in order that international civil aviation may be developed in a safe and orderly manner and that international air transport services may be established on the basis of equality of opportunity and operated soundly and economically;

Have accordingly concluded this Convention to that end.

#### PART I. AIR NAVIGATION

##### Chapter I. General principles and application of the Convention

##### Article 1. Sovereignty

The contracting States recognize that every State has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the airspace above its territory.

##### Article 2. Territory

For the purposes of this Convention the territory of a State shall be deemed to be the land areas and territorial waters adjacent thereto under the sovereignty, suzerainty, protection or mandate of such State.

##### Article 3. Civil and State Aircraft

(a) This Convention shall be applicable only to civil aircraft, and shall not be applicable to state aircraft.

(b) Aircraft used in military, customs and police services shall be deemed to be state aircraft.

(c) No state aircraft of a contracting State shall fly over the territory of another State or land thereon without authorization by special agreement or otherwise, and in accordance with the terms thereof.

(d) The contracting States undertake, when issuing regulations for their state aircraft, that they will have due regard for the safety of navigation of civil aircraft.

##### Article 4. Misuse of Civil Aviation

Each contracting State agrees not to use civil aviation for any purpose inconsistent with the aims of this Convention.

##### Chapter II. Flight over territory of contracting States

##### Article 5. Right of Non-Scheduled Flight

Each contracting State agrees that all aircraft of the other contracting States, being aircraft not engaged in scheduled international air services shall have the right, subject to the observance of the terms of this Convention, to make flights into or in transit non-stop across its territory and to make stops for non-traffic purposes without the necessity of obtaining prior permission, and subject to the right of the State flown over to require landing. Each contracting State nevertheless reserves the right, for reasons of safety of flight, to require aircraft desiring to

proceed over regions which are inaccessible or without adequate air navigation facilities to follow prescribed routes, or to obtain special permission for such flights.

Such aircraft, if engaged in the carriage of passengers, cargo, or mail for remuneration or hire on other than scheduled international air services, shall also, subject to the provisions of Article 7, have the privilege of taking on or discharging passengers, cargo, or mail, subject to the right of any State where such embarkation or discharge takes place to impose such regulations, conditions or limitations as it may consider desirable.

#### Article 6. Scheduled Air Services

No scheduled international air service may be operated over or into the territory of a contracting State, except with the special permission or other authorization of that State, and in accordance with the terms of such permission or authorization.

#### Article 7. Cabotage

Each contracting State shall have the right to refuse permission to the aircraft of other contracting States to take on in its territory passengers, mail and cargo carried for remuneration or hire and destined for another point within its territory. Each contracting State undertakes not to enter into any arrangements which specifically grant any such privilege on an exclusive basis to any other State or an airline of any other State, and not to obtain any such exclusive privilege from any other State.

#### Article 8. Pilotless Aircraft

No aircraft capable of being flown without a pilot shall be flown without a pilot over the territory of a contracting State without special authorization by that State and in accordance with the terms of such authorization. Each contracting State undertakes to insure that the flight of such aircraft without a pilot in regions open to civil aircraft shall be so controlled as to obviate danger to civil aircraft.

#### Article 9. Prohibited Areas

(a) Each contracting State may, for reasons of military necessity or public safety, restrict or prohibit uniformly the aircraft of other States from flying over certain areas of its territory, provided that no distinction in this respect is made between the aircraft of the State whose territory is involved, engaged in international scheduled airline services, and the aircraft of the other contracting States likewise engaged. Such prohibited areas shall be of reasonable extent and location so as not to interfere unnecessarily with air navigation. Descriptions of such prohibited areas in the territory of a contracting State, as well as any subsequent alterations therein, shall be communicated as soon as possible to the other contracting States and to the International Civil Aviation Organization.

(b) Each contracting State reserves also the right, in exceptional circumstances or during a period of emergency, or in the interest of public safety, and with immediate effect, temporarily to restrict or prohibit flying over the whole or any part of its territory, on condition that such restriction or prohibition shall be applicable without distinction of nationality to aircraft of all other States.

(c) Each contracting State, under such regulations as it may prescribe, may require any aircraft entering the areas contemplated in subparagraphs (a) or (b) above to effect a landing as soon as practicable thereafter at some designated airport within its territory.

#### Article 10. Landing at Customs Airport

Except in a case where, under the terms of this Convention or a special authorization, aircraft are permitted to cross the territory of a contracting State without landing, every aircraft which enters the territory of a contracting State shall, if the regulations of

that State so require, land at an airport designated by that State for the purpose of customs and other examination. On departure from the territory of a contracting State, such aircraft shall depart from a similarly designated customs airport. Particulars of all designated customs airports shall be published by the State and transmitted to the International Civil Aviation Organization established under Part II of this Convention for communication to all other contracting States.

#### Article 11. Applicability of Air Regulations

Subject to the provisions of this Convention, the laws and regulations of a contracting State relating to the admission to or departure from its territory of aircraft engaged in international air navigation, or to the operation and navigation of such aircraft while within its territory, shall be applied to the aircraft of all contracting States without distinction as to nationality, and shall be complied with by such aircraft upon entering or departing from or while within the territory of that State.

#### Article 12. Rules of the Air

Each contracting State undertakes to adopt measures to insure that every aircraft flying over or maneuvering within its territory and that every aircraft carrying its nationality mark, wherever such aircraft may be, shall comply with the rules and regulations relating to the flight and maneuver of aircraft there in force. Each contracting State undertakes to keep its own regulations in these respects uniform, to the greatest possible extent, with those established from time to time under this Convention. Over the high seas, the rules in force shall be those established under this Convention. Each contracting State undertakes to insure the prosecution of all persons violating the regulations applicable.

#### Article 13. Entry and Clearance Regulations

The laws and regulations of a contracting State as to the admission to or departure from its territory of passengers, crew or cargo of aircraft, such as regulations relating to entry, clearance, immigration, passports, customs, and quarantine shall be complied with by or on behalf of such passengers, crew or cargo upon entrance into or departure from, or while within the territory of that State.

#### Article 14. Prevention of Spread of Disease

Each contracting State agrees to take effective measures to prevent the spread by means of air navigation of cholera, typhus (epidemic), smallpox, yellow fever, plague, and such other communicable diseases as the contracting States shall from time to time decide to designate, and to that end contracting States will keep in close consultation with the agencies concerned with international regulations relating to sanitary measures applicable to aircraft. Such consultation shall be without prejudice to the application of any existing international convention on this subject to which the contracting States may be parties.

#### Article 15. Airport and Similar Charges

Every airport in a contracting State which is open to public use by its national aircraft shall likewise, subject to the provisions of Article 68, be open under uniform conditions to the aircraft of all the other contracting States. The like uniform conditions shall apply to the use, by aircraft of every contracting State, of all air navigation facilities, including radio and meteorological services, which may be provided for public use for the safety and expedition of air navigation.

Any charges that may be imposed or permitted to be imposed by a contracting State for the use of such airports and air navigation facilities by the aircraft of any other contracting State shall not be higher,

(a) As to aircraft not engaged in scheduled international air services, than those that would be paid by its national aircraft of the same class engaged in similar operations, and

(b) As to aircraft engaged in scheduled international air services, than those that would be paid by its national aircraft engaged in similar international air services.

All such charges shall be published and communicated to the International Civil Aviation Organization: provided that, upon representation by an interested contracting State, the charges imposed for the use of airports and other facilities shall be subject to review by the Council, which shall report and make recommendations thereon for the consideration of the State or States concerned. No fees, dues or other charges shall be imposed by any contracting State in respect solely of the right of transit over or entry into or exit from its territory of any aircraft of a contracting State or persons or property thereon.

#### Article 16. Search of Aircraft

The appropriate authorities of each of the contracting States shall have the right, without unreasonable delay, to search aircraft of the other contracting States on landing or departure, and to inspect the certificates and other documents prescribed by this convention.

#### Chapter III. Nationality of aircraft

##### Article 17. Nationality of Aircraft

Aircraft have the nationality of the State in which they are registered.

##### Article 18. Dual Registration

An aircraft cannot be validly registered in more than one State, but its registration may be changed from one State to another.

##### Article 19. National Laws Governing Registration

The registration or transfer of registration of aircraft in any contracting State shall be made in accordance with its laws and regulations.

##### Article 20. Display of Marks

Every aircraft engaged in international air navigation shall bear its appropriate nationality and registration marks.

##### Article 21. Report of Registrations

Each contracting State undertakes to supply to any other contracting State or to the International Civil Aviation Organization, on demand, information concerning the registration and ownership of any particular aircraft registered in that State. In addition, each contracting State shall furnish reports to the International Civil Aviation Organization, under such regulations as the latter may prescribe, giving such pertinent data as can be made available concerning the ownership and control of aircraft registered in that State and habitually engaged in international air navigation. The data thus obtained by the International Civil Aviation Organization, shall be made available by it on request to the other contracting States.

#### Chapter IV. Measures to facilitate air Navigation

##### Article 22. Facilitation of Formalities

Each contracting State agrees to adopt all practicable measures, through the issuance of special regulations or otherwise, to facilitate and expedite navigation by aircraft between the territories of contracting States, and to prevent unnecessary delays to aircraft, crews, passengers, and cargo, especially in the administration of the laws relating to immigration, quarantine, customs and clearance.

##### Article 23. Customs and Immigration Procedures

Each contracting State undertakes, so far as it may find practicable, to establish customs and immigration procedures affecting international air navigation in accordance

with the practices which may be established or recommended from time to time, pursuant to this Convention. Nothing in this Convention shall be construed as preventing the establishment of customs-free airports.

#### Article 24. Customs Duty

(a) Aircraft on a flight to, from, or across the territory of another contracting State shall be admitted temporarily free of duty, subject to the customs regulations of the State. Fuel, lubricating oils, spare parts, regular equipment and aircraft stores on board an aircraft of a contracting State, on arrival in the territory of another contracting State and retained on board on leaving the territory of that State shall be exempt from customs duty, inspection fees, or similar national or local duties and charges. This exemption shall not apply to any quantities or articles unloaded, except in accordance with the customs regulations of the State, which may require that they shall be kept under customs supervision.

(b) Spare parts and equipment imported into the territory of a contracting State for incorporation in or use on an aircraft of another contracting State engaged in international air navigation shall be admitted free of customs duty, subject to compliance with the regulations of the State concerned, which may provide that the articles shall be kept under customs supervision and control.

#### Article 25. Aircraft in Distress

Each contracting State undertakes to provide such measures of assistance to aircraft in distress in its territory as it may find practicable, and to permit, subject to control by its own authorities, the owners of the aircraft or authorities of the State in which the aircraft is registered to provide such measures of assistance as may be necessitated by the circumstances. Each contracting State, when undertaking search for missing aircraft, will collaborate in coordinated measures which may be recommended from time to time pursuant to this Convention.

#### Article 26. Investigation of Accidents

In the event of an accident to an aircraft of a contracting State occurring in the territory of another contracting State, and involving death or serious injury, or indicating serious technical defect in the aircraft or air navigation facilities, the State in which the accident occurs will institute an inquiry into the circumstances of the accident, in accordance, so far as its laws permit, with the procedure which may be recommended by the International Civil Aviation Organization. The State in which the aircraft is registered shall be given the opportunity to appoint observers to be present at the inquiry and the State holding the inquiry shall communicate the report and findings in the matter to that State.

#### Article 27. Exemption From Seizure on Patent Claims

(a) While engaged in international air navigation, any authorized entry of aircraft of a contracting State into the territory of another contracting State or authorized transit across the territory of such State with or without landings shall not entail any seizure or detention of the aircraft or any claim against the owner or operator thereof or any other interference therewith by or on behalf of such State or any person therein, on the ground that the construction, mechanism, parts, accessories or operation of the aircraft is an infringement of any patent, design, or model duly granted or registered in the State whose territory is entered by the aircraft, it being agreed that no deposit of security in connection with the foregoing exemption from seizure or detention of the aircraft shall in any case be required in the State entered by such aircraft.

(b) The provisions of paragraph (a) of this Article shall also be applicable to the storage of spare parts and spare equipment for

the aircraft and the right to use and install the same in the repair of an aircraft of a contracting State in the territory of any other contracting State, provided that any patented part or equipment so stored shall not be sold or distributed internally in or exported commercially from the contracting State entered by the aircraft.

(c) The benefits of this Article shall apply only to such States, parties to this Convention, as either (1) are parties to the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property and to any amendments thereof; or (2) have enacted patent laws which recognize and give adequate protection to inventions made by the nationals of the other States parties to this Convention.

#### Article 28. Air Navigation Facilities and Standard Systems

Each contracting State undertakes, so far as it may find practicable, to:

(a) Provide, in its territory, airports, radio services, meteorological services and other air navigation facilities to facilitate international air navigation, in accordance with the standards and practices recommended or established from time to time, pursuant to this Convention;

(b) Adopt and put into operation the appropriate standard systems of communications procedure, codes, markings, signals, lighting and other operational practices and rules which may be recommended or established from time to time, pursuant to this Convention;

(c) Collaborate in international measures to secure the publication of aeronautical maps and charts in accordance with standards which may be recommended or established from time to time, pursuant to this Convention.

#### Chapter V. Conditions to be fulfilled with respect to aircraft

##### Article 29. Document Carried in Aircraft

Every aircraft of a contracting State, engaged in international navigation, shall carry the following documents in conformity with the conditions prescribed in this Convention:

- (a) Its certificate of registration;
- (b) Its certificate of airworthiness;
- (c) The appropriate licenses for each member of the crew;
- (d) Its journey log book;
- (e) If it is equipped with radio apparatus, the aircraft radio station license;
- (f) If it carries passengers, a list of their names and places of embarkation and destination;
- (g) If it carries cargo, a manifest and detailed declarations of the cargo.

##### Article 30. Aircraft Radio Equipment

(a) Aircraft of each contracting State may, in or over the territory of other contracting States, carry radio transmitting apparatus only if a license to install and operate such apparatus has been issued by the appropriate authorities of the State in which the aircraft is registered. The use of radio transmitting apparatus in the territory of the contracting State whose territory is flown over shall be in accordance with the regulations prescribed by that State.

(b) Radio transmitting apparatus may be used only by members of the flight crew who are provided with a special license for the purpose, issued by the appropriate authorities of the State in which the aircraft is registered.

##### Article 31. Certificates of Airworthiness

Every aircraft engaged in international navigation shall be provided with a certificate of airworthiness issued or rendered valid by the State in which it is registered.

##### Article 32. Licenses of Personnel

(a) The pilot of every aircraft and the other members of the operating crew of every

aircraft engaged in international navigation shall be provided with certificates of competency and licenses issued or rendered valid by the State in which the aircraft is registered.

(b) Each contracting State reserves the right to refuse to recognize, for the purpose of flight above its own territory, certificates of competency and licenses granted to any of its nationals by another contracting State.

#### Article 33. Recognition of Certificates and Licenses

Certificates of airworthiness and certificates of competency and licenses issued or rendered valid by the contracting State in which the aircraft is registered, shall be recognized as valid by the other contracting States, provided that the requirements under which such certificates or licenses were issued or rendered valid are equal to or above the minimum standards which may be established from time to time pursuant to this Convention.

#### Article 34. Journey Log Books

There shall be maintained in respect of every aircraft engaged in international navigation a journey log book in which shall be entered particulars of the aircraft, its crew and of each journey, in such form as may be prescribed from time to time pursuant to this Convention.

#### Article 35. Cargo Restrictions

(a) No munitions of war or implements of war may be carried in or above the territory of a State in aircraft engaged in international navigation, except by permission of such State. Each State shall determine by regulations what constitutes munitions of war or implements of war for the purposes of this Article, giving due consideration, for the purposes of uniformity, to such recommendations as the International Civil Aviation Organization may from time to time make.

(b) Each contracting State reserves the right, for reasons of public order and safety, to regulate or prohibit the carriage in or above its territory of articles other than those enumerated in paragraph (a): provided that no distinction is made in this respect between its national aircraft engaged in international navigation and the aircraft of the other States so engaged; and provided further that no restriction shall be imposed which may interfere with the carriage and use on aircraft of apparatus necessary for the operation or navigation of the aircraft or the safety of the personnel or passengers.

#### Article 36. Photographic Apparatus

Each contracting State may prohibit or regulate the use of photographic apparatus in aircraft over its territory.

#### Chapter VI. International standards and recommended practices

##### Article 37. Adoption of International Standards and Procedures

Each contracting State undertakes to collaborate in securing the highest practicable degree of uniformity in regulations, standards, procedures, and organization in relation to aircraft, personnel, airways and auxiliary services in all matters in which such uniformity will facilitate and improve air navigation.

To this end the International Civil Aviation Organization shall adopt and amend from time to time, as may be necessary, international standards and recommended practices and procedures dealing with:

- (a) Communications systems and air navigation aids, including ground marking;
- (b) Characteristics of airports and landing areas;
- (c) Rules of the air and air traffic control practices;
- (d) Licensing of operating and mechanical personnel;
- (e) Airworthiness of aircraft;
- (f) Registration and identification of aircraft;

(g) Collection and exchange of meteorological information;

(h) Log books;

(i) Aeronautical maps and charts;

(j) Customs and immigration procedures;

(k) Aircraft in distress and investigation of accidents;

and such other matters concerned with the safety, regularity, and efficiency of air navigation as may from time to time appear appropriate.

#### Article 38. Departures from International Standards and Procedures

Any State which finds it impracticable to comply in all respects with any such international standard or procedure, or to bring its own regulations or practices into full accord with any international standard or procedure after amendment of the latter, or which deems it necessary to adopt regulations or practices differing in any particular respect from those established by an international standard, shall give immediate notification to the International Civil Aviation Organization of the differences between its own practice and that established by the international standard. In the case of amendments to international standards, any State which does not make the appropriate amendments to its own regulations or practices shall give notice to the Council within sixty days of the adoption of the amendment to the international standard, or indicate the action which it proposes to take. In any such case, the Council shall make immediate notification to all other States of the difference which exists between one or more features of an international standard and the corresponding national practice of that State.

#### Article 39. Endorsement of Certificates and Licenses

(a) Any aircraft or part thereof with respect to which there exists an international standard of airworthiness or performance, and which failed in any respect to satisfy that standard at the time of its certification, shall have endorsed on or attached to its airworthiness certificate a complete enumeration of the details in respect of which it so failed.

(b) Any person holding a license who does not satisfy in full the conditions laid down in the international standard relating to the class of license or certificate which he holds shall have endorsed on or attached to his license a complete enumeration of the particulars in which he does not satisfy such conditions.

#### Article 40. Validity of Endorsed Certificates and Licenses

No aircraft or personnel having certificates or licenses so endorsed shall participate in international navigation, except with the permission of the State or States whose territory is entered. The registration or use of any such aircraft, or of any certificated aircraft part, in any State other than that in which it was originally certificated shall be at the discretion of the State into which the aircraft or part is imported.

#### Article 41. Recognition of Existing Standards of Airworthiness

The provisions of this Chapter shall not apply to aircraft and aircraft equipment of types of which the prototype is submitted to the appropriate national authorities for certification prior to a date three years after the date of adoption of an international standard of airworthiness for such equipment.

#### Article 42. Recognition of Existing Standards of Competency of Personnel

The provisions of this Chapter shall not apply to personnel whose licenses are originally issued prior to a date one year after initial adoption of an international standard of qualification for such personnel; but they

shall in any case apply to all personnel whose licenses remain valid five years after the date of adoption of such standard.

### PART II. THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

#### Chapter VII. The organization

##### Article 43. Name and Composition

An organization to be named the International Civil Aviation Organization is formed by the Convention. It is made up of an Assembly, a Council, and such other bodies as may be necessary.

##### Article 44. Objectives

The aims and objectives of the Organization are to develop the principles and techniques of international air navigation and to foster the planning and development of international air transport so as to:

(a) Insure the safe and orderly growth of international civil aviation throughout the world;

(b) Encourage the arts of aircraft design and operation for peaceful purposes;

(c) Encourage the development of airways, airports, and air navigation facilities for international civil aviation;

(d) Meet the needs of the peoples of the world for safe, regular, efficient and economical air transport;

(e) Prevent economic waste caused by unreasonable competition;

(f) Insure that the rights of contracting States are fully respected and that every contracting State has a fair opportunity to operate international airlines;

(g) Avoid discrimination between contracting States;

(h) Promote safety of flight in international air navigation;

(i) Promote generally the development of all aspects of international civil aeronautics.

##### Article 45. Permanent Seat

The permanent seat of the Organization shall be at such place as shall be determined at the final meeting of the Interim Assembly of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization set up by the Interim Agreement on International Civil Aviation signed at Chicago on December 7, 1944. The seat may be temporarily transferred elsewhere by decision of the Council.

##### Article 46. First Meeting of Assembly

The first meeting of the Assembly shall be summoned by the Interim Council of the above-mentioned Provisional Organization as soon as the Convention has come into force, to meet at a time and place to be decided by the Interim Council.

##### Article 47. Legal Capacity

The Organization shall enjoy in the territory of each contracting State such legal capacity as may be necessary for the performance of its functions. Full juridical personality shall be granted wherever compatible with the constitution and laws of the State concerned.

#### Chapter VIII. The assembly

##### Article 48. Meetings of Assembly and Voting

(a) The Assembly shall meet annually and shall be convened by the Council at a suitable time and place. Extraordinary meetings of the Assembly may be held at any time upon the call of the Council or at the request of any ten contracting States addressed to the Secretary General.

(b) All contracting States shall have an equal right to be represented at the meetings of the Assembly and each contracting State shall be entitled to one vote. Delegates representing contracting States may be assisted by technical advisers who may participate in the meetings but shall have no vote.

(c) A majority of the contracting States is required to constitute a quorum for the meetings of the Assembly. Unless otherwise provided in this Convention, decisions of the

Assembly shall be taken by a majority of the votes cast.

##### Article 49. Powers and Duties of Assembly

The powers and duties of the Assembly shall be to:

(a) Elect at each meeting its President and other officers;

(b) Elect the contracting States to be represented on the Council, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter IX;

(c) Examine and take appropriate action on the reports of the Council and decide on any matter referred to it by the Council;

(d) Determine its own rules of procedure and establish such subsidiary commissions as it may consider to be necessary or desirable;

(e) Vote an annual budget and determine the financial arrangements of the organization, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter XII;

(f) Review expenditures and approve the accounts of the Organization;

(g) Refer, at its discretion, to the Council, to subsidiary commissions, or to any other body any matter within its sphere of action;

(h) Delegate to the Council the powers and authority necessary or desirable for the discharge of the duties of the Organization and revoke or modify the delegations of authority at any time;

(i) Carry out the appropriate provisions of Chapter XIII;

(j) Consider proposals for the modification or amendment of the provisions of this Convention and, if it approves of the proposals, recommend them to the contracting States in accordance with the provisions of Chapter XXI;

(k) Deal with any matter within the sphere of action of the Organization not specifically assigned to the Council.

#### Chapter IX. The Council

##### Article 50. Composition and Election of Council

(a) The Council shall be a permanent body responsible to the Assembly. It shall be composed of twenty-one contracting States elected by the Assembly. An election shall be held at the first meeting of the Assembly and thereafter every three years, and the members of the Council so elected shall hold office until the next following election.

(b) In electing the members of the Council, the Assembly shall give adequate representation to (1) the States of chief importance in air transports; (2) the States not otherwise included which make the largest contribution to the provision of facilities for international civil air navigation; and (3) the States not otherwise included whose designation will insure that all the major geographic areas of the world are represented on the Council. Any vacancy on the Council shall be filled by the Assembly as soon as possible; any contracting State so elected to the Council shall hold office for the unexpired portion of its predecessor's term of office.

(c) No representative of a contracting State on the Council shall be actively associated with the operation of an international air service or financially interested in such a service.

##### Article 51. President of Council

The Council shall elect its President for a term of three years. He may be reelected. He shall have no vote. The Council shall elect from among its members one or more Vice Presidents who shall retain their right to vote when serving as acting President. The President need not be selected from among the representatives of the members of the Council but, if a representative is elected, his seat shall be deemed vacant and it shall be filled by the State which he represented. The duties of the President shall be to:

(a) Convene meetings of the Council, the Air Transport Committee, and the Air Navigation Commission;

(b) Serve as representative of the Council; and

(c) Carry out on behalf of the Council the functions which the Council assigns to him.

#### Article 52. Voting in Council

Decisions by the Council shall require approval by a majority of its members. The Council may delegate authority with respect to any particular matter to a committee of its members. Decisions of any committee of the Council shall be appealed to the Council by any interested contracting State.

#### Article 53. Participation Without a Vote

Any contracting State may participate, without a vote, in the consideration by the Council and by its committees and commissions of any question which especially affects its interests. No member of the Council shall vote in the consideration by the Council of a dispute to which it is a party.

#### Article 54. Mandatory Functions of Council

The Council shall:

(a) Submit annual reports to the Assembly;

(b) Carry out the directions of the Assembly and discharge the duties and obligations which are laid on it by this Convention;

(c) Determine its organization and rules of procedure;

(d) Appoint and define the duties of an Air Transport Committee, which shall be chosen from among the representatives of the members of the Council, and which shall be responsible to it;

(e) Establish an Air Navigation Commission, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter X;

(f) Administer the finances of the Organization in accordance with the provisions of Chapters XII and XV;

(g) Determine the emoluments of the President of the Council;

(h) Appoint a chief executive officer who shall be called the Secretary General, and make provision for the appointment of such other personnel as may be necessary, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter XI;

(i) Request, collect, examine and publish information relating to the advancement of air navigation and the operation of international air services, including information about the costs of operation and particulars of subsidies paid to airlines from public funds;

(j) Report to contracting States any infraction of this Convention, as well as any failure to carry out recommendations or determinations of the Council;

(k) Report to the Assembly any infraction of this Convention where a contracting State has failed to take appropriate action within a reasonable time after notice of the infraction;

(l) Adopt, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VI of this Convention, international standards and recommended practices; for convenience, designate them as Annexes to this Convention; and notify all contracting States of the action taken;

(m) Consider recommendations of the Air Navigation Commission for amendment of Annexes and take action in accordance with the provisions of Chapter XX;

(n) Consider any matter relating to the Convention which any contracting State refers to it.

#### Article 55. Permissive Functions of Council

The Council may:

(a) Where appropriate and as experience may show to be desirable, create subordinate air transport commissions on a regional or other basis and define groups of states or airlines with or through which it may deal to facilitate the carrying out of the aims of this Convention;

(b) Delegate to the Air Navigation Commission duties additional to those set forth in the Convention and revoke or modify such delegations of authority at any time;

(c) Conduct research into all aspects of air transport and air navigation which are of international importance, communicate the results of its research to the contracting States, and facilitate the exchange of information between contracting States on air transport and air navigation matters;

(d) Study any matters affecting the organization and operation of international air transport, including the international ownership and operation of international air services on trunk routes, and submit to the Assembly plans in relation thereto;

(e) Investigate, at the request of any contracting State, any situation which may appear to present avoidable obstacles to the development of international air navigation; and, after such investigation, issue such reports as may appear to it desirable.

#### Chapter X. The Air Navigation Commission

##### Article 56. Nomination and Appointment of Commission

The Air Navigation Commission shall be composed of twelve members appointed by the Council from among persons nominated by contracting States. These persons shall have suitable qualifications and experience in the science and practice of aeronautics. The Council shall request all contracting States to submit nominations. The President of the Air Navigation Commission shall be appointed by the Council.

##### Article 57. Duties of Commission

The Air Navigation Commission shall:

(a) Consider, and recommend to the Council for adoption, modifications of the Annexes to this Convention;

(b) Establish technical subcommissions on which any contracting State may be represented, if it so desires;

(c) Advise the Council concerning the collection and communication to the contracting States of all information which it considers necessary and useful for the advancement of air navigation.

#### Chapter XI. Personnel

##### Article 58. Appointment of Personnel

Subject to any rules laid down by the Assembly and to the provisions of this Convention, the Council shall determine the method of appointment and of termination of appointment, the training, and the salaries, allowances, and conditions of service of the Secretary General and other personnel of the Organization, and may employ or make use of the services of nationals of any contracting State.

##### Article 59. International Character of Personnel

The President of the Council, the Secretary General, and other personnel shall not seek or receive instructions in regard to the discharge of their responsibilities from any authority external to the Organization. Each contracting State undertakes fully to respect the international character of the responsibilities of the personnel and not to seek to influence any of its nationals in the discharge of their responsibilities.

##### Article 60. Immunities and Privileges of Personnel

Each contracting State undertakes, so far as possible under its constitutional procedure, to accord to the President of the Council, the Secretary General, and the other personnel of the Organization, the immunities and privileges which are accorded to corresponding personnel of other public international organizations. If a general international agreement on the immunities and privileges of international civil servants is arrived at, the immunities and privileges accorded to the President, the Secretary General, and the other personnel of the Organization shall be the immunities and privileges accorded under that general international agreement.

#### Chapter XII. Finance

##### Article 61. Budget and Apportionment of Expenses

The Council shall submit to the Assembly an annual budget, annual statements of accounts and estimates of all receipts and expenditures. The Assembly shall vote the budget with whatever modification it sees fit to prescribe, and, with the exception of assessments under Chapter XV to States consenting thereto, shall apportion the expenses of the Organization among the contracting States on the basis which it shall from time to time determine.

##### Article 62. Suspension of Voting Power

The Assembly may suspend the voting power in the Assembly and in the Council of any contracting State that fails to discharge within a reasonable period its financial obligations to the Organization.

##### Article 63. Expenses of Delegations and Other Representatives

Each contracting State shall bear the expenses of its own delegation to the Assembly and the remuneration, travel, and other expenses of any person whom it appoints to serve on the Council, and of its nominees or representatives on any subsidiary committees or commissions of the Organization.

#### Chapter XIII. Other international arrangements

##### Article 64. Security Arrangements

The Organization may, with respect to air matters within its competence directly affecting world security, by vote of the Assembly enter into appropriate arrangements with any general organization set up by the nations of the world to preserve peace.

##### Article 65. Arrangements With Other International Bodies

The Council, on behalf of the Organization, may enter into agreements with other international bodies for the maintenance of common services and for common arrangements concerning personnel and, with the approval of the Assembly, may enter into such other arrangements as may facilitate the work of the Organization.

##### Article 66. Functions Relating to Other Agreements

(a) The Organization shall also carry on the functions placed upon it by the International Air Services Transit Agreement and by the International Air Transport Agreement drawn up at Chicago on December 7, 1944, in accordance with the terms and conditions therein set forth.

(b) Members of the Assembly and the Council who have not accepted the International Air Services Transit Agreement or the International Air Transport Agreement drawn up at Chicago on December 7, 1944, shall not have the right to vote on any questions referred to the Assembly or Council under the provisions of the relevant Agreement.

#### PART III. INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORT

#### Chapter XIV. Information and reports

##### Article 67. File Reports With Council

Each contracting State undertakes that its international airlines shall, in accordance with requirements laid down by the Council, file with the Council traffic reports, cost statistics and financial statements showing among other things all receipts and the sources thereof.

#### Chapter XV. Airports and other air navigation facilities

##### Article 68. Designation of Routes and Airports

Each contracting State may, subject to the provisions of this Convention, designate the route to be followed within its territory by any international air service and the airports which any such service may use.

#### Article 69. Improvement of Air Navigation Facilities

If the Council is of the opinion that the airports or other air navigation facilities, including radio and meteorological services, of a contracting State are not reasonably adequate for the safe, regular, efficient, and economical operation of international air services, present or contemplated, the Council shall consult with the State directly concerned, and other States affected, with a view to finding means by which the situation may be remedied, and may make recommendations for that purpose. No contracting State shall be guilty of an infraction of this Convention if it fails to carry out these recommendations.

#### Article 70. Financing of Air Navigation Facilities

A contracting State, in the circumstances arising under the provisions of Article 69, may conclude an arrangement with the Council for giving effect to such recommendations. The State may elect to bear all of the costs involved in any such arrangement. If the State does not so elect, the Council may agree, at the request of the State, to provide for all or a portion of the costs.

#### Article 71. Provision and Maintenance of Facilities by Council

If a contracting State so requests, the Council may agree to provide, maintain, and administer any or all of the airports and other air navigation facilities, including radio and meteorological services, required in its territory for the safe, regular, efficient and economical operation of the international air services of the other contracting States, and may specify just and reasonable charges for the use of the facilities provided.

#### Article 72. Acquisition or Use of Land

Where land is needed for facilities financed in whole or in part by the Council at the request of a contracting State, that State shall either provide the land itself, retaining title if it wishes, or facilitate the use of the land by the Council on just and reasonable terms and in accordance with the laws of the State concerned.

#### Article 73. Expenditure and Assessment of Funds

Within the limit of the funds which may be made available to it by the Assembly under Chapter XII, the Council may make current expenditures for the purposes of this Chapter from the general funds of the Organization. The Council shall assess the capital funds required for the purposes of this Chapter in previously agreed proportions over a reasonable period of time to the contracting States consenting thereto whose airlines use the facilities. The Council may also assess to States that consent any working funds that are required.

#### Article 74. Technical Assistance and Utilization of Revenues

When the Council, at the request of a contracting State, advances funds or provides airports or other facilities in whole or in part, the arrangement may provide, with the consent of that State, for technical assistance in the supervision and operation of the airports and other facilities, and for the payment, from the revenues derived from the operation of the airports and other facilities, of the operating expenses of the airports and the other facilities, and of interest and amortization charges.

#### Article 75. Taking Over of Facilities from Council

A contracting State may at any time discharge any obligation into which it has entered under Article 70, and take over airports and other facilities which the Council has provided in its territory pursuant to the provisions of Articles 71 and 72, by paying

to the Council an amount which in the opinion of the Council is reasonable in the circumstances. If the State considers that the amount fixed by the Council is unreasonable it may appeal to the Assembly against the decision of the Council and the Assembly may confirm or amend the decision of the Council.

#### Article 76. Return of Funds

Funds obtained by the Council through reimbursement under Article 75 and from receipts of interest and amortization payments under Article 74 shall, in the case of advances originally financed by States under Article 73, be returned to the States which were originally assessed in the proportion of their assessments, as determined by the Council.

#### Chapter XVI. Joint operating organizations and pooled services

##### Article 77. Joint Operating Organizations Permitted

Nothing in this Convention shall prevent two or more contracting States from constituting joint air transport operating organizations or international operating agencies and from pooling their air services on any routes or in any regions, but such organizations or agencies and such pooled services shall be subject to all the provisions of this Convention, including those relating to the registration of agreements with the Council. The Council shall determine in what manner the provisions of this Convention relating to nationality of aircraft shall apply to aircraft operated by international operating agencies.

##### Article 78. Function of Council

The Council may suggest to contracting States concerned that they form joint organizations to operate air services on any routes or in any regions.

##### Article 79. Participation in Operating Organizations

A State may participate in joint operating organizations or in pooling arrangements, either through its government or through an airline company or companies designated by its government. The companies may, at the sole discretion of the State concerned, be state-owned or partly state-owned or privately owned.

#### PART IV. FINAL PROVISIONS

##### Chapter XVII. Other aeronautical agreements and arrangements

##### Article 80. Paris and Habana Conventions

Each contracting State undertakes, immediately upon the coming into force of this Convention, to give notice of denunciation of the Convention relating to the Regulation of Aerial Navigation signed at Paris on October 13, 1919 or the Convention on Commercial Aviation signed at Habana on February 20, 1928, if it is a party to either. As between contracting States, this Convention supersedes the Conventions of Paris and Habana previously referred to.

##### Article 81. Registration of Existing Agreements

All aeronautical agreements which are in existence on the coming into force of this Convention, and which are between a contracting State and any other State or between an airline of a contracting State and any other State or the airline of any other State, shall be forthwith registered with the Council.

##### Article 82. Abrogation of Inconsistent Arrangements

The contracting States accept this Convention as abrogating all obligations and understandings between them which are inconsistent with its terms, and undertake not to enter into any such obligations and understandings. A contracting State which, before becoming a member of the Organiza-

tion has undertaken any obligations toward a non-contracting State or a national of a contracting State or of a non-contracting State inconsistent with the terms of this Convention, shall take immediate steps to procure its release from the obligations. If an airline of any contracting State has entered into any such inconsistent obligations, the State of which it is a national shall use its best efforts to secure their termination forthwith and shall in any event cause them to be terminated as soon as such action can lawfully be taken after the coming into force of this Convention.

##### Article 83. Registration of New Arrangements

Subject to the provisions of the preceding Article, any contracting State may make arrangements not inconsistent with the provisions of this Convention. Any such arrangement shall be forthwith registered with the Council, which shall make it public as soon as possible.

#### Chapter XVIII. Disputes and default

##### Article 84. Settlement of Disputes

If any disagreement between two or more contracting States relating to the interpretation or application of this Convention and its Annexes cannot be settled by negotiation, it shall, on the application of any State concerned in the disagreement, be decided by the Council. No member of the Council shall vote in the consideration by the Council of any dispute to which it is a party. Any contracting State may, subject to Article 85, appeal from the decision of the Council to an ad hoc arbitral tribunal agreed upon with the other parties to the dispute or to the Permanent Court of International Justice. Any such appeal shall be notified to the Council within sixty days of receipt of notification of the decision of the Council.

##### Article 85. Arbitration Procedure

If any contracting State party to a dispute in which the decision of the Council is under appeal has not accepted the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and the contracting States parties to the dispute cannot agree on the choice of the arbitral tribunal, each of the contracting States parties to the dispute shall name a single arbitrator who shall name an umpire. If either contracting State party to the dispute fails to name an arbitrator within a period of three months from the date of the appeal, the arbitrator shall be named on behalf of that State by the President of the Council from a list of qualified and available persons maintained by the Council. If, within thirty days, the arbitrators cannot agree on an umpire, the President of the Council shall designate an umpire from the list previously referred to. The arbitrators and the umpire shall then jointly constitute an arbitral tribunal. Any arbitral tribunal established under this or the preceding Article shall settle its own procedure and give its decisions by majority vote, provided that the Council may determine procedural questions in the event of any delay which in the opinion of the Council is excessive.

##### Article 86. Appeals

Unless the Council decides otherwise, any decision by the Council on whether an international airline is operating in conformity with the provisions of this Convention shall remain in effect unless reversed on appeal. On any other matter, decisions of the Council shall, if appealed from, be suspended until the appeal is decided. The decisions of the Permanent Court of International Justice and of an arbitral tribunal shall be final and binding.

##### Article 87. Penalty for Non-conformity of Airline

Each contracting State undertakes not to allow the operation of an airline of a contracting State through the airspace above its

territory if the Council has decided that the airline concerned is not conforming to a final decision rendered in accordance with the previous Article.

#### Article 88. Penalty for Non-conformity by State

The Assembly shall suspend the voting power in the Assembly and in the Council of any contracting State that is found in default under the provisions of this Chapter.

#### Chapter XIX. War

#### Article 89. War and Emergency Conditions

In case of war, the provisions of this Convention shall not affect the freedom of action of any of the contracting States affected, whether as belligerents or as neutrals. The same principle shall apply in the case of any contracting State which declares a state of national emergency and notifies the fact to the Council.

#### Chapter XX. Annexes

#### Article 90. Adoption and Amendment of Annexes

(a) The adoption by the Council of the Annexes described in Article 54, subparagraph (1), shall require the vote of two-thirds of the Council at a meeting called for that purpose and shall then be submitted by the Council to each contracting State. Any such Annex or any amendment of an Annex shall become effective within three months after its submission to the contracting States or at the end of such longer period of time as the Council may prescribe, unless in the meantime a majority of the contracting States register their disapproval with the Council.

(b) The Council shall immediately notify all contracting States of the coming into force of any Annex or amendment thereto.

#### Chapter XXI. Ratifications, adherences, amendments, and denunciations

#### Article 91. Ratification of Convention

(a) This Convention shall be subject to ratification by the signatory States. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America, which shall give notice of the date of the deposit to each of the signatory and adhering States.

(b) As soon as this Convention has been ratified or adhered to by twenty-six States it shall come into force between them on the thirtieth day after deposit of the twenty-sixth instrument. It shall come into force for each State ratifying thereafter on the thirtieth day after the deposit of its instrument of ratification.

(c) It shall be the duty of the Government of the United States of America to notify the government of each of the signatory and adhering States of the date on which this Convention comes into force.

#### Article 92. Adherence to Convention

(a) This Convention shall be open for adherence by members of the United Nations and States associated with them, and States which remained neutral during the present world conflict.

(b) Adherence shall be effected by a notification addressed to the Government of the United States of America and shall take effect as from the thirtieth day from the receipt of the notification by the Government of the United States of America, which shall notify all the contracting States.

#### Article 93. Admission of Other States

States other than those provided for in Articles 91 and 92 (a) may, subject to approval by any general international organization set up by the nations of the world to preserve peace, be admitted to participation in this Convention by means of a four-fifths vote of the Assembly and on such conditions as the Assembly may prescribe: provided that in each case the assent of any State invaded or attacked during the present

war by the State seeking admission shall be necessary.

#### Article 94. Amendment of Convention

(a) Any proposed amendment to this Convention must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the Assembly and shall then come into force in respect of States which have ratified such amendment when ratified by the number of contracting States specified by the Assembly. The number so specified shall not be less than two-thirds of the total number of contracting States.

(b) If in its opinion the amendment is of such a nature as to justify this course, the Assembly in its resolution recommending adoption may provide that any State which has not ratified within a specified period after the amendment has come into force shall thereupon cease to be a member of the Organization and a party to the Convention.

#### Article 95. Denunciation of Convention

(a) Any contracting State may give notice of denunciation of this Convention three years after its coming into effect by notification addressed to the Government of the United States of America, which shall at once inform each of the contracting States.

(b) Denunciation shall take effect one year from the date of the receipt of the notification and shall operate only as regards the State effecting the denunciation.

#### Chapter XXII. Definitions

#### Article 96

For the purposes of this Convention the expression:

(a) "Air service" means any scheduled air service performed by aircraft for the public transport of passengers, mail or cargo.

(b) "International air service" means an air service which passes through the air space over the territory of more than one State.

(c) "Airline" means any air transport enterprise offering or operating an international air service.

(d) "Stop for non-traffic purposes" means a landing for any purpose other than taking on or discharging passengers, cargo or mail.

#### Signature of Convention

In witness whereof, the undersigned plenipotentiaries, having been duly authorized, sign this Convention on behalf of their respective governments on the dates appearing opposite their signatures.

Done at Chicago the seventh day of December 1944, in the English language. A text drawn up in the English, French, and Spanish languages, each of which shall be of equal authenticity, shall be open for signature at Washington, D. C. Both texts shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America, and certified copies shall be transmitted by that Government to the governments of all the States which may sign or adhere to this Convention.

For Afghanistan: A. Hosayn Aziz.  
For the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia: Arthur S. Drakeford.  
For Belgium:  
For Bolivia: Tenl. Al. Pacheco.  
For Brazil:  
For Canada: H. J. Symington.  
For Chile: R. Sáenz, G. Bisquert, R. Magallanes B.  
For China: Chang Kia Ngau.  
For Colombia:  
For Costa Rica:  
For Cuba:  
For Czechoslovakia:  
For the Dominican Republic: C. A. McLaughlin.  
For Ecuador: J. A. Correa, Francisco Gomez Jurado.  
For Egypt: M. Hassan, M. Roushdy, M. A. Khalifa.  
For El Salvador:  
For Ethiopia:  
For France: M. Hymans, C. Lebel, Bourges, P. Locussol,

For Greece: D. Noti Botzariz, A. J. Argypoulos.

For Guatemala:  
For Haiti: Edouard Roy.  
For Honduras: E. P. Lefebvre.  
For Iceland: Thor Thors.  
For India: G. Bewoor.  
For Iran: M. Shayesteh.  
For Iraq: Ali Jawdat.  
For Ireland: Robt. Brennan, John Leydon, John J. Hearne, T. J. O'Driscoll.  
For Lebanon: C. Chamoun, F. El-Hoss.  
For Liberia: Walter F. Walker.  
For Luxembourg:  
For Mexico: Pedro A. Chapa.  
For the Netherlands: Copes, F. E. Aronstein.

For the Government of New Zealand: Daniel Giles Sullivan.

For Nicaragua: R. E. Frizell.  
For Norway:  
For Panama:

The Delegation of the Republic of Panama signs this Convention ad referendum, and subject to the following reservations:

1. Because of its strategic position and responsibility in the protection of the means of communication in its territory, which are of the utmost importance to world trade, and vital to the defense of the Western Hemisphere, the Republic of Panama reserves the right to take, with respect to all flights through the air space above its territory, all measures which in its judgment may be proper for its own security or the protection of said means of communication.

2. The Republic of Panama understands that the technical annexes to which reference is made in the Convention constitute recommendations only, and not binding obligations.

For Paraguay:

For Peru: A. Revoredo, J. S. Koechlin, Luis Alvarado, F. Elguera, Guillermo Van Oordt.

For the Philippine Commonwealth: J. Hernandez, Urbano A. Zafra, J. H. Foley.

For Poland: Zbyslaw Ciolek, Dr. H. J. Gorecki, Stefan J. Konorski, Witold A. Urbanowicz, Ludwick H. Gottlieb.

For Portugal: Mário De Figueiredo, Alfredo Deleque dos Santos Cintra, Duarte de Gusmão, Vasco Vieira Garin.

For Spain: E. Terradas, Germán Baralbar.

For Sweden: R. Kumlin.

For Switzerland:

For Syria: Kahale.

For Turkey: S. Kocak, F. Sahinbas, Orhan H. Erol.

For the Union of South Africa:

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: Swinton.

For the United States of America: Adolf A. Berle, Jr., Alfred L. Bulwinkle, Chas. A. Wolverton, F. La Guardia, Edward Warner, L. Welch Pogue, William A. M. Burden.

For Uruguay: Carl Carbajal, Col. Medardo R. Farias.

For Venezuela:

For Yugoslavia:

For Denmark: Henrik Kauffmann.

For Thailand: M. R. Seni Pramoj.

I certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the Convention on International Civil Aviation dated December 7, 1944, concluded at the International Civil Aviation Conference at Chicago, Illinois, in the English language, the signed original of which is deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America.

In testimony whereof, I, E. R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State, have hereunto caused the seal of the Department of State to be affixed and my name subscribed by an Assistant Chief, Division of Central Services of the said Department, at the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, this twenty-second day of January, 1945.

E. R. STETTINIUS, JR.,  
Secretary of State.

By M. L. KENETRICK,  
Assistant Chief, Division of Central Services.

**ADDRESS BY HON. JOSE CASTILLO TORRE  
WELCOMING DELEGATES TO A MEETING  
OF THE PERMANENT COMMISSION OF  
THE CONGRESS OF MEXICO**

[Mr. AUSTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a translation of an address delivered by Hon. Jose Castillo Torre welcoming the delegates to the recent Inter-American Conference held in Mexico City, on behalf of the Permanent Commission of the Mexican Congress, which honored them with a special session held in the Chamber of Deputies, which appears in the Appendix.]

**INTERNATIONAL AVIATION'S NEW CHARTER—ADDRESS BY L. WELCH POGUE**

[Mr. BAILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "International Aviation's New Charter," delivered by L. Welch Pogue, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, before a meeting of the Council on World Affairs at Kansas City, Mo., February 10, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

**UNANSWERED QUESTIONS—EDITORIAL  
BY DAVID LAWRENCE**

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Unanswered Questions," by David Lawrence, from the United States News of March 9, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

**TRIBUTE TO ANDREW FURUSETH**

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum regarding Andrew Furuseth, late president of the International Seamen's Union, which appears in the Appendix.]

**SPECIAL STAMP COMMEMORATING VALOR  
OF UNITED STATES MARINES ON IWO  
JIMA**

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Flag Raising Stamp," published in the Washington Star of March 12, 1945, and an article from the Washington Star of March 11, 1945, by James Waldo Fawcett, both relating to the proposal of Senator O'MAHONEY that the photograph of the raising of the American flag on Mount Suribachi, Iwo Jima, be adapted for use as a design for a special postage stamp, which appear in the Appendix.]

**THE MISSOURI RIVER VALLEY AUTHORITY—REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 555**

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution (S. Res. 78) to change the reference of S. 555, establishing the Missouri River Authority, from the Committee on Commerce to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, coming over from a previous day.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on February 15, 1945, I introduced Senate bill 555, a bill to create a Missouri Valley Authority. I had requested that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but instead the bill was referred by the Chair to the Senate Committee on Commerce. Such reference was in error, and I gave notice in the discussion on February 15, 1945, that I intended to move to have the reference rectified. I am now moving to have the Committee on Commerce discharged from further consideration and asking that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. President, I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. In introducing this bill, I did

not request its reference to a committee in whose deliberations I could participate or whose procedures I might be able to expedite. I requested reference to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry because that committee is best equipped to give the proposed legislation the fullest consideration and because that committee has the chief claim to jurisdiction of such legislation if the established precedents of the Senate are to guide.

I do not mean to suggest that the Committee on Agriculture is the only committee having an interest in the subject matter covered in the bill. On the contrary, the very nature of the measure makes it cut across the uncertain lines of committee jurisdiction in the Senate, just as it cuts across the sharper boundaries of the old-line departments of the executive branch of the Government.

The purpose of this bill is to unify responsibility for the administration of the major Federal programs dealing with the development of the Missouri River Basin. It has to do with water control, reclamation, the development of the natural resources, and other purposes relating to a single river valley. It is intended to end piecemeal legislation for the region it serves and to inaugurate a unified approach to the general problems involved.

As a result of the successful experiences of the Tennessee Valley Administration, which was set up by the Congress in 1933, both the legislative and executive branches of the Government have come to agreement on the question of the proper method of comprehensive development of river basins and resources.

It is now recognized that the administration of such multi-purpose programs should be entrusted to a single regional agency having headquarters in the region, which shall be directly responsible to the President and the Congress, with full authority and responsibility for carrying out the program authorized.

Ever since the successful inauguration of the T. V. A. in 1933 measures proposing legislation of this character have been uniformly referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. If this were the first time such a measure had ever come before the Senate, and I had had the vision and the wisdom to invent this new device for river development, I should have felt impelled to request that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry rather than any other of the several committees of the Senate whose claims for jurisdiction could be plausibly presented.

Such undertakings as that contemplated relate principally to agriculture, to land utilization, to soil erosion, to irrigation, and to the development of sound agricultural methods. Millions of farmers who reside in the area are directly affected by the program. Therefore, the soundest reasons exist for the referring of this character of legislation to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Of course, in addition to agriculture, the bill deals with various matters concerning which other Senate committees might be inclined to claim jurisdiction.

For example, the bill sets up a corporation, with power to sue and be sued, to settle its own claims, and to acquire

land by condemnation. Bills involving such matters are customarily referred to the Judiciary Committee. It is obvious, however, that these provisions in the bill are an inseparable part of the whole, and no one would dispute that reference to the Judiciary Committee would be an inept reference for a measure dealing with agricultural development, soil erosion, reclamation, and so forth.

I could point to other features of the bill which might give rise to the thought that other committees besides the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should be entitled to consider the legislation.

Of course, it would not be practical to have several committees working on the same legislative proposal. This matter has been discussed time and again by the Senate, and it has been uniformly recognized that in a program of this character, the committee having the major interest in the program is entitled to jurisdiction.

An important part of the bill relates to the development and administration of irrigation projects, but these projects also form only a special feature of a larger pattern of land and water conservation and use.

Again, one of the purposes of this bill is to promote navigation and the control of floods, subjects which, if separately considered, would lie within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce.

Nevertheless, if this legislation were being presented before the Senate for the first time, where these several committees were claiming jurisdiction based on its separate parts, it would still appear that, in view of the vast interest of agriculture in the proposed program, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should be the committee selected for its study.

Clearly, no other committee would have a better claim for jurisdiction than the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Section after section of the bill relates specifically to the problems of soil conservation and cultivation, reclamation of arid, semiarid, and swamp lands, utilization, fertilization, and conservation of forests, and reforestation of lands, the restoration of the subsurface water table, the protection of the Nation's resources from droughts, winds, and dust storms.

The bill contains provisions establishing a policy for the segregation of agricultural lands in small units for the encouragement of small family-sized farms, and providing homes for thousands of new settlers in the areas involved.

At a glance anyone can see what a tremendous role this program will play in the post-war period, when we will be called upon to provide new homes and new businesses for millions of workers.

No committee of the Senate is more familiar with the general problems of the region, because the Missouri Valley is the greatest agricultural area of this Nation. Its soil is the greatest single natural resource with which the Missouri Valley Authority will deal. Agriculture is the foundation of manufactures, since the products of the soil are

the materials of all commerce and industry. Commerce increases the wealth and glory of a country, but its real strength and stamina are to be looked for in agriculture. The agricultural lands of the United States constitute our greatest natural wealth. Upon the well-being of agriculture, the future progress and prosperity of this area and the Nation will depend.

All of these arguments I might have presented if this bill constituted a new and novel piece of legislation. I think such arguments made to justify the reference of the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would have been convincing to the Chair if the program were being presented *de novo*. But that is not the situation here.

Mr. President, the introduction of my bill does not raise a new question for determination. More than a quarter of a century ago when the first Muscle Shoals bill came from the House to the Senate, the question of its reference was taken up in open Senate and by the acquiescence of the Senate, after full notice, the bill was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It first was requested that the bill go to the Military Affairs Committee, but the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee at that time requested that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. There was an open discussion of the matter on the floor and the bill was finally referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Every piece of legislation on this subject has come to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, including bills pertaining to the Columbia River Basin.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held hearings on the Muscle Shoals bill and finally reported bills on the subject to the Senate. For the past quarter of a century no law on this subject has been passed which did not come from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and there can be no sound reason to change that procedure at this late day.

No other committee has any shadow of claim to jurisdiction, for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is the only committee of the Senate which has ever considered and reported a bill creating, as my bill proposes to create, an independent regional agency having unified responsibility and making its decisions in the field. It is the only committee which has had any experience with the application of the principles of modern management to the problems of resource development. It is the committee which from the beginning has had jurisdiction over legislation covering T. V. A.

It has certainly been no secret from the public that my bill is an attempt to apply the principles and adapt the experience of T. V. A. to the problems of the Missouri River Valley. I have never pretended that the administrative device proposed in my bill was an innovation. It is patterned after T. V. A. Its basic principles are the same. To suggest that such a bill should not be considered by the committee which has handled all legislation relating to T. V. A., to ignore and waste its unique experi-

ence, seems to me a wholly indefensible departure from traditional Senate procedure, one which could be justified only by a record of signal incompetence on the part of the Committee on Agriculture. The record is quite the contrary. Through the years, the Committee on Agriculture has demonstrated its competence and wisdom. It has recommended amendments to the original T. V. A. Act a half dozen times. It has refused to recommend amendments proposed on other occasions. I believe it has acted wisely. The people of the Missouri Valley have a right to the benefit of the accumulated wisdom of that committee.

It must be conceded that no other legislative committee of the Senate has this specialized knowledge, garnered from its exclusive consideration of all T. V. A. legislation which has come before the Senate. Yet we are faced here with the extraordinary situation of another committee, which, so far as I can learn, has never given an hour's consideration to matters affecting T. V. A., challenging the jurisdiction of the Agriculture Committee when the creation of a second regional agency is proposed.

Mr. President, this is a curious time for such a challenge to be made. I find that at least seven times since T. V. A. was created, bills which indicated a desire to adapt a part or all of the T. V. A. idea to other river valleys have been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and only once before the introduction of my bill was any kind of protest recorded. The committee was never discharged.

In 1935, in the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] and the then Senator from Idaho, Mr. Pope, introduced such bill relating to the Mississippi and Columbia Rivers, and they went to the Committee on Agriculture. In the second session of that Congress, in 1936, the last Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Norris, introduced a similar bill for the Mississippi Valley and it was promptly referred to the Committee on Agriculture. Again, in 1937, Senator Norris introduced another bill, this one creating a number of different authorities and extending the T. V. A. idea to various river valleys. It, too, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture as a matter of course, but in this latter case, the then chairman of the Committee on Commerce did challenge the reference. A motion to discharge were filed. The matter was debated. The manner in which bills are traditionally referred in the Senate was discussed with some humor. After the debate the claim of the Commerce Committee for jurisdiction was completely dropped.

Mr. President, I have before me the volume of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which contains that debate. As I have said, the matter was fully discussed at the time, and after that complete discussion of the problem of jurisdiction, the motion to have that sort of legislation referred to the Commerce Committee was dropped and nothing further was done about it. The question was discussed on two separate occasions at that time. I shall not take the time of the Senate at this moment to read from the CONGRES-

SIONAL RECORD what took place in reference to this matter, but if it becomes necessary during the course of the discussion of the subject I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. President, in 1941, in the Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, the then Senator from South Dakota, Mr. Bulow, introduced a bill providing for a development of the Missouri Valley. It, too, went to the Committee on Agriculture, and likewise in the same session a bill introduced by the then Senator from Arkansas, Mr. Miller, for himself and his colleague, Senator Caraway, was similarly referred. In 1942, in the Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, a bill introduced by the then Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. Lee, for himself, the Senator from Oklahoma Mr. Thomas, and Senator Caraway, followed to the Committee on Agriculture.

From the record it is fair to conclude that every since the establishment of T. V. A. this has been the procedure. Whenever a Senator intended the measure he introduced to provide a multipurpose development based on T. V. A.'s experience, as distinguished from other types of development, he requested its reference to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the Chair agreed. The reference of my bill to the Committee on Commerce is an astonishing reversal of what appears to be that unbroken precedent. It is an unmerited affront to the splendid Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, for my bill fulfills every condition for reference to that committee. It adheres to the basic principles of T. V. A. Its consideration requires the experience and knowledge of that committee.

I do not know how a reference of the bill to the Committee on Commerce can be justified. I assume it must have been so referred, because one of the purposes of the bill is the promotion of navigation and the control of floods. But, as I have already stated, that is not the only purpose of the bill. If it were the single purpose of the bill to authorize the building of structures for navigation or the control of floods, of course, it would belong before the Commerce Committee. No one would dispute that reference. In that event, I should have wanted to have the judgment of that committee. But my bill does not deal with flood control alone, nor does it propose to deal with it at all in the way in which bills customarily referred to the Committee on Commerce deal with it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I do not care to disturb the continuity of the Senator's thought if he would prefer not to yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. As a matter of fact, a great part of Senate bill 555 refers to reclamation and irrigation.

Mr. MURRAY. That is true.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does not the Senator believe that jurisdiction belongs in the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation?

Mr. MURRAY. No; I do not, for this reason: When a bill provides for multiple purposes, as this bill does, any one of several committees may be used in the first instance for considering the bill,

The bill cannot be sent to half a dozen committees. That question was discussed on the floor of the Senate. But such legislation having been sent to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which was the committee which had the major part of the program to study, it seemed to me that we should continue to send similar measures to that committee, which has had experience, and is qualified to act upon it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Of course, the Senator knows the bill in detail. The truth of the matter is that the greater part of the bill deals with matters concerning reclamation and irrigation.

Mr. MURRAY. I do not admit that.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is the whole tone of the bill, all the way through.

Mr. MURRAY. No; if the Senator will read the bill—

Mr. McCARRAN. I have read the bill with that in mind.

Mr. MURRAY. If the Senator will read the bill, he will find that section after section of the bill has no reference whatever to reclamation. But it would make no difference because, as I say, the Senate has had this question before it on a number of occasions, and the practice heretofore has always been to send bills of this character to the committee to which the Senator introducing the bill requests it to be sent. That has been the recognized practice in the Senate for the past 25 years, at least. Why, after all that experience, should we attempt to upset the precedents of the Senate and now take away from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which has had the study of such bills during all this time, and has gained experience, jurisdiction over such legislation, and send it to a committee which has not had 1 hour's experience with the major problems involved?

As I stated a moment ago, if legislation of this kind had been sent in the first instance to the Committee on Commerce I should have wanted my bill to go to the Committee on Commerce. If it had been sent to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation in the first instance, when the Muscle Shoals bill was introduced, and if for the following 25 years the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation had been considering such legislation, I should have requested reference to that committee, and I would have fought any move on the part of the Senate to take it away from that committee, and especially to take it away and turn it over to a committee which seems to have some preconceived notions about such legislation, and some philosophy which it wishes to put into effect with reference to the public power problem. That committee wishes to reverse Federal policies which have been in effect for a great many years, and take away from the people of the United States the great benefits which come from the development of power projects over the country. I object to that. I cannot understand why the Senate should want to agree to such a course as that when it is obvious that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is entirely qualified and competent in every way to handle this legislation.

As has been stated on the floor of the Senate many times, it is the practice, when a committee is handling legislation of a certain kind, to leave that committee in charge of future legislation of the same kind, and not deprive the Senate of the benefit of the knowledge and experience gained by the committee.

So I say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that he is mistaken in his view that this bill should go to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. It should not go there because the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry are just as well informed on irrigation and reclamation as are the members of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has studied the problems of irrigation and reclamation, and is just as well qualified to pass on those problems as is the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. If it were the single purpose of the bill to authorize the building of structures for navigation, I would, of course, concede that this bill should go to the Committee on Commerce.

My bill is not simply a bill to control the water in the river, although, of course, it contemplates the building of dams and reservoirs, levees and floodways. It provides for a much more comprehensive program. It envisages a continuing program designed to store the water on the land as well as behind great structures of earth and concrete. This bill recognizes, as T. V. A. has recognized, that flood control begins on the farm. Section 11 (a) (1) of the bill shows that the Board of M. V. A. will not limit its program of flood control to the building of physical structures. It is directed to include measures for "the control and retardation of water run-off and the restoration and improvement of the absorption and infiltration capacity of the soil" by "improved methods and conditions of soil conservation, utilization, fertilization, and cultivation, and the conservation of forests and afforestation and reforestation of lands."

Does the Committee on Commerce assert jurisdiction over a program which will affect the farming practices of tens of thousands of individual farmers? I think it will be admitted that such a program is the concern of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

What of the other agricultural features of Senate bill 555? Is the Committee on Commerce the most competent to consider broad programs for soil conservation and improved land use? No one would so contend. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is the proper committee to consider such questions; and it is the proper committee to consider questions of navigation and flood control as those problems are considered in my bill, as inseparable parts of a total program of conservation and utilization of the region's natural resources. No one can argue that those problems are new to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It can be argued that the Committee on Commerce has had no experience with and has never had jurisdiction over agricultural problems. But the converse is not true. The Commit-

tee on Agriculture and Forestry has had wide experience in handling problems relating to navigation and flood control. It cannot be claimed that reference of my bill to that committee is entrusting its provisions respecting water control to inexperienced hands. Legislation creating T. V. A. came from that committee in 1933; and never since has there been any question of its jurisdiction over bills affecting the most successful program of river control the world has ever seen.

It is exactly the kind of a program of river control the people of the West want to see carried out on the Missouri. The engineering problems will not be the same as those encountered by the T. V. A., of course. That is unimportant. No committee of the Senate should be required to pass on the technical problems of project design, construction, or operation. The Senate's concern is with major policy determinations. Its concern is with the characteristics which distinguish T. V. A. from every other instrumentality of the Federal Government.

Of course, other Government agencies build dams and reservoirs and levees. In the Missouri Valley today a dozen different bureaus are at work, dealing with problems which will be the concern of M. V. A. if the bill I introduced should be enacted. Competent and devoted public servants are employed by all those agencies. But, Mr. President, their work, carried on under the several bureaus, and directed from the Nation's Capital, has not been as beneficial to the people of my river valley or the Nation as the work of T. V. A. has been to the people of that area. I want the policies of T. V. A. to be repeated in the region where I live. I want its unrivalled record of accomplishments to be equalled in the Missouri Valley.

I have made some study of the question. I am convinced that the secret of the success of T. V. A. lies right in the statute which created it, the statute originally considered and reported, and at various later times considered and amended, on the recommendation of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That committee, as no other committee of the Senate, knows how essential to the repetition of the record is the repetition of observance of certain basic principles provided for in the organic act. It knows, as no other committee knows, the importance of the unified approach and how easily it might be destroyed by an infringement or limitation in the statute. It knows how essential for success is application of the principles of modern management in the development of our natural resources, as applied so magnificently in the T. V. A. It knows that T. V. A. would not be T. V. A. if it were not independent of other agencies of government, free to make its administrative decisions close to the people it serves.

Mr. President, my bill provides an instrument like T. V. A. in every fundamental. Its proper consideration requires the years of experience of the Committee of Agriculture and Forestry. I respectfully submit that the Chair was

in error in referring the bill to the Commerce Committee. That committee should now be discharged from its further consideration, and the bill should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing some of the debates of the Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, at which time this subject was under consideration in the Senate. I think the Members of this body should familiarize themselves with that debate in order intelligently to act on this motion. It seems to me it would be totally without justification to undertake to change the reference of such bills from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry at this late time, after such legislation has been referred during all that time to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, a committee which has done a splendid piece of work in that respect. I submit that the Senate should continue to have legislation of this kind handled by that committee, which has had so much experience with such measures.

I desire to call attention to the discussion which took place in the Senate on June 3, 1937. It will be found in volume 81, part V, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-fifth Congress, at page 5281 and the following pages.

At that time the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], said the following:

It seems to me that there ought to be some rule of the Senate by which bills shall be referred in a more consistent and uniform manner. I am not a member of either committee, and I am not concerned about which committee shall consider the subject; but it seems to me that bills of identical nature, introduced at the same session, and dealing with the same subject, should not be referred to two or three different committees. There ought to be a definite rule as to the reference of bills. Certainly two bills, relating to the same subject matter ought not to be considered one by the Committee on Commerce and the other by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The then Vice President, who at that time was in the chair, had this to say:

With the permission of the Senator, the Chair would like to say in defense of himself that in the matter of making references to committees, when bills are introduced which cover a number of subjects, and of which various committees have jurisdiction, it is the custom of the Chair to refer them to the committees requested by those introducing the measures. The bill which the Senator from Nebraska has introduced, and also the bill which the Chair understands the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the Senator from Ohio, Mr. Bulkley, have introduced, deal with various subjects concerning which different Senate committees would have jurisdiction.

The Senator from Nebraska asked that the bill he has just introduced be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Chair does not know whether the Senator from Kentucky or the Senator from Ohio requested that their bill be referred to the Committee on Commerce, or whether they left the disposition of the bill to the Parliamentarian.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] also said at that time:

Mr. President, I will say that bills providing for flood-control legislation have heretofore

come from the Committee on Commerce; and, whether or not we should request that a bill dealing with that subject be referred to that committee, the bill would go there. Of course, I do not raise any question with respect to which one of these committees would have jurisdiction of the subject. My point is that certainly two committees ought not to be considering the same subject at the same time.

Later he said:

With all due respect to everyone involved, it does seem that there ought to be some uniformity with respect to the reference of bills which deal with subjects which are already under consideration and before the Senate. I am not concerned about which one of these committees shall consider these flood-control bills, but both committees ought not to be considering the bills at the same time.

Then the late Senator from Arkansas, Mr. Robinson, the great majority leader at that time, said the following:

The rules of the Senate do not expressly define the jurisdiction of its committees. By precedent it has been the custom of the Senate to refer to the various standing committees measures which have relation to the titles of the committees. As stated by the Chair, frequently there is an overlapping, or rather duplication, of jurisdiction. Many bills might be referred to either one of two or more committees, and either one of those committees would have proper jurisdiction. It would be very difficult to revise the rules so as to determine or enable the Chair to determine just what committee should take jurisdiction of every bill that might be presented in this body.

Then the discussion continued, and the Senator from Kentucky at that time made the following further observation:

Mr. President, I did not rise to object to the reference of the whole subject to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I agree that the President's message contains a discussion of many subjects, and the bill introduced by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Norris] contains provisions touching many subjects which might give jurisdiction to one or more committees of the Senate. I doubt the wisdom of trying to have two committees consider the same measure. I think the bill should go to one committee or the other, because whenever we have division of authority between committees we have confusion and chaos. This particular bill does lend itself to reference to either one of the two committees, and perhaps to another one.

The Senator from Kentucky further said:

I am not raising any point about that; I do not care what committee considers it. As one of our chief justices in Kentucky once said about the 1st day of the month, when a large assortment of bills came in, it was not the size of the bills but the numerosity of them that troubled him. I think it is unfortunate we should have races between two committees and perhaps have both of them report the same bill.

Senator Robinson, the leader at that time, said:

Usually no contest arises between committees to obtain jurisdiction of bills. It seldom happens when a Senator prepares a bill or offers a bill, and, under the custom that prevails, makes a suggestion for its reference that the reference is not made in accordance with his suggestion.

Senator Norris also participated in the discussion of the subject. He stated:

An identical bill, introduced by the Senator from Tennessee, had already, in a prior Congress, been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That bill was reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as a part of a more comprehensive bill. It passed the Senate under the report from that Committee on Agriculture, and went into conference, where it was lost. So a year before the Senator introduced his bill and had it referred to the Committee on Commerce the Agricultural Committee had already passed on a similar measure and recommended that favorable action be taken, and the Senate had passed a bill in pursuance of that recommendation.

It merely illustrates, I think, what the Senator from Arkansas has said as to the jurisdiction of various committees. But I do not know of any rule that could be adopted, although it would be nice if one could be provided, that would make it impossible for any conflict to arise, for, in the very nature of things, there must be conflict. After all, however, the rule provides that if a reference is not satisfactory to the Senate it may take action and refer any bill to any committee it chooses.

Later Senator Robinson said:

Let me say as one who has had many years' experience in this body that I have not found very much difficulty arising out of the conflict of jurisdiction among the committees. While, as suggested by the Senator from Missouri, Mr. Clark, and other Senators, it would be preferable to have a clear definition of the jurisdiction of the committees. I know of no way by which that can be accomplished when a bill which is introduced embraces several subject matters. At last it becomes a matter of discretion with the Chair and a matter of judgment on the part of the Senate if an issue is raised as to the reference.

Mr. President, it seems to me that when we have followed a course of procedure for 25 years, and legislation of this character has been uniformly referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, there is no basis whatsoever for undertaking to take the bill out of the jurisdiction of that committee. I make that statement especially in view of the fact that it is apparent that the Commerce Committee has a philosophy with reference to public power which is not in accordance with the philosophy of most of us in this country. We believe that in the development of public power the benefits to be derived from it should be given to the people and not to the big power corporations of the United States. It seems to me that disagreement with that belief forms the sole basis for the effort to get this bill away from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Agriculture has demonstrated its sympathy with the national policy which has been in force. It has had experience with the subject, and I think the bill should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

DREW PEARSON

Mr. BILEO. Mr. President, it is not only generally known, but it is universally admitted, that Drew Pearson is the biggest and most notorious liar in America today. Not only is Pearson recognized as being the biggest liar, but he is also recognized as being the most perfect smear artist of the press and radio. He will go down in history as Drew Pearson

the sponge [laughter], because he gathers slime, mud, and slander from all parts of the earth and lets them ooze out through his radio broadcasts, and through his daily contributions to a few newspapers which have not yet found him out.

In his radio broadcasts he includes a feature of predictions of things to come. I wish to add one prediction, namely, that he will go down in history as Drew Pearson the sponge. He is so great a liar and so vicious that it becomes necessary for the President of the United States to denounce him as a chronic liar. The Secretary of State, that grand old man, Cordell Hull, found it necessary to denounce him as an infamous and pusillanimous liar. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], all outstanding Members of this body, have found it necessary from time to time to denounce him and call him what he really is—a liar.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Mississippi will recall that what I had to say about him was exceedingly and excessively mild.

Mr. BILBO. Yes; in comparison to what I proposed to do to this gentleman a little later on the Senator is correct.

Mr. President, it now becomes my duty, by request, to call the attention of the Senate and the country to a Drew Pearson article in the Washington Post of February 1, in which he denounced and slandered the Walter Reed General Hospital. Among other statements he makes this one:

One result is that ward attendants are doing a thriving business selling liquor from \$5 to \$15 a quart. Visitors have often noted that the innocent-appearing pitchers alongside hospital cots contained liquid much stronger than Coca-Cola, while nurses have been known to go through a ward distributing ice cubes.

Recently the men in ward 32, most of them in traction splints, which require absolute quiet, drank so much and became so noisy that an M. P. appeared to restore order and was beaten up by the patients. Several patients were set back several weeks in their recovery as a result of leaving their cots to jump on the M. P.

At the Forest Glen Convalescent Home, under Walter Reed administration, the situation is perhaps worse. Most of the G. I.'s here are able to get out and visit Washington. Classes in mathematics, language, and other academic subjects are offered by volunteer teachers, but no attempt is made to give the men psychological tests to aid them in choosing a post-war trade or profession.

Drew Pearson continues with the story and I ask that the full and complete story be made a part of my remarks at this juncture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

#### THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

#### VETERANS' HOSPITAL

Although the Army boasts of its Walter Reed General Hospital in Washington as the finest in the country, hundreds of servicemen come out severely critical, except of the actual surgery performed.

Head of Walter Reed is 64-year-old Maj. Gen. Shelly U. Marietta, General Pershing's close friend and personal physician. General Marietta is a renowned doctor, but not so strong as an administrator, with the result that the hospital morale is extremely low, especially among enlisted men.

One failing is that the Army's vaunted rehabilitation program has never been properly installed at Walter Reed. The only serious attempt at rehabilitating veterans is for men who are to remain in the service. Those scheduled to get discharges are practically ignored.

One result is that ward attendants are doing a thriving business selling liquor from 5 to 15 dollars a quart. Visitors have often noted that the innocent-appearing pitchers alongside hospital cots contain liquid much stronger than Coca-Cola, while nurses have been known to go through a ward distributing ice cubes.

Recently the men in ward 32, most of them in traction splints, which require absolute quiet, drank so much and became so noisy that an M. P. appeared to restore order and was beaten up by the patients. Several patients were set back several weeks in their recovery as a result of leaving their cots to jump on the M. P.

At the Forest Glen Convalescent Home, under Walter Reed administration, the situation is perhaps worse. Most of the G. I.'s here are able to get out and visit Washington. Classes in mathematics, language, and other academic subjects are offered by volunteer teachers, but no attempt is made to give the men psychological tests to aid them in choosing a post-war trade or profession.

The Army Morale Service is permitted to work at Forest Glen only at the invitation of the Medical Corps. Last summer a group of psychologists from the Morale Service prepared an analysis of the hospital's needs and recommended a reorganization. This group was ordered overseas before its report was completed—and the report never has been finished.

Mr. BILBO. In response to that slander and lie of Drew Pearson, I want to present to the Senate a statement signed by 85 patients at the Walter Reed General Hospital, 24 of whom are from ward 32, in which they in no uncertain terms denounce the gentleman in these words:

#### To Whom It May Concern:

As veterans of this war, who have given their utmost in blood and effort for the preservation of the sacred democracy founded by our forebears, we feel that Drew Pearson's caustic editorial entitled "Veterans Hospitals" (Washington Post, February 1), should not go unchallenged.

We, naturally, believe in free speech and a free press, but we unqualifiedly take exception to journalistic lies, lies that not only invade the sanctity of a veteran's life, but lies that try to hurt the institutions (hospitals) that are more instrumental than any other single element in mending us in mind and body.

Mr. Pearson is evidently familiar with the fact that legislation against morals has never worked throughout the centuries. Then, how does he expect it to work in hospitals where the dispensation of mercy is the chief

dosage? Does he wish to post a guard at the door of each ward to search mothers, fathers, wives, brothers, sisters and sweethearts before allowing them to visit some boy who has been seriously wounded? This is the Gestapo method, Mr. Pearson, the very thing we fought and are fighting against. Of course, as in any human society, there are exceptions to the rule, but we can assure you that any liquor that finds its way into the Walter Reed Hospital is not through maladministration.

What point are you trying to prove, Mr. Pearson, by your statement that General Marietta is a good friend of General Pershing's? Certainly, if "Black Jack" had judgment enough to win a war for us, his judgment is good enough for us veterans along other lines. Friendships, as a general rule, are based on respect and I assure you that anyone that is respected by "Black Jack" is respected by us.

Your allegation that nurses deliberately furnish patients ice cubes for whisky is a most flagrant violation of the truth. The fact is that, not only the nurses at Walter Reed, but the nurses in all veteran hospitals, furnish patients with a fresh pitcher of water along with ice cubes both morning and night. Patients who have been wounded severely have to be administered copious quantities of pain pills and sleeping pills day after day and night after night. Consequently, the drying effects of these drugs make them have a continual desire for ice water.

I shall not take the time to read the remainder of the statement which is a continuation of this lie and attack upon Walter Reed General Hospital and upon these soldiers. It is signed by 85 of the patients, nurses, and employees. I will ask that the entire statement may be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, merely stating the number of names and not the names themselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

WALTER REED GENERAL HOSPITAL,  
ARMY MEDICAL CENTER,  
Washington, D. C.

#### To Whom It May Concern:

As veterans of this war, who have given their utmost in blood and effort for the preservation of the sacred democracy founded by our forebears, we feel that Drew Pearson's caustic editorial entitled "Veterans Hospitals" (Washington Post, February 1), should not go unchallenged.

We, naturally, believe in free speech and a free press, but we unqualifiedly take exception to journalistic lies, lies that not only invade the sanctity of a veteran's life, but lies that try to hurt the institutions (hospitals) that are more instrumental than any other single element in mending us in mind and body.

Mr. Pearson is evidently familiar with the fact that legislation against morals has never worked throughout the centuries. Then, how does he expect it to work in hospitals where the dispensation of mercy is the chief dosage? Does he wish to post a guard at the door of each ward to search mothers, fathers, wives, brothers, sisters, and sweethearts before allowing them to visit some boy who has been seriously wounded? This is the Gestapo method, Mr. Pearson, the very thing we fought and are fighting against. Of course, as in any human society, there are exceptions to the rule, but we can assure you that any liquor that finds its way into the Walter Reed Hospital is not through maladministration.

What point are you trying to prove, Mr. Pearson, by your statement that General

Marietta is a good friend of General Pershing's? Certainly, if "Black Jack" had judgment enough to win a war for us, his judgment is good enough for us veterans along other lines. Friendships, as a general rule, are based on respect and I assure you that anyone that is respected by "Black Jack" is respected by us.

Your allegation that nurses deliberately furnish patients ice cubes for whisky is a most flagrant violation of the truth. The fact is that, not only the nurses at Walter Reed, but the nurses in all veterans hospitals, furnish patients with a fresh pitcher of water along with ice cubes both morning and night. Patients who have been wounded severely have to be administered copious quantities of pain pills and sleeping pills day after day and night after night. Consequently, the drying effects of these drugs make them have a continual desire for ice water.

It is too bad that Mr. Pearson is not imbued with some of the sympathy and understanding of the Army nurse, the girl who mothers the wounded soldier up through the echelons—from his removal from the fury of battle until he is far on the road to spiritual, mental, and physical recovery. She not only furnishes him with ice cubes to alleviate a scorching palate but she tediously dresses his wounds, gives him bedpans, scrubs his body, shaves him, and even clips his toenails. (The last of these ministrations is certainly a stinky one. However, it may not be quite as stinky as yours, Mr. Pearson. I specifically refer to the clipping of deserving reputations.)

This, Mr. Pearson, is the Army nurse, a lady who deserves, at this time especially, every consideration instead of the cheap criticism you have sent her way. If your accusation went unchallenged by us veterans, civilians throughout the country could easily acquire the impression that Army nurses are nothing more or less than glorified barmaids and that hospital wards had deteriorated into swank cocktail lounges. Mothers and fathers who have sons in hospitals and at the front have enough to worry about without your adding incendiary thoughts to their burdens.

Your allegations that the boys in ward No. 32 left their beds due to inebriation, to beat up an M. P. are entirely unfounded.

You, most certainly, must have obtained your flimsy information from someone suffering from an "off limits" psychosis. Disgruntled people talk too much.

Your accusation that the morale of the enlisted patients at Walter Reed is low is a pure fallacy, as anyone who has visited here will attest. If, to prove the rule, there may be an occasional isolated case of self-pity or discouragement, it certainly is not due to maladministration, but to the fact that any man who has been subjected to months of suffering flat on his back cannot be expected to have the high spirits of one like yourself, who has good legs, hearty lungs, and the cocktail lounge at his beck and nod. We firmly believe that our morale is amazingly high, considering some of the people we had to fight for.

We veterans wish to go on record right now against the trend of some commentators to pounce upon unfounded lies about individuals or organizations in order to build a great journalistic reputation and a "fatted pocketbook" for themselves. And, we are in sufficient numbers to not only see that this malignant trend is stopped but to put an end to a lot of other evils that have slowly arisen during our absence. We assure you that "dollar grabbers" will be taken care of in a way befitting their august positions.

May we suggest, Mr. Pearson, that men who have not experienced the long toils of pain that battle wounds bring, keep their noses out of veteran affairs. Any one of us would gladly give up his bed space to you or any

other commentator so that you, in turn, could become a guinea pig for unfounded journalistic jabs.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, so much for that lie.

On two or three occasions recently, while we have had under consideration the Aubrey Williams case, Mr. Pearson has stated in his broadcasts that there is a religious issue involved in the Williams case. Any newspaper man or radio broadcaster who wanted to know the truth could find out the truth because here is a copy of the hearings which is available to him and was at the time he made the statement. In justice to the committee, to the Senate, and to the Congress, I say to you, Mr. President, that not one member of the committee and no visiting Member of the Senate asked Mr. Williams one word on earth about his religious views or convictions. We are all aware of the Constitution. But, instead of telling the truth, Pearson is trying to make a false issue which is not involved in the Williams case.

In this morning's Washington Post I find a paid advertisement signed by a lot of folks about whom I could make a speech, but I merely wish to call attention to this advertisement and answer it before it gets cold; I want to answer it while it is hot. I read from it as follows:

Senator Bilbo in a letter to a constituent dated February 16 regarding Aubrey Williams' nomination, says, "We do not want this Negro-lover on this job."

Who will stand with Bilbo?

That is question No. 1.

Can political reactionaries decree that no Presidential appointee shall take office if he opposes racial discrimination?

This is question No. 2.

Question No. 3 is:

Shall a Presidential appointee be crucified by appeals to racial and religious bigotry because he puts the welfare of the small farmer above the self-interest of absentee landlords and private power companies?

Mr. President, I have been a candidate for office many times in my life and I have heard many candidates express themselves, but this is the sorriest and puniest piece of political demagoguery that I have heard in a lifetime.

The Senate will answer these questions, yes or no, when they vote on Aubrey Williams. Those who stand with Bilbo must accept the Bilbo tag, and defend themselves, if they can, before their constituents and their conscience.

FRIENDS OF AUBREY WILLIAMS.

That is all predicated upon a certain letter which I wrote to one of my constituents in Mississippi on February 16. Instead of giving the people the benefit of that letter and what I had to say about Mr. Williams, they merely take the concluding sentence of the letter and leave the impression that I am making a fight against Aubrey Williams because of his friendly attitude against racial discrimination. Let me read the letter; I want it to go in the RECORD:

HON. RALPH H. HERRIN,  
Collins, Miss.

FRIEND HERRIN: Your letter of February 14 has been received and I want to thank you for your very kind words of commendation on

my support of Henry Wallace for Secretary of Commerce.

So it will be seen that Mr. Herrin congratulated me on my position on Mr. Wallace. If this were a question of discrimination, if that were being considered in the Williams case, I certainly would have voted against Mr. Wallace, because he is as strong that way as is Aubrey Williams. The only difference is that Aubrey Williams came from the South, and should know better. He is guilty of the rankest apostasy to everything for which the South stands, while Mr. Wallace was reared in Iowa, and does not know the difference. [Laughter.] The letter continues:

I also note what you have to say about my opposition to Aubrey Williams. I will not take time to write you in full about the reasons that prompt me to fight this appointment but I am sure when you know all the facts you will approve of my position.

You know he used to be Deputy Administrator of the W. P. A. and it was there that I learned that he was totally bad, irresponsible and would do almost anything in the category.

That has been my personal experience with him, and I was against him before the President ever appointed him.

It would be a sad day for the R. E. A. if he should become its director. I am hoping that we will be able to defeat him in the interest of the people that I serve.

This letter is to a Mississippi constituent.

I will send you a copy of the hearings when they are printed so you can read for yourself and find out that we do not want this Negro lover on this job.

By that I mean I take them on some jobs, certainly. I have to. [Laughter.]

Thanking you for writing me, I am,  
Sincerely yours,

When I used the expression "Negro lover," that is a localism, that is a provincialism of the South. Whenever a man breaks over the color line in defiance of the custom that has existed in the South for 150 years, we white folks refer to him as a "Negro lover"—that is, when he breaks over the color line. In this letter I was talking to an old southern boy, and I had given him the reason why I was against Aubrey Williams, and this expression was merely a descriptive term I used in referring to Aubrey Williams.

Mr. President, if the attention of Senators is called to the advertisement in the Washington Post signed by "Friends of Aubrey Williams" and a partial list of the committee, and if they will study the list of committeemen, if their mental processes are working, I think they will have some inspiration, if they give thought to some of the folks who signed this petition for Aubrey Williams. If I had been for Williams before, I should certainly be against him after I saw the array of backers whose names are on the petition.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say at this time.

THE MISSOURI RIVER VALLEY AUTHORITY—REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 555

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of resisting the motion to

discharge the Committee on Commerce from the consideration of Senate bill 555, to which committee the bill was referred by the Vice President. We seem to have a good deal of time today, and not a great deal to do except to answer newspaper advertisements and columnists, and I believe I shall take a little time myself just by way of introduction.

Mr. Macaulay, celebrated as a historian, and also as an essayist on history and politics, speaking of the Roman Senate in the days of the Republic, remarked that the Senate was so exalted, it was constituted of such eminent men, that they sat quietly in their seats and with utter serenity received the news of the disaster at Cannae, when it appeared that Hannibal had broken down the last barrier; and it appears clearly that the historian attributed to Providence the fact that he did not proceed at once to march on Rome.

Mr. President, we may make a comparison as between the serenity of the Roman Senate in that ancient time, and the present American Senate, which pauses to respond to the radio comments and the newspaper writings of a man whose title to infamy is well established, or which must take time to respond to a political advertisement.

We travel very far, Mr. President. That seems to me to be about the distance between the earth and the remotest sun.

I have a suggestion for my brethren of the Senate in this matter, and it comes by way of a tradition or legend of the South. It was said that many years ago the possum was elected head of the animals in his neck of the woods, and after being elected by all the other animals, he was walking down the path one day, when the polecat insulted him, in the only manner in which a polecat can either insult, or defend, or operate. The animals were very indignant and very much amazed that they had elected as their leader another animal who would take an insult from the polecat. The polecat heard of it, and greatly enjoyed his distinction in having gotten away with the insult. So he repeated it the next day when he again met the possum. Finally he got the possum in a crowd on Saturday, the day when everyone in the South sees everybody else. The saying is, "I'll see you Saturday." That expression was used in "Green Pastures," and it is a perfect touch. The polecat insulted the possum again in public, and the animals decided that they would turn the possum out as president, that they would not have such a president. So they had a meeting and arraigned him, brought their charges, and Mr. Possum kept perfectly silent. He listened to what they said. They denounced him for being a coward. They said they halfway believed that he deserved the insult he had received, and they all got ready to vote him out of office. Then Mr. Possum said, "Well, brethren, before you take final action I should like to say a word. I am not resisting your motion to discharge me, but I should like to say a word in explanation." They said, "That is fair. What do you say?"

He replied, "Well, now, brethren, I could have 'fought' him and I could have

whipped him, but I knew doggone well my family would never let me come in the front door again." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, that is the story. I think there are people who bring us down if we notice them. I think we compromise ourselves and justify the lower animal by taking notice of anything he says. He flourishes upon notice of his attacks.

Now, coming back to the matter about which I rose to speak, the Senator from Montana rather astonished me by saying, toward the conclusion of his remarks, that he thought the purpose of having Senate bill 555 referred to the Committee on Commerce related to some power policy, and had the objective of stating one policy and framing another. That is a rather severe reflection upon the Vice President of the United States.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] says he sent the bill to the desk without indicating to which committee he wished it to be referred, and the Vice President referred it to the Committee on Commerce. The Committee on Commerce had nothing whatever to do with that. I did not even know when the bill was introduced, and I did not know it was referred until it reached the Commerce Committee. But the idea of a sinister or an ulterior motive here relates altogether to the Vice President of the United States, the President of the Senate. I do not think he needs defense in the circumstances, and I do not intend to try to offer one for him. I know that the Vice President is not permitted to take part in debate. I do not think I would reflect upon him under the circumstances. He is not even present. But I will say on behalf of the Vice President of the United States that he is superior to such an attack and superior to any necessity for defense.

Something was said a few weeks ago, and again today, about the Committee on Commerce, and the imputation was made that the Committee on Commerce is up to something having to do with power. The power policy of the United States was fixed by the Committee on Commerce and submitted to the Senate, and the Senate confirmed it, and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who is listening to me, wrote that policy, as I understand, in association with the Army engineers. I resisted that policy in part. I am not satisfied with it now. But that is not to be imputed to the committee.

I shall not discuss the policy; I do not care to involve it here; but I will say that such policy as we have in this country in respect to the sale of power, such policy as we have with respect to irrigation, to dams and the production of electrical energy, has proceeded from the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate, and been approved by the House and the Senate and the President of the United States. So I think that is enough to say in the defense of the Committee on Commerce against the suggestion, and, so far as I am concerned, I do not intend to defend it.

Mr. President, there cannot be imputed to the committee, which consists of 20 members, any shortcomings which the chairman may have. I might defend the 19 and be very happy to submit myself to the condemnation of the junior Sen-

ator from Montana, and I would submit myself before any tribunal on earth without a qualm with him for the accuser.

Mr. President, to come down to the merits of the matter, here is the bill. The Senate can read it for itself. The title is:

A bill to establish a Missouri Valley Authority, to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River and surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods—

What committee, Mr. President, in the Senate has charge of legislation intended to relate to the control and the prevention of floods? Everyone knows it is the Commerce Committee. It has been so ever since there was any legislation on the subject. I read further:

the promotion of navigation.

What committee of the Senate has had jurisdiction of the promotion of navigation? There has been but one committee having that jurisdiction in 130 years. The Commerce Committee was constituted by the Senate in the year 1816, and it has had jurisdiction of navigation in America from that year until now.

I think the Vice President acted properly in referring the bill. If the title of the bill is to be relied upon, the two most prominent features and purposes of the bill are the promotion of navigation and the development of water control. Of course, that means dams and other means "in the interest of the control and prevention of floods."

The title also contains the words, "The strengthening of national defense." No one intends to refer the bill to the Military Affairs Committee or the Committee on Naval Affairs. After national defense we find "and for other purposes." The title speaks of "the development of recreational possibilities" and "the promotion of family-type farming" and "reclamation of the public lands." So the bill on its face, and by way of the title, which I suppose was written by its author, the junior Senator from Montana, declares it to be within the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee. Yet the Senator comes before the Senate and protests and make a special plea on the basis of the precedents with respect to the T. V. A.

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

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. MURRAY. Does not the Senator recognize that the title of the bill has a much broader application than the Senator has indicated? The title says: "To provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River and surrounding region."

Mr. BAILEY. Oh, yes. I was just reading the title.

Mr. MURRAY. But if the Senator will read the bill itself he will find section after section and page after page which indicate that the main purpose of the bill is the development of the entire region of the Missouri Valley.

Mr. BAILEY. I have read the bill, but I am saying to the Senator, and I want him to hear me, that a Senator who introduces a bill in the Senate is supposed to state its purposes in its title.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. I have read the title. It may be read any way one wishes to, and one may crawl in any direction, but when it is all said and done, here is the declaration in the very title of the bill, "to establish a Missouri Valley Authority."

That is there. You may talk about it all you please; but when you get through it is there—

The Moving Finger . . . having writ—

You cannot change a word of it.

Does the Senator wish to say anything more?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I think the Senator places a very narrow construction on the title of the bill. The rule of construction of the bill it seems to me would require an examination of the purpose of the bill as indicated by the various paragraphs and sections in the bill. The title of the bill is broad enough to cover all the provisions contained in the bill, because it states that it is "to provide for unified control and resource development on the Missouri River and surrounding region."

The great purpose and object—

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I did not yield to the Senator for a speech.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BAILEY. Let me answer the Senator from Montana.

I have read the title of the bill, as written, I presume, by its author; and I stand upon it. Of course, I know it takes in more territory. It takes in the general welfare, the national defense, and I suppose the Kingdom of God as well. That is not the test. The test is what he wrote by way of interpreting his bill to start with. That is on the threshold of the argument.

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

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Tennessee Valley Authority Act refer to control of floods and improvement of navigation also?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; I am coming to that.

Mr. AIKEN. Those bills have all been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BAILEY. I was just coming to that argument. I think that is the basis of the contention now advanced, and it brings forward a rather interesting matter of history.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is no precedent for the reference of bills. That is a broad statement, but I think I can support it. The Tennessee Valley Authority was a gradual development. Fortunately I was here to see a great deal of it, as were other Senators. At the end of the First World War the United States Government had a great dam on its hands at Muscle Shoals. That dam had been built for the national defense. It had been built un-

der the direction of President Wilson. The purpose was to create an enormous amount of energy and obtain nitrates from the air. We had to ship our nitrates, which are essential in the manufacture of munitions, all the way from Chile, and the German raiders were on the high seas. We felt that as a matter of national defense we should create our nitrates here, since there were none in the earth to amount to anything, and we could not mine them. So we built the Wilson Dam.

The war ended, and nitrates could again come from Chile for agricultural purposes. We needed none for munitions, and we thought peace was here for a long, long time.

A great question arose as to what to do with Muscle Shoals. I remember when that was a matter of debate for 5 or 6 years. The press carried stories to the effect that Mr. Henry Ford was about to buy it and establish a great manufacturing plant in the South. Finally, after at least 15 years, we decided to go back to the original purpose and use the dam to obtain nitrates from the air and supply the farmers with cheap fertilizer. Very naturally a bill intended for that purpose was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That is the whole sum and substance of it. But having gone that far, and that being the primary purpose, we felt that it was necessary to develop it.

I believe I will ask something of a personal nature. After I was elected to the Senate, and before I had qualified, the question was raised, by way of inquiry, I believe from newspapers or poll takers, as to what the new Senators thought should be done with Muscle Shoals. That put the matter rather earnestly in my mind, and I raised the question with someone as to why Mr. Henry Ford did not buy it and turn it into a great manufacturing plant for the South. I was told that Henry Ford would not buy it because it was said that he would have to spend more than \$100,000,000 building dams up the stream in order to create the power necessary to make Muscle Shoals a success. I think that is true. Our Government took it over and, having found it to be not worth anything as a single dam, went up and down the Tennessee River and the Little Tennessee River and their tributaries and built great reservoirs. It is true that Henry Ford would not pay \$15,000,000 for it because he said it would cost him \$100,000,000 to make it worth \$15,000,000. So we proceeded to develop the whole Tennessee Basin. It is a very astonishing development, a very popular development, and a very useful development.

My whole point is that it began as a scheme to supply the farmers with fertilizer, after having been abandoned as a scheme to create nitrates for munitions. So naturally and reasonably, the T. V. A. and the legislation which followed through the years, was handled by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, largely through the insistence of the late Senator George Norris, a very able man, and a man with whom the Senate liked to agree. He was old, and he was honest. None of us liked to disappoint him about

anything. He insisted that, having begun with the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as a fertilizer enterprise, it should remain there. So I consider the T. V. A. as no precedent at all. It is an isolated instance.

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

Mr. BAILEY. I will yield for a question. I do not wish to stand here and hear the Senator read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to call attention to the fact that the bill which we have before us today is like the bill to which Senator Norris was referring in the debate which took place on the floor of the Senate on June 3, 1937, when the question of the appropriate reference of that bill was under consideration.

Mr. BAILEY. I understand the Senator's position. That is an illustration in logic from Montana. Because this bill is like the bill which created the Tennessee Valley Authority, it must go the same way. I was just showing how the T. V. A. started. If this bill had started as a fertilizer proposal, the Senator would have some basis for his reasoning.

Mr. MURRAY. Let me interrupt the Senator for a moment. This bill does contemplate the development of fertilizer on a huge scale.

Mr. BAILEY. I want to keep the Senator's mind on the ball.

Mr. MURRAY. I have my mind on the ball.

Mr. BAILEY. It does not start as a fertilizer enterprise. All I was saying was that the T. V. A. started as a fertilizer enterprise. According to the Senator's logic—Montana logic—if we ever mention fertilizer in any bill from now on, I suppose it will go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or if we have a bill anything like the T. V. A. legislation it must go to that committee. That is not logic. It is not reason. It is not even rational.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator entirely misconstrues my argument. I do not make any such contention at all. However, I do say that when the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has for 25 years been handling this sort of legislation, we should not deprive the Senate of the benefit of the experience which that committee has had. One of the main purposes of this bill is the resource development of the Missouri River and the surrounding region.

Mr. BAILEY. I realize that. I have already stated the purposes. If the Senator wishes to make an argument inside mine, I shall take my seat and let him try again. I should like to have him confine his observations to questions, and not argue in and out of what I am saying.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit another observation?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. I am not arguing in or out.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not believe the Senator is arguing either, to tell the truth.

Mr. MURRAY. I am presenting my case as clearly and plainly as it is possible to present it. The Senate has previously had this question under consideration, and it seems to me that if the

Senator wishes to be fair he will recognize that this legislation properly belongs to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BAILEY. I was just showing why I did not. But I am not disposed to reply to a suggestion that I am not fair.

I believe I will say to the Senator that he is a Senator from Montana, but no one ever made him a judge over any other Senator. This imputation of unfairness in the Senate does not go.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Senator is unduly sensitive. I have merely been referring to the Senator's fairness in construing my language.

Mr. BAILEY. I understand.

Mr. MURRAY. I have no desire to reflect on or to impugn the motives of the Senator from North Carolina in any respect. I have had very friendly relations with him for a great many years.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator has very friendly ones with him now.

Mr. MURRAY. I do not think the Senator will say that I have ever been unreasonable in my attitude regarding any matters before the Senate. In the argument I have presented in support of my motion, I think I have been absolutely fair and reasonable in every respect. I have not said anything at which the Senator can take any offense.

Mr. BAILEY. I am not saying anything in reply, but I have just remarked that self-praise is no recommendation with me. The Senator has imputed that I might be unfair, but he swears that he is fair. If he wishes to be a judge of himself, he may be. But he may not be a judge of other Senators.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to make a closing remark. I think the discussion into which we are now entering is entirely irrelevant to the question before the Senate. The question before the Senate is whether my bill should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The pending question is not whether the Senator from North Carolina is fair or whether I am fair or whether anyone else is fair.

Mr. BAILEY. I am glad to have the Senator's apology. He is the one who raised the question, and I am glad he takes back his statement. I accept the Senator's apology.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I think the Senator has been very captious in calling attention to my mere reference. All I said was that if the Senator would be fair he would not give such a narrow construction to what I said. I will withdraw the word "fair" and will let the rest of my statement stand.

Mr. BAILEY. Anything to suit the Senator.

Mr. MURRAY. It is not a question of doing anything to suit the Senator. I do not think it is a question of suiting anyone. It is a question of presenting this matter in a fair and decent manner. That is all I am trying to do. I am not attempting to reflect on the Senator.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not think the Senator can reflect on me. I am not troubled about that, I am not at all disturbed about it. I do not think the Senator has tried to do so. But if he did try to do so, it would not disturb me at all, anymore

than it disturbed the Vice President of the United States when the Senator reflected on him today.

Now let us go to another matter.

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

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from North Carolina whether he cares to express an observation regarding the extent of authority the bill might give to a Missouri Valley Authority relative to the use of the waters of the Missouri River, over and above or in direct contradiction to the policy which Congress laid down in the last session, which policy provided that the States which lie wholly or in part west of the ninetieth meridian may use the waters for the purposes which the States themselves may determine. I realize my question is a long one. Let me state briefly what I should like to have the Senator express an observation upon. If legislation as proposed by the bill is enacted, would the authority granted under it be broad enough so that the Authority could or might establish a policy in direct contradiction to a policy the Congress has already laid down.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; unquestionably. But I was not going into the merits of the proposed legislation. If I were to discuss the merits of what is proposed, I think I could make the Senator's hair stand on end.

But now I am dealing with the question of how the bill is founded and whether it should be referred to the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, the Military Affairs Committee, or the Committee on Naval Affairs. The bill is a defense bill, so it says on its face.

I have cleared up the matter of the origin of the T. V. A. legislation and how the T. V. A. bill happened to go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and how it stayed there. The legislation began as an act to enable the Government to manufacture fertilizer for the farmers. The bill now under discussion does not begin in that way at all.

Let us consider for a moment the first declaration on page 19 of the bill:

Particular consideration in such a plan and recommendations shall be given to projects and activities which shall serve the following purposes:

(1) The control and prevention of floods which impair and disrupt navigation, the facilities of interstate commerce, the properties and functions of the United States, and agricultural and industrial properties and production.

There we have flood control and navigation. They are covered in the first purpose mentioned in that section of the bill.

On page 20, in paragraph (2), we find the following:

The promotion of navigation by, among other means, the improvement of the channels of navigable rivers and their tributaries.

That is navigation, if I understand anything about it.

Next, we find—

The prevention of siltation of such waters.

That subject is under the Army engineers at this moment, and likewise is under the Commerce Committee.

Next we have—

The regulation of stream flow.

That is flood control.

Next—

And the development and coordination of navigation facilities.

At that place in the bill the Senator is laying the foundations of his bill in navigation. There is no authority on earth for any other portion of his bill except the power to regulate navigation and flood control. The Senator must stop there; every Member of the Senate knows that. Electrical energy must be handled as an incidental to flood control. Agricultural development and irrigation are incidental to the dams, navigation, and flood control. The power of Congress over navigation is founded in the commerce clause of the Constitution. The Congress derives a great train of powers and activities from that clause.

For 128 years all such matters have been considered by the Commerce Committee. I have been chairman of the committee only 7 years, but I speak in the names of all the chairmen down the decades, back to 1816.

Paragraph 4, on page 20, reads as follows:

(4) The safeguarding of navigable waters and their use by, among other means, the prevention and abatement of pollution of navigable streams and their tributaries.

Except insofar as that subject might refer to health, measures relating to it always have been referred to the Committee on Commerce; and even matters relative to health have been referred to the Committee on Commerce to this day.

Paragraph (b), under paragraph (4), reads as follows:

(b) So far as may be consistent with or necessary or appropriate for the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation, the safeguarding of navigable waters, and the reclamation of the public lands.

Beginning on page 24, we find the following provision:

The Corporation—

In other words, the Authority. The bill would create a corporation with all the powers of the United States. The corporation would have all the powers of buying and selling, all the powers of building, all the powers of giving, all the welfare powers which the United States has. Action would be taken in the name of the corporation. By such legislation a great structure would be erected—probably greater than that of any three States of the United States—and it would be given all the powers of the Federal Government. It would be able to buy anything or to do anything.

Under the provisions of the bill the corporation would be authorized and directed to construct, acquire, operate, and carry out such projects and activities on the Missouri River, its tributaries, and surrounding region as will serve to control and prevent floods, to reclaim the public lands, to promote navigation.

Yet the Senator from Montana says that the Commerce Committee has no jurisdiction. If it does not have jurisdiction of a bill of this character its jurisdiction over any form of proposed legislation can be questioned. The Commerce Committee was founded on the subject of navigation. For more than 100 years every river and harbor bill which has been introduced in Congress has been referred to the Committee on Commerce. That applies as well to all flood bills with the exception of those relating to the T. V. A., which I have explained.

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

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The first bill which was passed for the improvement of the Tennessee River was the one relating to the dam at Muscle Shoals, now known as the Wilson Dam.

Mr. BAILEY. I have previously referred to that matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives. I was a member of that committee at the time and urged the committee to report the bill to the House. It was reported. However, it was handled by the Military Affairs Committee because the purpose of the bill was to manufacture nitrates for war purposes and, incidentally, for agriculture in peacetime.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the Senator.

Subparagraph (1) on page 25 of the bill reads as follows:

(1) To acquire, construct, operate, maintain, and improve dams, locks, reservoirs, levees, spillways, floodways, fishways, conduits, powerhouses, steam-generating plants, transmission lines, rural electric lines and substations, canals, roads, roadways, docks, wharves, terminals, and recreation facilities, and structures, equipment, and facilities incidental thereto.

The bill is far reaching. It could be referred to any one of three committees.

Subparagraph (2) on page 26 is as follows:

(2) To acquire, construct, operate, maintain, and improve such machinery, equipment, structures, and facilities, for the storage and transportation of water or for the generation and transmission of electric energy as the Corporation deems necessary or appropriate to supply existing and potential users or markets.

That language would provide the power to condemn and take over land anywhere. It would embrace exclusive use, possession, control, and operation of the Fort Peck Dam.

I wish to invite the attention of Senators to something else as showing how far the bill would go. Senators know that we must authorize before we appropriate. Authorizations must first come from some committee. The Committee on Commerce never appropriates money. All it does is to authorize. The pending bill carries language substantially as follows: "All appropriations necessary to carry out this act are hereby authorized." That would cover the whole United States. I suppose that it could also include Mexico and Canada.

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

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I invite attention to the concluding section of the bill, which seems further to fortify the Senator's construction of it. Section 27, the concluding section of the bill, provides in part, as follows:

This act shall be liberally construed to carry out the purposes of Congress—

And so forth. The purposes, as explained near the beginning of the bill, are to strengthen the national defense, promote navigation, control destructive floods, promote interstate commerce, and aid in the general welfare of the United States.

Mr. BAILEY. That would include everything except taxation. If we read section 8, of article I, of the Constitution, we find that the bill contains all the power which is found in section 8, except the power to tax. On such a theory the bill could be referred to any committee of the Senate except the Committee on Finance.

Mr. President, the question of what is referred to my committee has never been a matter of any great concern to me. I entertain no jealousy with regard to the committee's jurisdiction. All the members of the committee have plenty to do. As the committee's chairman, I consider it to be my duty to defend the jurisdiction and functions of the committee. I believe that when an attempt is made to take from the Commerce Committee a bill which, on its face, has to do with flood control and navigation, I have a duty to perform. I have an idea that a Senator may be very useful whether he happens to be a member of a committee or not. I do not think that a Senator's usefulness or his career depends on his membership on a committee. I believe, however, that if the chairman of the committee should stand here at any time and assert its rights, I have the duty to do so now. I think the Committee on Commerce compares favorably with any other committee of the Senate, and that its members compare very favorably with any other Senators. No one of us ever got high enough to set himself up in judgment over the Vice President, or over any other Senator. That may be done in some other tribunal, but I do not think it can be done very successfully here.

Mr. President, I have a proposal to make, I think I could stand on the record and hold the bill in the Committee on Commerce. But I do not like to enter into jurisdictional conflicts. I have one now with the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce. It will come up some time this week. I believe he and I have agreed on next Thursday, have we not?

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BAILEY. Jurisdictional conflicts are very disagreeable. They do not do the Senate any good. They handicap us, consume our time, and worry us. They are very disagreeable. Under the Constitution, perhaps such things are necessary. A person should take what is coming to him in the ordinary course of nature without quarrel or complaint. But I should like no Senator ever to think that the Committee on Commerce

tries to take jurisdiction over matters which should be handled by any other committee. If I have something on my desk which I think should go to the Committee on Commerce, I will send it there. If I have something on my desk which I think should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations, I will send it to that committee. The Members of the Commerce Committee have plenty to do without encroaching on the duties of the Members of other committees.

In order to show my good will, and to eliminate friction, I submit the following resolution:

Whereas Senate bill 555 (to establish a Missouri Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River and surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation and reclamation of the public lands, the promotion of family-type farming, the development of the recreational possibilities and the promotion of the general welfare of the area, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes) having been referred to the Committee on Commerce and motion having been made to discharge said committee and refer the bill to the Committee on Agriculture: Therefore be it

Resolved, That said bill, to wit, S. 555, shall be considered forthwith by the Committee on Commerce with respect to navigation and flood control, and thereafter returned to the Senate for reference to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, to be considered by said committee with respect to irrigation and reclamation, and thereafter shall be returned to the Senate for reference to the Committee on Agriculture for consideration with respect to the agricultural features thereof; be it further

Resolved, That said bill shall be reported on respectively by each of said committees within 60 days from the date of its reference to each of said committees and that the first 60-day period shall be calculated from the date of the passage of this resolution.

That takes in all committees. It saves all faces.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution (S. Res. 97) submitted by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] will lie over, under the rule.

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

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it the Senator's understanding that if the bill were referred to the three committees to which he has referred, it could not be acted upon by the Senate until it had been favorably reported by all three committees.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senate may always act on any bill, whether it has been reported favorably or unfavorably.

Mr. AIKEN. If one committee should report it unfavorably—

Mr. BAILEY. In my judgment, an unfavorable report does not prevent the Senate from considering a bill, and the rule of the Committee on Commerce has been to send bills to the floor, even those with adverse reports. It did it with respect to the Florida Canal I remember, and, as I recall, at the instance of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I will say that the Commerce Committee has one rule and it was a rule of the committee when I became chairman of it and it was spread on the calendar. I have stated it before in the Senate. I found it on the Calendar of

the Commerce Committee. The rule is to this effect, that when a bill is referred to the Committee on Commerce the chairman must refer it at once to the appropriate agencies in the executive department of the Government.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President—

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I should like to finish my statement with reference to the rule if the Senator will permit me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning hour having expired, and the consideration of the pending resolution not having been concluded, under the precedents it will be placed on the calendar under rule 8.

Mr. BAILEY. Then we cannot vote on the resolution today?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution goes to the calendar.

#### REPORT OF NOMINATION OF AUBREY W. WILLIAMS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma obtained the floor.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to ask about another matter?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I wish to ask the Senator from Oklahoma, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, at what time we may expect the Committee on Agriculture to report on the nomination of Aubrey Williams, which I understand the committee passed on about a week or two ago; I have forgotten the exact time.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, out of order and as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to report adversely the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams, of Alabama, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received, as in executive session, and placed on the Executive Calendar.

#### APPROPRIATIONS FOR CIVIL FUNCTIONS OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2126.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2126) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that

the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY rose.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I understand the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] desires to have something to say about his recent trip to Mexico. I know every Senator will be glad to hear him, and I ask permission of the Senator from Oklahoma that I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, before I yield for that purpose let me say that I have an engagement at the Navy Department at 2:30 p. m., which, from my standpoint, necessitates my attendance. I think we can pass this bill in 10 or 15 minutes. There are only a very few amendments and, so far as I know, they are all assented to by everyone interested. If the Senator from Texas will defer his remarks for 10 or 15 minutes, if we do not conclude the bill in that time I shall be very glad to yield to him.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well, I shall not press for recognition now.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Texas the next bill is an appropriation bill, and when that bill comes up I shall certainly ask for a quorum and yield to him to make his address.

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

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Quartermaster Corps—Cemeterial expenses," on page 2, line 3, after the word "one", to insert "used."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Signal Corps—Alaska communication system," on page 3, line 23, after the word "be", to strike out "affected" and insert "effected."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Corps of Engineers—Rivers and harbors," on page 6, line 15, after the word "hundred", to insert "used", and in line 19, after the word "law", to strike out "\$41,358,000" and insert "\$44,508,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Flood control," on page 7, line 19, after the word "forty", to insert "used", and in line 22, after the word "control", to strike out "\$14,037,000" and insert "\$24,172,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "The Panama Canal," on page 10, line 23, after the word "twelve", to insert "used."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 2, after the word "shall", to insert "be."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engross-

ment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill (H. R. 2126) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of the report of the committee on the bill which has just been passed, and following the committee report I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD a statement of the new work contemplated by the bill, which is very meager.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the report (No. 87) and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2126) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made:

Amount of bill as passed House—\$99,165,940

Amount of increase by Senate—13,285,000

Amount of bill as reported

to Senate—112,450,940

Amount of regular and supple-

mental estimates for 1946—104,263,240

Amount of appropriations, 1945—102,475,840

The bill as reported to the Sen-

ate—

Exceeds the estimates for 1946 8,187,700

Exceeds the appropriations for

1945—9,975,100

The break-down of the direct appropria-

tion of \$112,450,940 in the bill recommended

by the committee is as follows:

Quartermaster Corps: Ceme-

terial expenses—\$1,658,700

Signal Corps: Alaska Communi-

cation System—227,840

Corps of Engineers:

Rivers and har-

bors—\$44,508,000

Flood control,

general—24,172,000

Flood control,

Mississippi

River and trib-

utaries—30,000,000

Emergency fund

for flood control

on tribu-

taries of Mis-

issippi River—500,000

Flood control,

Sacramento

River, Calif.—2,050,000

Miscellaneous

civil works—12,000

101,242,000

United States Soldiers' Home—1,213,600

The Panama Canal:

Maintenance and

operation—\$4,137,000

Sanitation, quar-

antine, etc.—1,784,200

Civil government—1,377,000

Construction of

additional facil-

ities—810,600

8,108,800

Total, direct appropriations

in bill as recommended to

the Senate—112,450,940

The changes in the amounts of the House bill recommended by the committee are as follows:

#### *Increases and limitations*

#### Corps of Engineers:

##### Rivers and harbors:

Preliminary examinations and surveys..... \$1,500,000

The bill as passed by the House includes \$2,000,000 for this purpose. At the Senate hearing, however, the Chief of Engineers testified that the \$2,000,000 contained in the bill as passed by the House did not provide for carrying out any of the preliminary examinations and surveys called for in the recently enacted river and harbor bill, which bill contains provision for some 300 investigations.

He testified further that in order to carry on preliminary examinations and surveys for the items listed in the new river and harbor act, the Corps of Engineers could spend an additional \$1,500,000. The list of projects included in the additional \$1,500,000 appears on pages 20-27 of the Senate hearing.

New York and New Jersey channels..... 1,650,000

The bill as passed by the House carries \$1,600,000 for work on the New York and New Jersey channels. It was brought out at the hearings that the Corps of Engineers requested of the Budget Bureau a total of \$3,250,000 for this work during the fiscal year 1946. The Budget allowed \$1,600,000, and the purpose of the committee's amendment is to provide the additional \$1,650,000 requested by the Corps of Engineers.

The funds requested are for dredging and rock removal to afford wider channels for the larger oil tankers now in use.

It was stated at the hearing that the Navy has been very much interested in the advancement of this work, and that likewise the American Merchant Marine Institute, the Standard Vacuum Oil, and the Shell Oil Co. are interested in it. A letter from Secretary Forrestal to the Secretary of War relative to this project appears in the Senate hearing on pp. 42-43.

Total, rivers and harbors..... 3,150,000

##### Flood control, general:

Preliminary examinations and surveys..... 2,500,000

The bill as passed by the House includes \$2,000,000 for this purpose. At the Senate hearing, the Chief of Engineers testified that the \$2,000,000 included by the House does not provide any funds for

#### Corps of Engineers—Con.

##### Flood control, general:

##### Preliminary examinations and surveys—Con.

the forty-odd examinations and surveys authorized in the Flood Control Act approved Dec. 22, 1944. He stated that to carry forward this survey program at a moderate rate, including work on the examinations and surveys authorized in the last flood control act, would require a total amount for the fiscal year 1946 of \$4,500,000, or an increase of \$2,500,000 over the House bill. The projects included in the additional \$2,500,000, recommended by the committee, appear on pp. 19-20 of the Senate hearing.

Advance planning (preparation of detailed plans and specifications)..... \$7,635,000

The bill as passed by the House includes \$2,000,000 under this appropriation for advance planning on flood-control projects. Of the \$7,635,000 increase recommended by the committee, \$5,000,000 is proposed in a supplemental Budget estimate contained in S. Doc. 11, which was received by the Senate on Mar. 1, 1945. The list of projects included in the \$5,000,000 proposed in the estimate and approved by the committee appears on pp. 27-29 of the Senate hearing. The remaining \$2,635,000 recommended by the committee is to provide for advance planning in connection with the following projects:

|   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| Missouri River Basin:                         |                  |
| Garrison Reservoir, N. Dak.                   | 500,000          |
| Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak.           | 250,000          |
| Fort Randall Reservoir, S. Dak.               | 200,000          |
| Missouri River local protection projects..... | 450,000          |
| Havre, Milk River, Mont.                      | 28,000           |
| Hazen, Knife River, N. Dak.                   | 2,000            |
| Harlem, Milk River, Mont.                     | 4,000            |
| Beulah, Knife River, N. Dak.                  | 6,000            |
|   | <u>1,440,000</u> |

##### Central Valley, Calif.:

|   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| Table Mountain Reservoir, Calif.                  | 200,000          |
| Sacramento River, Calif., local protection.....   | 125,000          |
| Folsom Reservoir, Calif.                          | 125,000          |
| Isabella Reservoir, Calif.                        | 175,000          |
| Kings River project, California.....              | 200,000          |
| Terminus Reservoir, Calif.                        | 175,000          |
| Hogan Reservoir, Calif.                           | 50,000           |
| Tuolumne River Reservoir project, California..... | 50,000           |
|   | <u>1,100,000</u> |

Farm Creek Reservoirs, Ill..... 95,000

2,635,000

Total, flood control, general..... 10,135,000

Total, Corps of Engineers... 13,285,000

Purchase of automobiles: Purchase of used passenger-carrying automobiles: Under the appropriation "Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries," as passed by the House, requirement is made that during the fiscal year 1946 only used motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles can be purchased. The committee has approved this requirement. However, there are 4 other appropriations in the bill out of which it is proposed in the 1946 estimates to purchase passenger-carrying automobiles. The committee has amended the appropriation language accompanying each of these appropriations so as to provide that only used passenger-carrying automobiles can be purchased during the fiscal year 1946.

Total increase..... \$13,285,000

Amount of bill as reported to Senate..... 112,450,940

*Funds for new work on river and harbor and flood-control projects included in the pending War Department civil appropriation bill, H. R. 2126*

#### RIVERS AND HARBORS

*Proposed allotment fiscal year 1946*

New York and New Jersey channels..... \$1,600,000

For application to dredging and rock removal to afford wider channels for the larger oil tankers now in use.

Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okechobee drainage areas, Florida..... 165,000

To provide 7 Taintor gates for the new spillway at the St. Lucie lock, and the construction of a single leaf auxiliary lock gate to replace temporary wooden flashboards.

Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers... 1,000,000

For continuation of dike and revetment construction to afford a more stable 9-foot navigation channel in this important link of the Great Lakes to Gulf Waterway.

Ohio River open channel work... 507,000

To provide for enlarging channels and removing shoal areas at various locations to provide safe passage for heavier tows navigating the river.

Kanawha River, W. Va..... 198,000

For payment of flowage rights resulting from the construction of large navigation dams.

Illinois waterway, Illinois..... 500,000

For widening the channel at 2 locations, necessary due to larger tows now in use.

Total..... 3,970,000

#### FLOOD CONTROL, GENERAL

Clear Creek drainage and levee district, Illinois..... 874,000

East St. Louis and vicinity, Illinois..... 1,000,000

Wood River drainage and levee district, Illinois..... 1,495,000

Harrison and Ivy Landing drainage and levee district No. 2, Illinois..... 1,140,000

Perry County drainage and levee districts Nos. 1, 2, and 3, Missouri..... 995,000

Raising and enlarging earth levees and reconstruction of appurtenant drainage facilities. Funds are needed to continue the program of raising the levee systems along the upper Mississippi River between St. Louis and Cape Girardeau, which will be resumed with funds appropriated in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1945, as soon as manpower conditions permit resumption of this essential work (certified by War Food Administration and Office of Defense Transportation). The completion of this work is urgently needed to provide protection from recurring floods for 153,000 acres of highly productive agricultural lands, main lines of Missouri-Pacific, St. Louis-Southwestern, Illinois Central, and St. Louis-San Francisco Railroads, and important industries engaged in war production, and to prevent further large expenditures for flood fighting and repair work on those levees such as were made in 1943 and 1944 when more than \$3,800,000 was spent for those purposes. The repair work accomplished restored the levees to their original condition but did not remove the threat of further failures because of the need for raising and extensive strengthening the levees which was beyond the scope of the emergency authority and funds provided by Congress for the repair work.

York, Pa.

\$450,000

Earth and rock fill dam and channel improvement. Funds are required for completion of the channel improvement, removal of an existing mill dam in the river channel, and to complete miscellaneous items to place the project in full operation. Since the project was suspended, silting has taken place and has become very critical. If completion of the project is not accomplished during the fiscal year 1946, the project in present incomplete status might create a flood hazard greater than that which existed prior to initiation of construction.

Brevort levee, Indiana..... 300,000

Levee Unit No. 8, Indiana..... 230,000

Gill Township levee unit, Indiana..... 60,000

Levees and pumping plants. Funds required during the fiscal year 1946 are for raising and strengthening the levees. This work has been found necessary as a result of the experience of the floods of 1943 and 1944. The levees have been found to be sufficiently pervious to show that the Government investment is in constant danger of being destroyed due to bolls and sloughing. Construction of an additional blanket of impervious material will be necessary to remove this threat. Unless this work is done and the projects placed in complete operation, there is a constant threat of overtopping and breaching of the levees, thereby causing loss of Government investment and flooding of the protected area.

Muskingum River Reservoirs, Ohio.....

\$500,000

14 reservoirs (13 earth-fill dams and 1 concrete gravity structure) for flood control and water conservation in eastern Ohio. Construction of the dams and railroad relocations and most of the highway relocations have been completed. Funds are required for continuation of reimbursement to the Muskingum Water Conservancy District for expenditures by that agency for acquiring lands, easements, and rights-of-way, and for the direct purchase by the Government of lands, easements, and rights-of-way.

Total ..... 7,044,000

#### MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Mississippi River, flood control (includes \$10,000,000 for maintenance).....

30,000,000

Continuation of work on the project for flood control in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River. The comprehensive project involves the construction of levees, reservoirs, revetments, and other works for flood control, the maintenance of certain existing works that have been completed as part of the project, the necessary dredging to maintain and improve the navigation channel, and the surveying, mapping, and miscellaneous work essential to the prosecution of the various features of the project. Above the mouth of the Red River the main Mississippi River levees have not been completed to final grade and cross section. A large portion of the funds requested for fiscal year 1946 will be applied to work on these levees, a failure of which would inundate several million acres in the St. Francis, Tensas, and Yazoo Basins.

#### SACRAMENTO RIVER, CALIF.

Sacramento River, Calif., flood control (includes \$153,000 for maintenance).....

2,050,000

Continuation of levee construction and bank protection work and maintenance dredging of flood channels including shore protection. Existing protection against floods is inadequate at places and until additional levee work is completed to the required grade and section, vital transportation facilities to be protected by the levees may be damaged or destroyed by floods, resulting in serious delays in transportation of material and military personnel and supplies for civilians. The annual program of bank protection, clearing of flood channels, and maintenance dredging, is required to sustain completed flood protection works and prevent their deterioration. Construction of the works proposed for fiscal year 1946 will be of direct benefit to two transcontinental railroads, one transcontinental highway, and the main highway and railroad routes from Portland, Oreg., to San Francisco and Sacramento, Calif.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1984) mak-

ing appropriations for the executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

|           |                 |               |
|-----------|-----------------|---------------|
| Alken     | Gerry           | O'Mahoney     |
| Austin    | Green           | Overton       |
| Bailey    | Gurney          | Pepper        |
| Ball      | Hart            | Radcliffe     |
| Bankhead  | Hatch           | Reed          |
| Barkley   | Hawkes          | Revercomb     |
| Bilbo     | Hayden          | Robertson     |
| Brewster  | Hickenlooper    | Russell       |
| Bridges   | Hill            | Saltonstall   |
| Briggs    | Hoey            | Shipstead     |
| Buck      | Johnson, Calif. | Smith         |
| Burton    | Johnson, Colo.  | Stewart       |
| Bushfield | La Follette     | Taft          |
| Butler    | Lucas           | Taylor        |
| Byrd      | McCarran        | Thomas, Okla. |
| Capehart  | McClellan       | Thomas, Utah  |
| Capper    | McFarland       | Tunnell       |
| Chandler  | McKellar        | Tydings       |
| Chavez    | McMahon         | Vandenberg    |
| Connally  | Maybank         | Wagner        |
| Cordon    | Millikin        | Walsh         |
| Donnell   | Moore           | Wheeler       |
| Downey    | Morse           | Wherry        |
| Eastland  | Murdock         | White         |
| Ellender  | Murray          | Wiley         |
| Fulbright | Myers           | Willis        |
| George    | O'Daniel        | Wilson        |

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is necessarily absent as a member of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Moses.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent on official business of the Senate.

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

## RESULTS OF INTER-AMERICAN CONFERENCE AT MEXICO CITY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, prior to the convening of the Inter-American Conference on problems of war and peace, in Mexico City, the Secretary of State invited the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and myself, together with Representatives LUTHER A. JOHNSON, of Texas, and Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts, to attend the Conference as advisers to the Secretary of State, who was, of course, the American delegate. I assume that we were probably acting more in an executive capacity than as Members of the Senate and of the House, but I construe the invitation from the Secretary of State to have Senators and Representatives participate in these deliberations as an evidence of a better spirit between the executive department and the Congress with regard to many matters of international import which will from time to time come before the Senate for its action. So I feel a sense of gratification that the course will be as indicated.

As the Senate has already been advised through the press, the President has invited the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] to attend the coming conference which is to meet in San Francisco on April 25—and I understand he has accepted—together with the senior Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and two Members of the House of Representatives. So that when we consider the constitutional provision which declares that treaties are to be made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, it seems to me these are instances wherein the full power and authority of the Senate is being recognized. In other words, the Senate is being consulted before the actual drafting and submission of the treaties, and, of course, will be called upon later to act upon, and to ratify or reject.

In pursuance of the invitation of the Secretary of State to which I referred in starting these remarks, the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Vermont journeyed to Mexico City. I regret that my duties here detained me so that I was 7 days or more late. The Senator from Vermont preceded me by 2 or 3 days, and I wish to say that he rendered very outstanding and distinguished service in the deliberations, upon which I shall touch more fully a little later.

In its activities the conference covered a great number of resolutions and propositions, all of which I shall not, of course, be able even to mention, to say nothing of discussing them. As to the economic resolutions, they will be properly filed with the Senate, and at a later date, when they have been thoroughly revised and verified, I shall offer them for printing as a Senate document for the information of all Senators. I shall not discuss the economic resolutions at this time, and I shall advert only briefly to some of the other matters which were considered.

Permit me to state, Mr. President, that all the 21 American republics, with the exception of Argentina alone, were represented in the Conference. As Senators know, the Argentine situation has been a source of much concern, not only to our

own State Department, but under the administration of Mr. Hull, and to many of the countries of Latin America. Toward the end of the sessions a resolution was adopted by all those in attendance relating to Argentina.

On January 26, 1944, the Argentine Republic broke diplomatic relations with both Germany and Japan, but she made no declaration of war, neither did she sign the United Nations declaration. That declaration, however, was signed by all the other 19 Latin-American nations.

The situation produced by the attitude of Argentina has been quite irritating, not alone to our own interests but, as suggested a moment ago, to many of the Latin-American countries.

At this point I wish to pay a tribute to former Secretary of State Hull. I feel that the action of the conference with regard to Argentina is a complete vindication of the far-seeing vision, the patience, and the statesmanship of Cordell Hull while he was Secretary of State.

Mr. President, I shall not read the action taken with regard to Argentina in detail, but shall read its salient features. After the preamble the resolving clauses, reading from the provisional English translation, are as follows:

1. To deplore that the Argentine Nation has up to the present time not found it possible to take the steps which would permit her participation in the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace, with the conclusions of which the principle of solidarity of the hemisphere against all types of aggression is consolidated and extended.
2. To recognize that the unity of the peoples of America is indivisible and that the Argentine nation is and always has been an integral part of the Union of the American Republics.
3. To express its desire—

This is the desire of the Conference—

That the Argentine Nation may put herself in a position to express her conformity with and adherence to the principles and declarations which are the results of the Conference of Mexico, and which enriched the juridical and political heritage of the continent and enlarged the scope of American public law, to which on so many occasions Argentina herself has made notable contributions.

4. To reiterate the declaration, established at Habana, amplified and invigorated by the Act of Chapultepec, and demonstrated by the association of the American republics as members of the United Nations, and this Conference holds, that complete solidarity and a common policy among the American states when faced with threats or acts of aggression by any state against an American state, are essential for the security and peace of the continent.

5. To declare that the Conference hopes that the Argentine Nation will implement a policy of cooperative action with the other American nations, so as to identify herself with the common policy which these nations are following, and so as to orient her own policies so that she may achieve her incorporation into the United Nations as a signatory to the joint declaration entered into by them.

And the final paragraph:

To declare that the final act of this Conference shall be open to adherence by the Argentine Nation, always in accordance with the criteria of this resolution, and to author-

ize His Excellency, Dr. Ezquiel Padilla, president of the conference, to communicate the resolutions of this assembly to the Argentine Government through the channel of the Pan American Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the action taken with regard to Argentina as set out in a provisional English translation of the final act printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

## LIX

The Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace having considered the text of the communication directed by the Argentine Government to the Pan American Union considering:

1. That the Conference was called for the purpose of taking measures to intensify the war effort of the United American Nations against Germany and Japan and to seek the strengthening of their political and economic sovereignty and their cooperation and security;

2. That the circumstances existing before the meeting have undergone no change that would have justified the Conference in taking steps to reestablish, as it earnestly desires to do, the unity of the 21 states in the policy of solidarity that has been strengthened during the deliberations of the Conference.

## Resolves:

1. To deplore that the Argentine Nation has up to the present time not found it possible to take the steps which would permit her participation in the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace, with the conclusions of which the principle of solidarity of the hemisphere against all types of aggression is consolidated and extended.

2. To recognize that the unity of the peoples of America is indivisible and that the Argentine Nation is and always has been an integral part of the union of the American republics.

3. To express its desire that the Argentine Nation may put herself in a position to express her conformity with and adherence to the principles and declarations which are the results of the Conference of Mexico, and which enrich the juridical and political heritage of the continent and enlarge the scope of American public law, to which on so many occasions Argentina herself has made notable contributions.

4. To reiterate the declaration, established at Habana, amplified and invigorated by the Act of Chapultepec, and demonstrated by the association of the American republics as members of the United Nations, and this conference holds, that complete solidarity and a common policy among the American states when faced with threats or acts of aggression by any state against an American state are essential for the security and peace of the continent.

5. To declare that the conference hopes that the Argentine Nation will implement a policy of cooperative action with the other American nations, so as to identify herself with the common policy which these nations are following, and so as to orient her own policy so that she may achieve her incorporation into the United Nations as a signatory to the joint declaration entered into by them.

6. To declare that the final act of this conference shall be open to adherence by the Argentine Nation, always in accordance with the criteria of this resolution, and to authorize His Excellency Dr. Ezquiel Padilla, president of the conference, to communicate the resolutions of this assembly to the Argentine Government through the channel of the Pan American Union.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the essence of the resolutions is to the effect that Argentina is at liberty to subscribe to the resolutions and declarations made at the conference in Mexico City, and that she is also at liberty and is really invited to place herself in position and to become a member of the United Nations, and that when she complies with these suggestions that she then will be restored—if that may be the word—to full partnership and brotherhood in the organization of the republics of the Western Hemisphere. Of course, there is speculation as to whether Argentina will see fit to meet these conditions or to accept these suggestions. That can only be relegated to the field of speculation and to the development of time.

Allow me to say also, Mr. President, that the attitude of the Latin-American nations toward the United States at Mexico City was of the most cordial character, and gave many evidences of an improved situation throughout the Western Hemisphere toward the United States. There was the warmest consideration for the delegates, and there seemed to be ever present a disposition and a desire that we should coordinate our efforts with regard to the war and with regard to the peace.

We found practical unanimity among all the nations of Latin America to support the conference which is to be called at San Francisco. There was, however, a distinct understanding that each nation represented at San Francisco would have the liberty and the right to present any resolutions or any proposed amendments, and that they would be considered at San Francisco. There was avoided any appearance of an American bloc, as it might be, in going to San Francisco. There was no suggestion that the 20 or 21 American republics shall in any wise be considered as a united bloc or a voting bloc or anything of that character in the San Francisco conference. Each nation goes there with complete liberty of action and the right to present problems as it may see fit. But over all these things there seems to be complete unity in the desire to see established at San Francisco, as a result of that conference, an international organization for the preservation of the peace and for the curbing of aggressors.

Mr. President, one other matter and then I shall surrender the floor. The most important aspect, in my mind, of the whole conference was what was known as the Act of Chapultepec. That was the resolution relating to the measures to be adopted for the preservation of the peace in the Western Hemisphere, whether that preservation of peace be against the aggressions of a country from foreign shores, or whether it should arise within the Western Hemisphere itself. In essence the resolutions adopted at Chapultepec, according to my mind, amounted to an adoption of our historic policy which we have had through the years, and which we have called the Monroe Doctrine. The Latin-American countries were enthusiastic in adopting a multilateral policy with regard to that ancient doctrine. Some of them, as Members of the Senate know, were not

particularly fascinated with the name "Monroe Doctrine," but they were anxious that its principles should be embraced by all of them, and that hereafter it should be a multilateral doctrine which would have the support and attachment of all the republics of the Western Hemisphere, and not be supported alone by one or two or a group of states.

I have in my hand a copy of the so-called Act of Chapultepec. I shall not read the whereases because probably that would grow a little tedious. The whereases in the document relate to prior pronouncements of international conferences held at Habana, Lima, and other points in Central and South America. They furnish a background and basis for the declarations and policies adopted in the main body of the Act of Chapultepec. I ask that the entire document be printed in the RECORD.

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

ACT OF CHAPULTEPEC—RECIPROCAL ASSISTANCE AND AMERICAN SOLIDARITY

Whereas the peoples of the Americas, animated by a profound love of justice, remain sincerely devoted to the principles of international law;

It is their desire that such principles, notwithstanding the present difficult circumstances, may prevail with greater force in future international relations;

The Inter-American Conferences have repeatedly proclaimed certain fundamental principles, but these must be reaffirmed and proclaimed at a time when the juridical bases of the community of nations are being reestablished;

The new situation in the world makes more imperative than ever the union and solidarity of the American peoples, for the defense of their rights and the maintenance of international peace;

The American states have been incorporating in their international law, since 1890, by means of conventions, resolutions, and declarations, the following principles:

(a) The proscription of territorial conquest and the nonrecognition of all acquisitions made by force (First International Conference of American States, 1890);

(b) The condemnation of intervention by a state in the internal or external affairs of another (Seventh International Conference of American States, 1933, and Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 1936);

(c) The recognition that every war or threat of war affects directly or indirectly all civilized peoples and endangers the great principles of liberty and justice which constitute the American ideal and the standard of American international policy (Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 1936);

(d) The procedure of mutual consultation in order to find means of peaceful cooperation in the event of war or threat of war between American countries (Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 1936);

(e) The recognition that every act susceptible of disturbing the peace of America affects each and every one of the American nations and justifies the initiation of the procedure of consultation (Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 1936);

(f) That any difference or dispute between the American nations, whatever its nature or origin, shall be settled by the methods of conciliation, or full arbitration, or through international justice (Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 1936);

(g) The recognition that respect for the personality, sovereignty, and independence of each American state constitutes the essence of international order supported by continental solidarity, which historically has been expressed and sustained by declarations and treaties in force (Eighth International Conference of American States, 1938);

(h) The affirmation that respect for and the faithful observance of treaties constitutes the indispensable rule for the development of peaceful relations between states, and that treaties can only be revised by agreement of the contracting parties (Declaration of American Principles, Eighth International Conference of American States, 1938);

(i) That in case the peace, security, or territorial integrity of any American republic is threatened by acts of any nature that may impair them, they proclaim their common concern and their determination to make effective their solidarity, coordinating their respective sovereign wills by means of the procedure of consultation, using the measures which in each case the circumstances may make advisable (Declaration of Lima, Eighth International Conference of American States, 1938);

(j) That any attempt on the part of a non-American state against the integrity or inviolability of the territory, the sovereignty or the political independence of an American state shall be considered as an act of aggression against all the American states (declaration XV of the second meeting of the ministers of foreign affairs, Habana, 1940).

The furtherance of these principles, which the American states have practiced in order to secure peace and solidarity between the nations of the continent constitutes an effective means of contributing to the general system of world security and of facilitating its establishment;

The security and solidarity of the continent are affected to the same extent by an act of aggression against any of the American states by a non-American state, as by an act of aggression of an American state against one or more American states.

PART I

The governments represented at the Inter-American Conference on War and Peace declare:

1. That all sovereign states are juridically equal amongst themselves.

2. That every state has the right to the respect of its individuality and independence, on the part of the other members of the international community.

3. That every attack of a state against the integrity or the inviolability of the territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American state, shall, conformably to part III hereof, be considered as an act of aggression against the other states which sign this act. In any case invasion by armed forces of one state into the territory of another trespassing boundaries established by treaty and demarcated in accordance therewith shall constitute an act of aggression.

4. That in case acts of aggression occur or there may be reasons to believe that an aggression is being prepared by any other state against the integrity and inviolability of the territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American state, the states signatory to this act will consult amongst themselves in order to agree upon the measures it may be advisable to take.

5. That during the war, and until the treaty recommended in part II hereof is concluded, the signatories of this act recognize that such threats and acts of aggression, as indicated in paragraphs 3 and 4 above, constitute an interference with the war effort of the United Nations, calling for such procedures, within the scope of their constitutional powers of a general nature and for war, as may be found necessary, including

recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; breaking of postal, telegraphic, telephonic, radiotelephonic relations; interruption of economic, commercial, and financial relations; use of armed force to prevent or repel aggression.

6. That the principles and procedure contained in this declaration shall become effective immediately, inasmuch as any act of aggression or threat of aggression during the present state of war interferes with the war effort of the United Nations to obtain victory. Henceforth, and to the end that the principles and procedures herein stipulated shall conform with the constitutional processes of each republic, the respective governments shall take the necessary steps to perfect this instrument in order that it shall be in force at all times.

#### PART II

The Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace recommends that, for the purpose of meeting threats or acts of aggression against any American republic following the establishment of peace, the governments of the American republics should consider the conclusion, in accordance with their constitutional processes, of a treaty establishing procedures whereby such threats or acts may be met by the use, by all or some of the signatories of said treaty of any one or more of the following measures: Recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; breaking of postal, telegraphic, telephonic, radiotelephonic relations; interruption of economic, commercial, and financial relations; use of armed force to prevent or repel aggression.

#### PART III

The above declaration and recommendation constitute a regional arrangement for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action in this hemisphere. The said arrangement, and the pertinent activities and procedures, shall be consistent with the purposes and principles of the general international organization, when established.

This agreement shall be known as the Act of Chapultepec.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in general the "whereases" are merely recitations of the anxiety to preserve peace and solidarity of the Western Hemisphere, and the interest of each of the countries in the security and peace of other countries of Latin America.

Perhaps I should read first the declaration of the Lima Conference, which is pertinent. This is paragraph (i) of the "whereases." This is the declaration at Lima in 1938:

(i) That in case the peace, security, or territorial integrity of any American republic is threatened by acts of any nature that may impair them, they proclaim their common concern and their determination to make effective their solidarity, coordinating their respective sovereign wills by means of the procedure of consultation, using the measures which in each case the circumstances may make advisable.

At the conference at Habana was laid the basis for the action taken at Mexico City. I quote paragraph (j):

That any attempt on the part of a non-American state against the integrity or inviolability of the territory, the sovereignty, or the political independence of an American state shall be considered as an act of aggression against all the American states.

That proclamation was issued at Habana, adopting among all the American

states support of the doctrine to which we have been attached since 1823, and long before that in our hearts and minds.

As a summary of declarations previous to the Act of Chapultepec, the document continues as follows:

The furtherance of these principles, which the American states have practiced in order to secure peace and solidarity between the nations of the continent, constitutes an effective means of contributing to the general system of world security and of facilitating its establishment.

The security and solidarity of the continent are affected to the same extent by an act of aggression against any of the American states by a non-American state, as by an act of aggression of an American state against one or more American states.

This document, in its later passages, which I shall note, lays down the rule that an aggression by one American state against another shall be regarded as an act of aggression against all the states. That is one of the surest safeguards that can be initiated to preserve the peace.

The Act of Chapultepec, in its formal parts, is divided into several sections. Part I is called the declaration. Part II is called the recommendation. Part III gives the designations, names, and so forth. At the risk of wearying the Senate, I wish to read the declaration and the recommendation. They comprise less than two pages.

In part I the Conference declares—

1. That all sovereign states are juridically equal amongst themselves.

2. That every state has the right to the respect of its individuality and independence on the part of the other members of the international community.

3. That every attack of a state against the integrity or the inviolability of the territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American state, shall, conformably to part III hereof, be considered as an act of aggression against the other states which sign this act. In any case invasion by armed forces of one state into the territory of another trespassing boundaries established by treaty and demarcated in accordance therewith shall constitute an act of aggression.

Part III, to which reference is there made, as will be pointed out a little later, is the part which provides that these measures must all be consistent with the purposes and principles of the international organization. We were seeking to avoid any conflict between the jurisdiction, powers, and activities of any American organization for peace, as against the international organization, so they are made subordinate to, and they must conform with, the general purposes and principles of, the international organization. I may say that the language "conformably to part III hereof," which brought about the removal of any clash between the organization of the 21 American republics and the world organization, were inserted at the urgent insistence of the United States delegation.

The American delegation also insisted on the last sentence of the third declaration wherein it is stated that "trespassing boundaries established by treaty and demarcated in accordance therewith shall constitute the act of aggression."

4. That in case acts of aggression occur or there may be reason to believe that an

aggression is being prepared by another state against the integrity and inviolability of the territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American state, the states signatory to this act will consult among themselves in order to agree upon measures it may be advisable to take.

To my mind, that is a very wise provision. In other words, if acts of aggression are occurring, or there is reason to believe that they are about to occur, instead of plunging recklessly into war the nations agree to consult among themselves as to the appropriateness of measures they may be able to take that will remove the aggression or remove the danger of its occurrence.

The next provision is very important. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. Austin] devoted his splendid attainments and labors toward having it drafted in a manner agreeable to the United States delegation.

5. That during the war, and until the treaty recommended in part II hereof, is concluded—

We have not yet reached part II, but we shall reach it in a moment—

the signatories of this act recognize that such threats and acts of aggression, as indicated in paragraphs 3 and 4 above, constitute an interference with the war effort of the United Nations, calling for such procedures, within the scope of their constitutional powers of a general nature and for war, as may be found necessary, including recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; breaking of postal, telegraphic, telephonic, radio-telephonic relations; interruption of economic, commercial, and financial relations; use of armed forces to prevent or repel aggression.

6. That the principles and procedures contained in this declaration shall become effective immediately, inasmuch as any act of aggression or threat of aggression during the present state of war interferes with the war effort of the United Nations to obtain victory. Henceforth, and to the end that the principles and procedures herein stipulated shall conform with the constitutional processes of each republic, the respective governments shall take the necessary steps to perfect this instrument in order that it shall be in force at all times.

In other words, pending the conclusion of the war, acts of aggression by any other power in Central, South, or North America should be regarded as interfering with the war effort. Then, under the war powers, the United States Government would have the authority to act in conjunction with other Western Hemisphere republics in taking such measures as may be found necessary to prevent further interference with the war effort.

Mr. President, that concludes what is called the declaration. In other words, the declaration is an announcement of principles to which they agree, and in it they make certain suggestions as to how they shall meet the danger of aggression.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that

the Act of Chapultepec repeals the Monroe Doctrine?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I did not say that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Or did the Senator say that the Act of Chapultepec supersedes the Monroe Doctrine?

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not use either one of those terms. I said that it is an evidence that all the Latin-American countries are now embracing the Monroe Doctrine and are making it a policy of their own, as well as of ours.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Then, it is an acceptance of the Monroe Doctrine, instead of a repeal of it; is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. There is no repeal of it. Of course, I tried to suggest as delicately as I could, awhile ago, that heretofore there have been certain elements in South America which did not feel very well about the idea of having the United States enforce the Monroe Doctrine, in the sense that it offended their pride, and so forth and so on; and some of them may not agree to the statement that the agreement embraces the Monroe Doctrine. But they mean to say that now it is a doctrine which is multilateral, rather than unilateral.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That part is all right; but I wish to ask whether I correctly understood the Senator to say that the new approach to the Monroe Doctrine or the new attitude toward it in the Western Hemisphere and the new approach to its acceptance have been made subordinate to whatever peace plans might develop.

Mr. CONNALLY. I would not say that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is the Monroe Doctrine made subordinate to the international peace organization which is to come?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sure that is not the case. That is not the purpose of these resolutions. A moment ago I referred to a portion of the act as showing that we were undertaking to avoid any conflict of jurisdiction between the peace measures covered by the Act of Chapultepec and the over-all world organization.

Paragraph No. 3 of the declaration reads as follows:

3. That every attack of a state against the integrity or the inviolability of the territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American state, shall, conformably to part III hereof, be considered as an act of aggression against the other states which sign this act.

Those are all the other states.

Let me say to the Senator that this declaration does not have the legal effect of a treaty because it has not been ratified by the Senate. It is a declaration of policies and principles upon which they agree.

Part II of the Act of Chapultepec is entitled "Recommendation." This is what the delegation recommends in order to accomplish these purposes and these declarations. It reads in part as follows:

#### PART II. RECOMMENDATION

##### Recommendation.

The Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace recommends:

That for the purpose of meeting threats or acts of aggression against any American

republics following the establishment of peace, the governments of the American republics should consider the conclusion, in accordance with their constitutional processes, of a treaty establishing procedures whereby such threats or acts may be met by the use, by all or some of the signatories of said treaty, of any one or more of the following measures:

Then it cites what I referred to a while ago, namely, the recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions, and so forth.

Part III is the one to which the Senator from Colorado no doubt has reference. It provides that upon the establishment of the world security organization, all procedures referred to therein "shall be consistent with the purposes and principles of the general international organization, when established."

We felt that it was absolutely necessary so to provide in order to keep faith with our plan and our purpose to establish an international organization at the conference in San Francisco.

The concluding words are simply the following:

This agreement shall be known as the Act of Chapultepec.

Furthermore, I wish to point out that part III also provides as follows:

This declaration and recommendation provide for a regional arrangement—

That language was inserted because, in view of the fact that the Dumbarton Oaks convention or temporary convention provides for regional organizations, we wished to provide that this Western Hemisphere organization, if appropriate, and if agreeable with the over-all organization, might for some purposes from time to time be utilized as a regional organization to settle regional disputes.

So part III provides that—

The above declaration and recommendation constitute a regional arrangement for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action in this Hemisphere. The said arrangement and the pertinent activities and procedures, shall be consistent with the purposes and principles of the general international organization, when established.

Mr. President, with the exception of the provision that the declaration and recommendation shall be known as the Act of Chapultepec, that concludes the formal parts of the so-called Act of Chapultepec.

For the duration of the war it will be unnecessary for any treaties or other matters to be negotiated; but as a long-time peace measure there is contained in the recommendation the statement that after the conclusion of the war we shall consider the matter of drafting treaties. That provision is not a pledge as to what the treaty or treaties may contain, but it is simply a statement that we shall consider the matter of drafting treaties.

Mr. President, I am sure that all of us are aware of the very great importance to the United States of having peace in this hemisphere. Our historic Monroe Doctrine was designed to prohibit aggression by any foreign power against any foot of soil in the Western Hemisphere. This document expresses the desires and the wishes of 19 other republics

in this hemisphere to support that doctrine as against any non-American state. That was declared in the Declaration of Habana, in 1940. Now, however, not only are they willing to extend that doctrine and to have it apply as against a non-American state, but in the interest of peace they declare that they are willing to regard an act of aggression by any other American state against its neighbor as an act of aggression against all of them. Mr. President, that may seem a rather broad course of action; but if what we want is peace, that is about the surest way we can guarantee it, namely, to let an aggressor know that if he violates the laws of logic and reason and justice he will have not only one enemy, but 15 or 20 enemies to see that he is not successful.

So, Mr. President, according to my view this document is a very important one, and it will be regarded in the literature of peace as a milestone along the roadway which we hope to be able to tread in order to reach world peace.

One of my chief concerns was to insure that nothing antagonistic to the world organization was contained in those resolutions. I realized that the success of the world organization was paramount, and transcended any other conception of an organization anywhere else. Unless we are able to establish a world organization with the sanctions not alone of the small powers, but of the great powers as well, and unless we are able to join hands with the great and the weaker nations of the earth in a common compact to take measures to preserve the peace of the world, those regional organizations will not have the authority or the power to accomplish the results for which we hope and expect.

According to my view, without any offense intended to any Latin-American country, the Act of Chapultepec adopts the Monroe Doctrine as a multilateral rather than a unilateral policy, both as to attacks by any non-American state, and unjust attacks by an American state. The Act of Chapultepec pledges the resistance of all American states against the aggressor. It establishes the rule of law and logic instead of the cruel and bloody statutes of the sword. It embodies the realization of all the powers of the Western Hemisphere that the historic pronouncement that no alien power may establish his system on the Western Hemisphere was a wise and prophetic policy which has preserved the liberty and independence of the nations of the western world. It represents a formal adoption by all the republics of this hemisphere of that salutary and far-seeing doctrine, and makes it the common property of all the western world.

As one of the representatives of the United States delegation, I wish to express my gratification at the results of the conference in its approval of the Act of Chapultepec. We of the United States participated in the conference and had a part in the consideration of an international arrangement for the preservation of peace and security in the entire western world.

Mr. President, allow me to say to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] that we in the United States have a par-

ticular responsibility in the Western Hemisphere. We have maintained an ancient doctrine, and together with its maintenance go certain responsibilities and duties. If we are to say that the Western Hemisphere is to be a sanctuary which shall not be invaded by any European or American aggressor, or armed conqueror, it becomes all important that we give leadership, direction and assistance to the people of the western republics in order that they may be able to work out their ambitions with respect to peace and development of their system, consistent with our sense of protection and assistance in the maintenance of that ancient doctrine. I do not think the United States can consistently do less than to give leadership and direction to the peoples of Latin America who are trying to attain the standards of peace.

Mr. President, it has long been the ambition of the Western Hemispheric republics to preserve their integrity, and to see that no alien system from Europe or elsewhere shall be established among them. By action of the Conference that was the objective of all American states. We are united in the objective that aggression shall never come from other shores to assail the sanctity of America without meeting the resistance of the united republics of the western world.

No ambitious power in this hemisphere can now contemplate the conquest of another republic in this hemisphere. The act recognizes the equality of states. It protects both the weak and the strong. We do not ignore in this document the organization of the over-all international organization on peace and security. We propose that the regional organization shall be integrated and coordinated with the world organization. We hope that the San Francisco Conference may construct a world organization based on the same noble principles. Within that framework looking toward peace and security of the entire world we are giving courage and hope to the advocates of security and peace the world over.

Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the activities and labors of our American representatives: Secretary of State Stettinius; his Assistant Secretaries, Rockefeller and Clayton; and the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. The Senator from Vermont was untiring in his industry. He brought a fine intelligent grasp of the problems which we were considering, and he gave unremittingly of his time and labor.

The Members of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Texas, Hon. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, also rendered valuable service. Among the advisers were representatives of labor, agriculture, industry, and women's organizations. Each contributed valuable suggestions and aided materially in advancing the work of the Conference.

On the whole, Mr. President, we feel that the accomplishments, particularly those which culminated in the Act of Chapultepec, will be historic. We feel that they are evidence of an accomplishment in securing unity and harmony

among 20 republics. Senators may think that they were simple and easy of accomplishment. While I had never attended this type of conference before my information had been that in former years there were conflicts, irritation, blocs, and groups. In the conference at Mexico City there could not have been a finer and more splendid attitude of mind and conception. The delegates seemed to be animated by the one desire to stand by the United States in the war effort, and to aid and promote the formation of an international organization for peace to take effect at the earliest possible moment.

I shall not deal with the economic resolutions which were agreed to. All of us know that in the years to come we cannot ignore all of Central and South America with relation to trade, commerce, industry, and the development of all their resources. During the war we have been purchasers of large amounts of war material from those territories. We pray that we shall never need war materials again; but if we do need them we shall hope to obtain those which are available from the republics of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. President, I believe that we made giant strides toward peace. I think we traveled a long way on the road toward San Francisco. I believe that the action taken at Mexico City will serve as a beacon in enabling the states represented at San Francisco to see the roadway toward peace. We believe it will rank in the future among the great state papers set down for future generations to observe. The Act of Chapultepec is an epochal document which will mean peace and security in the Western Hemisphere for years to come. It will be a great influence in guaranteeing that aggression and conquest shall be challenged, and that those who would shed the blood of innocent peoples shall be curbed forever.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the modesty of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate [Mr. CONNALLY] is equalled by his generosity. I appreciate what he has said with respect to the humble service which I performed in the meeting at Mexico City. I also join in commending our Latin-American neighbors for their remarkable spirit. Our South American neighbors joined the North American delegation fully in spirit to make everything drive toward that greatest objective in the hearts of all mothers and fathers of soldiers in this great war, namely, the establishment of security in which the conditions necessary for the attainment of peace through long years of living together according to reasonable rules of the game can be attained. From the beginning to the end of the conference I felt that I was having an education in courtesy, in sportsmanship, in fairness, and in justice.

It can well be imagined on the proposition of security and peace, coming from nations like Brazil, Uruguay, Colombia, Cuba, and Mexico there would be differences in detail. An example is be-

fore me. One of the propositions was this paragraph:

The signatory states oblige themselves to defend by all means, including by arms, the territorial integrity and the political independence of all and each one of them once it has been decided by the absolute majority of all of the American states.

It can readily be seen how a keen difference would arise in the subcommittee dealing with this subject on that one item, which would have committed the armed forces of the United States to the direction of an absolute majority of all the American states. Notwithstanding that we were able to deal with each other in the subcommittee and later in the conference on a basis of understanding. Men's minds and hearts were receptive of the ideas of each other; and I may say in all sincerity and candor that the Latin-American representatives contributed greatly to the thought that entered into the ultimate Act of Chapultepec.

So, Mr. President, I am grateful for the opportunity to have learned from our Latin-American neighbors the remarkable fact that whatever documents we may write, whatever they may contain, they will be vitalized by a harmony of spirit, of consecration to a great and noble idea by which we are sure to achieve progress.

I shall not take the time, Mr. President, to go into these matters in detail, but there are some observations which I should like to put in the RECORD with respect to certain features of the Act of Chapultepec which the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has emphasized as probably the most important achievement of the conference.

Let me digress long enough to say that the respect and honor for the judgment of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate which was entertained by our Latin-American friends, as well as by his colleagues of the North American delegation, paved the way for the ultimate acceptance of the very important amendments which finally were made in the Act of Chapultepec, and gained for him a prestige which I know already has spread all over the Western Hemisphere. I know that from statements of representatives personally to me, as well as from announcements over the radio and by the press. It was a great privilege to me to serve in this duty with him and under his leadership.

I now refer to one item. The Act of Chapultepec marks a reversal of attitude in one regard. Even as late as 1936 there was a reiteration of a doctrine of international attitude on the part of the American republics, the substance of which was the condemnation of intervention by a state in the internal or external affairs of another. That had also been announced at the seventh annual conference of American states in 1933. It was a clear expression of the doctrine of nonintervention.

Again there had been the doctrine enunciated at Habana in 1940:

That any attempt on the part of a non-American state against the integrity or in-

violability of the territory, the sovereignty or the political independence of an American state shall be considered as an act of aggression against all the American states.

The Act of Chapultepec reversed the doctrine of noninterference in the external affairs of another state, and it declared that whenever the sovereignty or the territorial integrity of one of those states is attacked by another state, whether from within the Western Hemisphere or from without, it becomes a concern of all other American states.

That is an extension of the Monroe Doctrine instead of a restriction or limitation of it, and its tendency of course is to serve as a warning to all other states to seek those channels of determination of controversies which are pacific and not warlike. The Act of Chapultepec recognizes the priority in use of the pacific method of settlement of controversies among the American nations.

It also takes that further step which has never been taken before, and which has always been feared by Latin-American republics, the step of requiring the use of armed force when necessary, when peaceful and pacific means of settling controversies have failed.

It may be asked, "Who says they have failed?" This arrangement, which is a regional arrangement, adopts the plan of consultation, to be entered into before the employment of that type of peace force which consists of the use of armed force. So that in a very simple form there is a regional arrangement set up for the pacific settlement of disputes within the Western Hemisphere.

Someone raised the question as to whether this was not an act which endangered the prospects of a world organization of general character for the same purpose, and I wish to answer that briefly.

To begin with, this conference approved of the principles and policies set forth in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as a basis of consideration at the San Francisco Conference. Of course, many of the countries had individual desires and projects, and they were not suppressed. They were given assurance that each individual country would have its free opportunity to present its own individual desires and recommendations at the San Francisco Conference. However, they unanimously approved of the purposes and principles set forth in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as a basis for negotiation.

I say they approved; they did so in another resolution, but in this very resolution they envisage that in this form. Section 6 of the whereases of the act of Chapultepec provides:

The furtherance of these principles—

Meaning the principles aimed at peace and security which have come down through history—

The furtherance of these principles, which the American states have practiced in order to secure peace and solidarity between the nations of the continent, constitutes an effective means of contributing to the general system of world security and of facilitating its establishment.

They envisaged that. They were conscious, by having it repeatedly referred

to, of the following language of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. I read section c, "Regional arrangements."

Nothing in the 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.

I skip some of the text to get in another thought which fits this discussion:

2. The Security Council should, where appropriate, utilize such arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority, but no enforcement action should be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council.

We articulated that right into the Act of Chapultepec by part III of the act, which adopts part of the language. Senators will see the striking similarity to it. It adapts it to the Western Hemisphere in the following way:

The above declaration and recommendation constitute a regional arrangement for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of national peace and security as are appropriate for regional action in this hemisphere, and such arrangements and the activities and procedures referred to therein shall be consistent with the purposes and principles of the general international organization when established.

Of course, all that deals with the future. That deals with the period after the war is over. The grave fears aroused on the border between Uruguay and Argentina, and certain rumors that were afloat, the fears of the necessity of help to maintain security and peace immediately caused every one of these declarations which came from Latin-American countries to envisage the obligation to come to the rescue in the event of aggression.

It can readily be seen how impossible it was for any country whose constitution required that a declaration of war should be made by its legislative body to enter into any such arrangement as that unless and until a treaty should be entered into which provided for such prompt mobilization of troops.

Therefore, once we got together on this point, on the use of some of the peace forces which do not consist of the use of armed forces, and certainly that type of force which consists of armed forces—when we got into the subject and pointed out to the representatives of the other countries that their own constitutions made it impossible for them to subscribe to such a declaration as that, they readily saw it, of course. They were reasonable men. What they wanted was, of course security now by lawful means. Thus it is that we find in this act of Chapultepec, part II, which is based on constitutional, general, and war powers which now exist, provision for the use of powers which are available during war, whenever and wherever an interference with the war effort of the United Nations occurs.

Mr. President, I shall not repeat the reading of it; Senators have it in memory. I shall conclude with a brief statement,

We have done three things. We have provided for security and peace during the war through the employment of constitutional, general, and war powers after consultation. This does not require any act of our Congress or of any other parliamentary body in the Western Hemisphere.

Second, we have provided for the negotiation of a treaty to take care of the same objective in peacetime.

We have, third, provided that this hemispheric arrangement shall be within the structure of the world organization.

Mr. President, if the world organization should fail of establishment, or if the world organization should operate in such a way that it did not afford the security and protection and peace we seek in the Western Hemisphere, this arrangement of the Western Hemisphere would be competent and able to take care of security and peace in the Western Hemisphere so long as the war lasts and in subsequent peacetime by special treaty.

Thus the structure of security and peace has been started on sound foundations. So what we have done is not temporary. What we have done is not in conflict with the plans for a general international organization for security, and what we have done is sure to develop conditions in which peace can be attained that will prevail in this hemisphere, whatever may betide.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Was Canada represented at this conference?

Mr. AUSTIN. No. Canada is not one of the American republics, and Canada's situation is somewhat different because of her membership in the Commonwealth of British Nations. There was great interest shown by Latin Americans and by ourselves in having Canada articulated in some way with this hemispheric arrangement. Everyone desires it. Often it came up and often discussion arose: "How can we invite this great neighbor of ours into this cooperative effort for peace?" We feel that we will attain that result some day. I will not say "we feel"—I should rather say "we felt"—because I doubt that I will ever be a member of such a conference again.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In any case, there was no objection to Canadian entry if it could be brought about?

Mr. AUSTIN. No.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would think the entry of Canada would strengthen the organization.

Mr. AUSTIN. There was no objection. On the contrary, there was a great desire to have that effected. The difficulties involved are somewhat complex at the present moment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Reference was made a moment ago to the Monroe Doctrine. It would seem to me, from the Senator's description of the conference, that it has resulted in vastly strengthening the Monroe Doctrine in that it aligned the interests of all the American nations behind the Monroe Doctrine. Is that not true?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes. One of the astounding things we discovered there was that the Latin-Americans, who formerly regarded the Nation up north as a sort of a club over their heads, now were not only willing but eager to participate in the Monroe Doctrine. Some of them desired that Dumbarton Oaks plans should involve some direct and express reference to such an eventuality; that all the American nations should become responsible for the Monroe Doctrine and that the responsibility be recognized by the rest of the world.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Texas have any particular difficulty there in connection with the question of the juridical equality of all these sovereign states; that is, the difficulty of reconciling our side with that of the small nations? There has been much criticism of Dumbarton Oaks because of that. I wonder whether that question was to any extent discussed at the conference.

Mr. AUSTIN. It was not discussed at all. No question was raised about it. In fact, one of the most beautiful characteristics of the whole conference was the faith, the spirit of confidence which permeated that meeting. Mind you, these proposals arose in Latin America. These proposals for security came to us principally in the form that they first came from Brazil, Colombia, and Uruguay. The most impressive suggestions that were made came from them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator means our delegation did not propose those things?

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, no. What our delegation did, however, was, in my judgment, admirable. Secretary of State Stettinius, Assistant Secretary Rockefeller, and Assistant Secretary Clayton, assisted by Ambassador Berle, Ambassador Avra Warren, Ambassador Messersmith, and by others whose names do not arise to my memory at once.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Ambassador Messersmith was there, was he not?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes. They conducted informal negotiations among the various representatives of state departments of all these countries, so that undoubtedly there was an exchange of views informally on this subject, which became reflected more or less definitely in these proposals. But, of course, there were differences between their view and our view of the matter which prompted the striking out of the direct obligations that would be enforced by a vote of the majority of the American states, and so on. The United States would not make such a proposal as that, of course.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. From what I understand, the two Senators representing the Senate made a great contribution toward bringing in these suggestions and reconciling differences.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I would give great credit to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee for what was done, but I think no one man can claim preponderant credit for it. It was our job to do all we could for it, as we had the light and guidance given to us. I am sure every representative performed that duty at the conference.

The representatives of labor and agriculture were particularly diligent and came forward and presented their views in meetings, and in the evening personally to the steering committees, and so on. We were in session much of the time. We had a great working team in Mexico City. To have a cross section of our interested life here in America at that conference was beneficial and something new. I wish to say that the consideration of these matters on the parliamentary level was a good thing. There were representatives of parliamentary bodies from all over the Western Hemisphere there, and their point of view had much to do with taking the "bugs" out of propositions which parliamentarians have to deal with in considering and passing laws. I feel that the theory of having intercourse among the parliamentary bodies of the world regularly and frequently was given a new impulse at the conference in Mexico City, because of the positive benefits that it provided in setting up, not the Act of Chapultepec alone, but 59 other resolutions. Two hundred and eighty-five resolutions were offered, and they all received some consideration, sufficient consideration to enable the conference to know what to sift out. They were sifted down to 60, and 60 of these very important resolutions were acted upon.

Consider the calendar of the Senate, and remember that these propositions were, some of them, as serious as any that come before the Senate. We disposed of 60 resolutions in about 2 weeks. That is because men could act with knowledge. They had the benefit of special study and experience and skill right there on hand all the time. For example, whenever we confronted a question which affected the dairy interests of the State of Vermont there was a man there who was able to tell us what was the matter with that proposition. In this case the president of the Grange, Mr. Goff, stayed there 2 days extra because of what he saw in a certain resolution he wanted attended to. He stayed until it was attended to.

Have I answered the Senator's question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I heard both of our distinguished colleagues say that the proceedings at Chapultepec were historic. As I sat here and listened to them relate the events of that occasion I got a great thrill. Why? Because here was the democratic process—the constitutional process—in action. I wonder if we are cognizant of the fact that their report to this body is historic. This is, indeed, a significant occasion. For a period of 6 years some of us have stood here and insisted that the word "advise" in the Constitution, when it speaks of treaties and foreign relations, and the function of the Senate, meant something.

I am indeed grateful that I am alive at this moment. I see a new day in prospect for America. No longer do the two members of this team—the Senate and the Executive—play separately. They are now playing together. This is the first time since I came to the Senate that

a Senator of the United States has been sent by the executive department to treat with foreign nations; and we have the report today. The occasion is highly encouraging. It augurs well for the future. When we can send two such men as the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who know the Constitution, who know the meaning of having checks and balances in government, and who can sit down and reason a proposal through, we know that the plan of the fathers is in operation.

All of us realize that in all the conferences heretofore—Casablanca, Cairo, Teheran, Moscow, Yalta—not once was the Senate of the United States represented. Not once did we have an accounting by our "own" such as we have had here today. Not once have we been told the facts, or received the "stimulation" which we have received today.

Mr. President, only a few days ago I submitted a resolution expressing in substance the hope that what has occurred in this instance might happen in relation to such a conference as that which is to be held in San Francisco. We might resolve ourselves into a committee of the whole and be told definitely and clearly the facts, without having to rely upon hearsay. We would hear at first hand the report of our own Members, as well as that of representatives of the State Department.

Mr. President, I say again that this is a great occasion. This is a historic occasion of far greater importance than the conference which took place at Chapultepec. The South American countries have now come to see the wisdom of the Monroe Doctrine. Perhaps they did not see it before. The world has been shrunk. Airplanes go around the world in a matter of hours. Those nations sense the need of unified action, and they sense, further, the importance of extending the Monroe Doctrine, as explained by our distinguished associates.

This is the report of our associates, and they have builded well, as the Constitution contemplated.

Mr. President, I thank our two brother Senators for the fine work they have done. I am satisfied that they have set the pattern which will be followed in the future. I am grateful that the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are going to San Francisco; and I trust that in every other conference hereafter, whenever foreign relations are considered, this body will have its representatives present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the senior Senator from Texas a question. Do I correctly understand that the Senator intends, at some future time, to describe to the Senate the economic resolutions of the Mexico Conference?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to discuss them, but I have just handed the Senator a copy of the resolutions.

Mr. TAFT. I glanced through them.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think possibly the Senator was misled by my statement that I would try to have them all col-

lected up to date, and then request that they be printed as a Senate document.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator know whether or not any obligations were undertaken by the United States in the matter of loans, and so forth, after the war, which were not included in the resolutions?

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator mean privately or under cover?

Mr. TAFT. They necessarily would be between two nations. There would not be a general resolution covering such arrangements. I wondered if there were any specific obligations in view, through Lend-Lease, F. E. A., the Export-Import Bank, or otherwise, in connection with the conference.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall ask the Senator from Vermont to stand by. I made specific inquiry of our delegates dealing with those matters. I was not on the committee which handled the economic resolutions, although I did give considerable attention, as did the Senator from Vermont, to the particular resolutions called the economic charter. We studied that document. I inquired of our other delegates, and they assured me that no money commitments of any character were made during the conference.

Mr. TAFT. I did not intend to criticize if there were. I only wondered, if there were, how we could find out about them. If there are none, there is no further knowledge to be sought.

Mr. CONNALLY. For more accurate information I refer the Senator to Assistant Secretaries of State Clayton and Rockefeller. But I made specific inquiry as to that matter, and I was told that there were no commitments which required that we furnish any money whatever. I do not mean by that that there were not general statements in the resolutions that we would endeavor to do this, that, or the other thing which might eventually involve some expenditures. However, so far as direct commitments are concerned, I believe that the statement which I have made is accurate. I will ask the Senator from Vermont if he has any information to the contrary.

Mr. AUSTIN. The economic charter is in quite general terms. I take some risk in undertaking to state its purpose and objective simply, because it is quite a lengthy document. However, this is my impression of it:

It declares the policy of promotion of equal and reciprocal opportunity for both the nationals and goods of each country. That does not mean free trade, and does not mean equality in its absolute sense; but it does mean reduction of trade barriers in a scientific manner, adapted to the needs ascertained at the time and for the period necessary in order to create an expanding economic system in the Western Hemisphere. This was a hemisphere proposition; but it contemplated also the world, and the attitude of the Western Hemisphere toward the world in economic matters. In general, its objective was stated in broad terms, and not specifically. As I recall, there was no express promise to make a loan, to reduce a tariff, or to remove a subsidy; but the general principles which any man can see will have to be inau-

gurated in the world if we are to have economic peace, and by its means a political peace, are declared in the economic charter.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. When will these documents be printed? When shall we see the economic charter?

Mr. AUSTIN. I have a copy of it here, Mr. President.

Mr. McKELLAR. It has not as yet been printed has it?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; it has not as yet been printed.

Mr. McKELLAR. But I assume it will be printed?

Mr. AUSTIN. I certainly assume that it will be printed, and that all the 60 resolutions of the meeting at Mexico City will be published. They ought to be published.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think most of them were published in the New York Times, or at least a summary was published in the New York Times, and is available there.

Mr. AUSTIN. It was.

Mr. TAFT. I was only interested to know whether there were outside agreements between individual nations. As I understand, the Senator knows of no such agreements.

Mr. AUSTIN. I know of none. There was another economic document which referred more specifically to the subject of tariffs. That was the one in which President Goss was so much interested. As it was finally adopted, it met with his approval; and I believe that anything that meets with President Goss' conservative approval would meet with Republican approval.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Last week I obtained consent to have printed in the Record what was purported to be an authorized interview with Mr. William L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State, regarding two subjects. One of them was protection for infant industries in South America, a subject about which some concern was expressed, apparently. As I understand the situation, ample latitude was allowed for the South American and Central American republics to protect their infant industries.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is my recollection. I think it came under the heading of new industries.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. It included not only independent industries, but new industries erected within old industries, and reference is made to protection, namely, tariff protection and trade barriers.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. I cannot remember the exact language; but it is against the raising of such barriers above a reasonable level.

Mr. BREWSTER. Very well.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Maine was referring, was he not, to the resolutions relative to new industries?

Mr. BREWSTER. In the report by Mr. Herbert B. Elliston, associate editor of the Washington Post, reference was made to infant industries.

Mr. CONNALLY. A clause relating to new industries, as I recall, is contained in the economic charter. It is not available here at the moment. There is a clause providing that new industries within a country shall have protection, but that when it is no longer necessary to have high rates of duty to keep them going and alive, the rates shall be reduced.

Mr. BREWSTER. That provision would be applicable to us, as well as to the other countries, I understand. In other words, I assume it is of universal applicability.

Mr. CONNALLY. I assume it would be. I do not recall that any exceptions are stated. But the point was, for instance, that in some countries there are simply no industries of certain characters. If it was desired to establish such industries, they would be assured of sufficient protection to put them on their feet. But the provision was that once such industries were on their feet, the tariff should be reduced. However, I think a distinction was made between a new industry and an addition to an old industry. The latter would not acquire that particular right, I believe. My recollection is that in case of an addition to an old industry, that provision would not be applicable. It was for new industries, which are to be created and stimulated.

Mr. BREWSTER. There is another phrase in the same interview which indicates that, apparently, Mr. Clayton undertook to draw a distinction between good cartels and bad cartels. Is that also a matter which enters into the document in its economic sense?

Mr. CONNALLY. It probably enters into some of the documents; but I cannot recall them all. There is a great mass of them. I was not on the committee which dealt with them, so my information regarding some of them is very inadequate.

Mr. WHEELER. Is there a difference between good cartels and bad cartels?

Mr. BREWSTER. I obtained unanimous consent to have the interview printed in the Record, and I spoke to Mr. Clayton following his return. In the interview he indicated that there might be cartels which might be appropriate and which, he said, speaking for our Government, might meet with the approval of our Government. Other cartels he regarded as bad cartels.

Mr. WHEELER. I am interested in knowing whether there were any agreements whereby we would break down the tariffs on raw materials. Coming from the West, which produces the raw materials, I find that although a number of persons who are manufacturers in the East want to have high tariffs on their manufactured articles, they are perfectly willing to have no tariffs or low tariffs on raw materials which are produced by the

farmers, the miners, and the stock growers of the West. I certainly hope that there were no agreements which would break down or throw open the tariffs on the raw materials produced in the western section of our country, whereby raw materials would be shipped into the United States from the countries to the south with the result that our farmers, stockmen, and miners would be put out of business.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I now have before me the economic charter. At page 61, paragraph 4, appears the following, which I think bears on the subject of cartels:

Private agreements which restrict international trade:

4. To seek early agreed action by governments to prevent these practices by cartels or through other private business arrangements which obstruct international trade, stifle competition, and interfere with the maximum efficiency of production and fair competitive prices to consumers.

That is all there is to that paragraph.

The following paragraph, entitled "Elimination of Excesses of Economic Nationalism," provides as follows:

5. To cooperate for the general adoption of a policy of international economic collaboration to eliminate the excesses which may result from economic nationalism, including excessive restriction of imports and the dumping of surpluses of national production in world markets.

I do not believe the word "subsidy" will be found in this economic charter at all. I do not think any direct reference to it will be found.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield to me, let me say that the interview with Mr. Clayton appears at page A1054 of the Appendix of the RECORD under date of March 7. In that interview we find that the following was apparently Mr. Clayton's authorized distinction:

Distinction can be drawn between private cartel arrangements which have to do with the fixing of prices, the allocation of markets and the control of production for private profit, particularly when such agreements are made by such industries with a limited number of products, as the chemical industry and an international agreement under Government auspices which relates to commodities which have developed unmarketable supplies—

I presume that means surpluses—

and which concern raw materials in the production of which millions of producers are involved. We can defend the latter while we condemn the former.

Does that distinction come within the scope of what appears in the economic charter?

Mr. AUSTIN. It is not an interpretation which I would place upon it. I suppose it is possible to place such an interpretation upon it, but I do not see it in the language which is employed.

Mr. BREWSTER. When the Senator from Vermont has an opportunity to examine it, I think it would be very interesting to have his comment. The portion I read purports to be quoted from an interview with Mr. Clayton. The remainder of the article is an interpreta-

tion by Mr. Elliston, who, of course, is a very competent reporter.

Mr. AUSTIN. The charter further states directly, on the subject of private enterprise, the following:

(8) To promote the system of private enterprise in production which has characterized the economic development of the American republics, to take appropriate steps to secure the encouragement of private enterprise and to remove as far as possible obstacles which retard or discourage economic growth and development.

Everything is in rather broad, general terms. So this does not make a commitment with respect to the points about which the Senator from Maine has inquired, as I understand it or interpret it.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator feel that the agreement reached at Mexico City will result in building up and maintaining more balanced economies in all the Americas? The reason why I ask that question is that we are all aware that in some sections there is a fear that emphasis will be placed upon agricultural production in South America, Central America, and Mexico, and that less emphasis will be placed on industrial production. If that is the case, of course it is conceivable that such a policy might have a harmful effect upon agriculture in the United States.

On the other hand, if the industrialization of those countries somewhere near keeps pace with their agricultural production, then not only would we probably have little, if anything, to fear for our own agriculture, but the increased purchasing power of those countries would create a better market for everything we produce here.

Does my colleague feel that the agreement reached will have a tendency to build and maintain a balanced economy? I realize that that cannot come about all at once; but will it have that tendency?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, my answer is "Yes." I am not as familiar with the economic principles and policies as I am with other features of the conference, although I worked with the steering committee on that subject as well as on other subjects.

I now turn over the page, and in section 10 point out how the policy is expressed with respect to labor. The language—and, as in all similar matters, action is looked forward to in the future—is as follows:

To take appropriate steps to assure to the workers of the American republics, under conditions of progressive economic development, the realization of the objectives set forth in the declaration at Philadelphia adopted by the International Labor Conference.

That is one segment of our economic responsibility. I well recall that there are others which have in view the encouragement of the industrialization of Latin-American countries. The use of their own balances—I do not recall this having been written into the document, but I do recall the discussion concerning

it—in the United States will be for the purchase of machine tools, and becoming established on an industrial basis so that their economy will not be based solely on the production of raw materials and agricultural products.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that it is hoped by all of us that earning power of the countries to the south may nearly approximate that of our own, and that when that time comes we may be able to discard barriers which now exist between the nations. If the Conference at Mexico City has resulted in a step being taken toward the day for which we all hope, it will certainly result in a very lasting benefit. I hope that at some time we may learn a little more about the economic agreements which were reached at Mexico City, but I realize the Senator did not take part to any extent in the negotiations on that subject.

Mr. AUSTIN. I believe that within a few days a printed copy of the document will be available to all of us.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. A little while ago the Senator said that the word "subsidy" was not used during the entire deliberations.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator care to express an observation as to whether or not any policy of restriction was discussed which would have a tendency to prevent surpluses being produced or being dumped into world markets, especially with respect to agricultural production?

Mr. AUSTIN. Of course, there were deliberations along that line, but as a result of those deliberations there was omitted from the economic charter any reference to subsidies. I am now giving only my opinion.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I am asking for.

Mr. AUSTIN. It is my opinion that section 5 really covers in a broad way the point to which the Senator refers. It reads as follows:

To cooperate for the general adoption of a policy of international economic collaboration to eliminate the excesses which may result from economic nationalism, including excessive restriction of imports and the dumping of surpluses of national production in world markets.

The Senator can see from that language that much is implied but there is no reference to subsidies.

Mr. WHERRY. Nor any methods which may be adopted with reference to them?

Mr. AUSTIN. No.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2506) to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910, as amended, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2506) to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910, as amended, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

## INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1984) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Executive Office of the President—Bureau of the Budget," on page 3, line 19, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$2,227,257" and insert "\$2,004,532."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 20, to strike out:

National defense activities: For all necessary expenses of the Bureau of the Budget in the performance of activities relating to the national defense, including all the objects for which the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Budget" is available, and including the temporary employment (not exceeding \$12,500) of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and the employment of persons, including State, county, or municipal officers and employees, with or without compensation, \$445,300: *Provided*, That upon the expiration of 60 days after the cessation of hostilities between the United States and the principal enemy powers or after the date of an armistice between the United States and the principal enemy powers, this appropriation shall cease to be available for obligations unless Congress shall otherwise provide by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 12, to insert:

No part of the appropriations herein made to the Bureau of the Budget shall be used for the maintenance or establishment of regional, field, or any other offices outside the District of Columbia.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, would that amendment take away from the Bureau of the Budget the funds necessary in order to carry out the purposes of the Federal Reports Act, which was passed by the Senate a short time ago?

The Bureau of the Budget has been putting that act into effect, and the funds which were appropriated for it were for the purpose of enabling the Bureau of the Budget to carry out the purposes of the act.

Mr. McKELLAR. This amendment refers to the national-defense activities. The item was stricken out entirely. The Bureau of the Budget now desires to have four regional offices. The committee felt that to be unnecessary because the estimates have heretofore been made

at Washington, and the Bureau wished to establish two additional offices. The amendment deals merely with that subject.

Mr. MURRAY. Small business has been especially benefited by the Federal Reports Act, and the Bureau of the Budget, as the result of its work under that act, greatly relieved small business from the innumerable requirements which were in effect heretofore with regard to the submission of reports to Washington.

Mr. McKELLAR. The subject was not mentioned in the hearings. I think the pending bill has nothing to do with it.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I think the pending bill does have something to do with it. The Federal Reports Act is administered in the Bureau of the Budget by the Division of Statistical Standards, which will share in the reductions proposed to be made.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will look on page 3, in line 19, he will see that a general appropriation of \$2,004,532 has been recommended. The Bureau will have plenty of money with which to administer the act so far as its responsibilities are concerned.

Mr. MURRAY. My information is to the effect that it will not have sufficient funds, and that the amendment will greatly hamper and interfere with the administration of the act by the Bureau of the Budget. The Division of Statistical Standards, which has been carrying forward the program of relieving small business from the necessity of filing innumerable reports, will be greatly hampered.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand, the testimony which was given before the committee contains nothing in the world about that subject. What the Senator has said is a new idea which has been suggested since the testimony was taken, and since the bill was reported. Of course, every bureau of the Government which may be affected in the slightest way by a reduction always feels that it will be hampered, and that something will happen to somebody, usually employees of the bureau. But the committee went over the matter very carefully and heard all the testimony which was offered.

The representatives of the Bureau appeared before us. They did not mention that particular feature at all, but, after carefully considering the matter, the committee felt that these reductions could be made, and they were made, and I think were properly made. I hope the Senator feels the same about it.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I understand this matter was given some consideration in the House of Representatives, and there are certain Members of the House who feel that this curtailment would have the effect I am stating it would have. The Federal Reports Act, as administered by the Bureau of the Budget, has certainly served a very useful purpose, and if it is true that the cut which will be made will reduce their activities and interfere with their carrying out the purposes of the act, of course I object to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the amendment proposed is the judgment of the committee. Of course, if the Senate feels that the statement of the Senator from Montana is correct, the Senate can restore the item, but I hope it will not be restored. This Bureau started out 22 years ago, when it was established, with 35 employees. Today it has 575, and is constantly adding to them, and if we appropriated all the money they ask for, there is no telling how great the sum would be. I believe that the committee was correct and that the Senator is not.

Mr. MURRAY. I have no doubt that the Senator has given very great study to the matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. The committee has.

Mr. MURRAY. While it is true that this Bureau has grown, the country has grown as well, and we have become one of the greatest industrial nations in the world.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. It seems to me that the Bureau of the Budget is a very important agency of the Government, and will have to grow some more if it is to take care of the problems which will be forced upon it in the years to come, especially in the immediate post-war period. Anyway, I feel that this curtailment is not justified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 4, after line 20.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7 it is proposed to strike out lines 1 to 18, both inclusive, as follows:

## AMERICAN COMMISSION FOR THE PROTECTION AND SALVAGE OF ARTISTIC AND HISTORIC MONUMENTS IN WAR AREAS

For all expenses necessary for the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas in performing its functions, as described in the letter of the Secretary of State, approved by the President, June 23, 1943, as amended, including the employment of persons, without regard to citizenship, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed \$15,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the civil-service and classification laws or section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; travel expenses, purchase of books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; not to exceed \$90 for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail as required by section 2 of the act of June 28, 1944 (Public Law 364); and printing and binding; \$40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Civil Service Commission," on page 8, line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$236,270" and insert "\$217,000"; and in line 17, before the words "of which", to strike out "\$9,512,520" and insert "\$8,673,882."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee to explain what reason the committee had for this sharp cut in the appropriations for the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. McKELLAR. We provided for them exactly what they had for the current fiscal year. The Civil Service Commission is performing an excellent service for the Government, but it was the opinion of the committee that to increase the appropriation at this time was not necessary, and would not be of any material assistance. I certainly hope the Senate will uphold the committee in this respect.

The Commission has been very active. They have had a great many employees. The Commission has grown tremendously, and as the Senator knows, it does a very valuable work; but to increase the appropriation just about the time the war in one area at least is over, and give them more and more, is not justified. This country is going to have a very large debt, and it is time we were trying to do something for the benefit of the taxpayers.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am fully aware of the debt. The Senator is correct; it is large. There must have been some justification given to the House committee or it would not have allowed \$9,512,520. What I am trying to ascertain from the Senator is what specific activities of the Commission the committee has in mind curtailing in reducing this item.

Mr. McKELLAR. They are getting exactly what they had last year. I do not think the Commission was ever more active in its history than it was during the past year. It had an infinite number of defense activities caused by the war. Instead of such activities increasing, it is very likely that by July the 1st they will probably decrease, not only in a small degree, but to a very considerable extent; and, after mature, careful consideration, and after hearing the testimony of those who were interested, the committee was of the opinion that the amount appropriated last year was sufficient, and that is why it is left as it was.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not have the benefit of being a member of the Committee on Appropriations, but everyone knows that the House committee goes over these items very carefully and is as much concerned with the debt and with economy as is the Senate committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The amount of \$9,512,520 was allowed and passed the House. I am not a member of the Senate committee, and I have not had the benefit of sitting in on the hearings. All I am asking the Senator from Tennessee to tell me is what particular phases of the activity of the Civil Service Commission which appeared justified to the House it is now proposed they shall not either carry on or undertake. According to my hurried calculation, if we take into consideration the cut in the printing item, the reduction amounts to about \$838,638. That much of a cut cannot be made without either curtailing some of their existing activities or some they had in contemplation when this item was originally arrived at.

Mr. McKELLAR. These are the activities they had in contemplation:

Work improvement program, \$106,678. Promoting better personnel management, \$76,400.

Preparing and issuing standards, field classification work, \$229,810.

Budget and Finance Division, \$30,489. Office services division, \$33,703.

Penalty mail, \$26,400.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Do those items constitute those which have been eliminated?

Mr. McKELLAR. The House applied cuts to them, and then the Senate committee applied the same sort of cuts. We reduced the appropriation to the amount appropriated last year. The committee did not think it was necessary to appropriate more money for the Civil Service Commission this year than was appropriated last year, because last year they had the heaviest amount of work they ever had, and we thought it was exceedingly unlikely they would have a larger amount of work to do the coming year. That is what actuated the committee, and that is the situation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let me ask the Senator whether included in this cut will be any reduction in the activities of the Commission so far as the placement of veterans is concerned.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I think not. They are placing veterans. The veterans are returning now by the scores of thousands, and perhaps, even at a greater rate. I believe the Commission can do their work with the appropriation allowed as well as they did it last year.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understood that among other things the Commission had set up a section, or whatever they may call it, which has special reference to the placement and replacement of veterans, because of course there are a very large number of veterans who have gone into the armed forces from the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. From the civil service.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And under the Selective Service Act the Government is under the same obligation to find re-employment, as is a private employer.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am anxious to know from the Senator whether this rather substantial cut—

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; not a cut. The appropriation is exactly the same as that of last year.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Well, it is a cut below what the Bureau of the Budget recommended and what the House allowed.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is about a 10-percent cut, roughly speaking.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And I am trying to ascertain whether the reduction recommended by the Senate committee will impair this activity which the Commission has undertaken so far as veterans are concerned.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I do not think so.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Was that activity taken into consideration by the Senate committee in arriving at the amount which was recommended?

Mr. McKELLAR. It certainly was. The Senate committee had before it the number of soldiers who were being dis-

charged. Many questions arose concerning such soldiers. I assure the Senate and the Senator from Wisconsin that if I thought that what we did would impair any right of the soldiers or duty we owe them the cut would not have been made.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is very reassuring to me, because it seems to me that it is obviously an activity which is going to expand rather than contract as the war comes to an end.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true, but other activities will contract very greatly. The employment of individuals by the Government today is enormously greater than it ever has been before, and the Government will be obliged to reduce this employment when the war is over.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Oh, certainly, that is obviously true, especially so far as the war agencies are concerned. I realize that probably it may be even more than we hope for; but what I had in mind was that, as it becomes possible to discharge and demobilize the armed forces, the problem confronting the Civil Service Commission in seeing to it that the Government responsibility under section 8 of the Selective Service Act is properly administered and discharged, will increase in direct ratio to the number of persons previously employed in the Government service, or with respect to a later established veterans' preference, in seeing to it that they are given their rightful consideration. I am very anxious to make certain that if the Senate adopts the amendment proposed by the committee, it will not result in curtailing that particular activity of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. McKELLAR. The committee not only discussed that, I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin; but on page 332 of the record of the hearings the Senator will find that Mr. Flemming was told concerning a 10-percent cut under the House provision:

Try it (for) 1 year. If you did and then came back and said you could not do it, we would be more likely to want to uphold you.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Under the heading "Civil Service Commission," I notice in addition to this cut, "Salaries and expenses, \$838,638" there is another cut "Salaries and expenses, national defense, \$1,000,000." Will the Senator explain the reason for that?

Mr. McKELLAR. We did not believe there would be the necessity of putting so many employees in national-defense service next year as the present year.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it an expression of hope on the part of the committee that it will not be necessary?

Mr. McKELLAR. Naturally, no one can tell; but it seems to be a very extravagant view to take that we should appropriate money for the Commission for another year and 4 months of war.

Mr. AIKEN. It is the Senator's expectation, then, that if it develops that the money will be needed, the officials can return and ask for it later in the year?

Mr. McKELLAR. It can be done, and if it is done the money will be provided.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I did not attend all the meetings of the subcommittee, but I heard some of the discussion with reference to this item. I think I am wholly justified in saying that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate acted in no punitive spirit at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. WHITE. But the committee restored the appropriation to that of last year because, in the opinion of the committee, of failure to justify the increase asked for?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Maine is correct. No member of the committee had any other view but to appropriate every dollar that was actually necessary for this purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 8, in lines 16 and 17.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 24, after the word "binding", to strike out "\$7,032,000" and insert "\$6,032,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Communications Commission," on page 12, line 12, before the word "maintenance", to strike out "purchase (not to exceed five)"; and in line 21, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$2,554,400" and insert "\$2,550,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Power Commission—Salaries and Expenses," on page 15, line 13, after the word "services" and the semicolon, to strike out "purchase (not to exceed three)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 19, before the words "of which", to strike out "\$2,150,000" and insert "\$1,818,466."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that that amendment, and the one in the next line, go over until tomorrow in order that we may receive some information about them.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments will be passed over.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the next amendment, which is in line 22, on page 15, also be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment in line 22 will be passed over.

Mr. McKELLAR. I also ask that the amendment in line 5 on page 17 be passed over, so all amendments relating to the Federal Power Commission, except the one on page 15, line 13, may go over together. I think it would be better if that were done.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not asking that they all go over.

Mr. McKELLAR. They all come under the heading "Federal Power Commission," and should all go over together.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments referred to will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Works Agency—Office of the Administrator," on page 18, line 20, after the word "laws" to strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$293,302."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 25, after the word "planning" and the colon, to strike out "Toward accomplishing" and insert "For carrying out."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask the Chair not to be in such a hurry with this bill. Unanimous consent was granted that the bill might be reported during the adjournment of the Senate. I am now beginning to question whether it was a wise thing to grant such request.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Chair will not rush the bill through. I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin will have every opportunity to discuss its various provisions.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. This is a very important amendment, and I am trying to obtain some information about it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin can rest assured that the Chair is not railroading the bill through. Every Senator will be given a chance to be heard on it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Chair. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee a question about this item. This is the item which, as I understand, provides for assistance to the States and local subdivisions, and for the activities of Federal Government looking to the planning of a post-war public works program. The Bureau of the Budget recommended \$77,000,000 plus for this purpose, and the House, I regret to say, reduced the item to \$5,000,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair may say to the Senator from Wisconsin that the amendment under consideration is the one beginning in line 25 at the bottom of page 18.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As I understand, that amendment involves the question I am discussing.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There may be simply a change of language, but in order to get in in time, before the Chair has the next item in the next line agreed to, I thought I would take advantage of my right and ask for some information. Will the Senator from Tennessee be kind enough to make a rather comprehensive statement about this matter? I think this is a very important item, and one that should have the consideration of the Senate. I wish to say at the outset that I am pleased that the Senate committee saw fit to restore at least a portion of the amount estimated for this item, thus recognizing the importance of the subject matter; but

I have heard, also, that a legislative amendment was intended to be offered. If the Senator would be kind enough to give us a rather comprehensive statement about this item, I would appreciate it very much.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to do so. As we all know, the President recommended \$77,000,000-plus for planning. There seemed to be some difference as to whether the planning money was to be returned after the bonds were issued by a particular city which is to issue bonds for public works. The plans must be made before the bonds are issued.

There was a difference as to whether, after the \$77,000,000 was advanced, the cities, States, counties, and other subdivisions of government should return the money.

When the matter came before the House, the House allowed only \$5,000,000, reducing the appropriation by \$72,000,000. When it came to the Senate committee, to be very frank, I thought that probably the full amount should be restored, and that the question should go to conference. However, there was a very sharp difference of opinion among members of the committee. We heard every kind of argument about the matter, and finally some member of the committee suggested this method. The question arose very frequently as to whether the money should be paid back. I remember that we asked Mayor LaGuardia, Mayor Kelly, and other witnesses whether or not the money was to be paid back. Some of them thought it was to be paid back, and others thought that perhaps not all of it would be paid back to the Government. Thereupon a member of the committee made the suggestion that, inasmuch as in making such appropriations we had almost uniformly adopted the plan of a 50-50 appropriation in connection with roads and other things of like character, that plan might well be followed in this instance. Very quickly the suggestion was carried out; and instead of providing for the whole sum, the committee adopted the plan to appropriate \$30,000,000, with none of it to be returned. We are not asking the cities to return it, but merely to match it. In other words, we have adopted the well-known policy of matching State, county, or city funds.

That amendment was adopted. I think probably it would prove as satisfactory as the other plan. The only difference is that the cities, counties, and States will have to put up half the money. Most of them are going to put up large sums, anyway. Judging from the statements of witnesses, it is expected that this will be only a part of the planning funds.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. Just a moment. I am rather inclined to the view that perhaps I was mistaken in suggesting that the whole amount be appropriated. I am rather inclined to think that it would be more beneficial to the cities themselves to put half the money and let the Government put up the other half. The cities can return the half which the Government puts up.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator intend to offer an amendment to the bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. It is perfectly clear to me what the bill would do. The bill would lend the money to the States or the cities, as the case might be; and if the city should proceed with the work, it would have to pay it back, because bonds would be issued to cover the whole project, and money would be included in the bond issue to pay it back. If for any reason a project were discontinued, the city would not have to pay back the money. That seemed to me to be a perfectly reasonable system. I do not quite see the reason for changing the system.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is the amendment which has been proposed and will be offered tomorrow.

On page 19, line 13, before the period, it is proposed to insert:

*Provided*, That of the \$35,000,000 appropriated in this paragraph, \$5,000,000 shall be available for loans for advances without matching—

That is the \$5,000,000 which the House has allowed—

under the provisions of said title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, but the remaining \$30,000,000 shall not be available for obligation or expenditure under said title V except to make loans or advances in cases in which sums at least equal to such loans or advances shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, their agencies or political subdivisions for the purposes set forth in said title V.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. What the committee is now proposing to do is to accomplish the identical thing which we were trying to avoid. Many municipalities and political divisions are not able to take out of their treasuries money to make surveys and plans and prepare for post-war work, but must depend upon their own people for a bond issue later in order to carry out their programs. They will not be able to get any of this money on the matching basis. A few large, wealthy cities will perhaps be able to absorb it all. So the very purpose which the committee had in mind, and which Congress had in mind, would be defeated.

Mr. McKELLAR. The large cities could not absorb it all. It would be allocated under the terms of the law.

Mr. GEORGE. That may be true; but they will absorb all of it that can be paid out.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if he shares the apprehension which I have, that if the matching plan is adopted, and thus the plan which I thought had been agreed to and enacted into law is altered, we are likely to have a very distorted and spotty type of planning. Communities which are able to provide money for planning purposes will have their plans all ready; but communities which can-

not do so, and must have a bond issue in order to get the money, will not be able to plan. The net result will be that certain municipalities and States which have a program and are ready to go forward will have an advantage, whereat communities in which improvement may be more needed may not be able to carry out the policy and program envisioned in the measure to which the Senator refers.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I believe that this is an important question. I ask the Senator from Tennessee if he is willing to have this amendment go over until tomorrow.

Mr. GEORGE. I wish the Senator from Tennessee would do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to do so.

Something has been said about large cities. I should like to read a paragraph from Mayor LaGuardia's testimony:

Mayor LaGUARDIA. Gentlemen, I want to be perfectly frank and be fair with the committee, and say, as General Fleming has stated, that is the law, but I want to add this, by stating that the mayors of those communities have said that a public-works program of the magnitude necessary to create employment and get industry going is not possible with merely advancing the money for these plans. It contemplates grants to localities, cities, and counties, from the Government if such a program is to be worked out within 3 to 5 years following the war.

To my mind, nothing is of greater importance in the matter of furnishing employment for our returning soldiers than to have plans made as early as possible. That was the important idea, just as it was the President's idea to advance \$75,000,000, in round numbers, for this purpose. It seems to me that would be the better plan.

On the other hand, when it was stated by some witnesses that the expectation was to pay back the \$75,000,000, and by others that the funds would be accepted without any intention of paying back the money, it seemed to me that the plan which was offered was not a bad plan. Probably some cities would prefer the 50-50 arrangement, rather than paying back the money. Others would not, and would take their chances on paying it back.

I believe that what we should do is to make plans. After the last war we did not make plans. I was a Member of the Senate at that time, and I know that planning was not done. It was very unfortunate that it was not done, because there was a great deal of unemployment that would not have occurred if there had been proper planning.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not familiar with the wording of title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee if any part of the \$35,000,000 would be available for use for the planning of semipublic or nonprofit institutions, such as schools or hospitals.

Mr. McKELLAR. The States could use it as they like.

Mr. AIKEN. It would have to be used through the States.

Mr. McKELLAR. It would have to be used through the States. They could use it as they liked, except for 10 percent of it, which would be an emergency fund.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think the act so provides. The act very distinctly provides that loans or advances shall be made to the States and their agencies and political subdivisions. It does not authorize any loans for charitable institutions.

Mr. McKELLAR. If a loan or advance were made to a State, I presume that an institution under the authority of the State could be improved. I am not sure. The Senator may be correct about the law. I have not examined it. However, I should say that ordinarily, if the State were to set apart money for a certain purpose, it would be used for that purpose.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Could the Senator's amendment be worded in such a way that it would be applicable to institutions which are public in fact, although perhaps not 100 percent public in name or title?

Mr. McKELLAR. Section 501 (a), under title V, reads as follows:

Sec. 501 (a). In order to encourage States and other non-Federal public agencies—

They must be public agencies—

to make advance provision for the construction of public works (not including housing), the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to make, from funds appropriated for that purpose, loans or advances to the States and their agencies and political subdivisions (hereinafter referred to as "public agencies") to aid in financing the cost of architectural, engineering, and economic investigation and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures, and other action preliminary to the construction of such public works: *Provided*, That the making of loans or advances hereunder shall not in any way commit the Congress to appropriate funds to undertake any projects so planned.

Several witnesses evidently thought that the making of such advances would commit the Congress. That is a matter which will have to be threshed out in the future, I presume.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The use by Congress of the words "loans or advances" carries with it the implication that they are not identical terms. If they were loans to be paid back, Congress need not have said anything except "loans," which would the implication that they were to be repaid. But when it used the word "advances" that did not necessarily mean that the amount was to be repaid. It might mean an advance on the part of the Federal Government to plan public improvements, and that the Government was encouraging employment to that extent by helping to plan such projects in

the future. So in view of those two words, there might have been justification for those who felt that the amounts were not to be repaid.

Mr. McKELLAR. That may be true; and, of course, it has given rise to a difference of opinion.

On the other hand, it is perfectly certain that this is an advance of money for the purpose of planning, and necessarily that in itself carries the idea of a loan.

Mr. TAFT. Not only that; but subparagraph (c) specifically provides as follows:

Advances under this section to any public agency shall be repaid by such agency if and when the construction of the public works so planned is undertaken.

Mr. McKELLAR. Absolutely.

Mr. TAFT. The word "advance" cannot mean anything different from a loan.

Mr. GEORGE. This question was gone into fully a few months ago when we passed the act in question. We had a good deal of controversy with the House; and the House has cut the life out of the measure by the smallness of the appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. GEORGE. We used the language "loans or advances" because many municipalities and some States have no authority to borrow except in a constitutional way. Their constitutions provide for making direct loans. Therefore we classified this planning money as "loans or advances." But it must be repaid, whether it is in the form of a loan or an advance, if any construction is undertaken by the political subdivision or State making the improvement. It is perfectly obvious.

This question was debated to some extent on the floor of the Senate when we passed the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act. Our purpose was to encourage planning at the earliest possible date, and also to assist political divisions of States, counties, school districts, and perhaps levee districts, in making their investigations, having their engineering work done, and their plans blueprinted in preparation to commence work at the appropriate time. If the improvement is made, there is an obligation to return the money advanced.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. In most instances, of course, there would have to be a bond issue by the local political subdivision.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one who has followed State governments very closely in the past few years, I should like to call attention to the fact that if the amendment proposed by the committee is to be adopted, there should be some over-all State agency to determine where the money should go. The amount to be allocated to each State is limited. When the Federal Government contributes under the Hayden-Cartwright Act to the States there is an over-all State agency which determines where the money shall go.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is there a planning commission in the Senator's State?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure it would go to the planning commission.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But the amendment refers to any State or local planning agency. The approval of the local planning agency would be sufficient. What would that mean? It would mean that under the terms of this amendment there would be a race; and if two cities should get the money, the State and the other cities would not get any. In cases where a limited amount goes to each State, it would seem, I say most respectfully, that some one State agency should determine where the amounts should go.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator very much. The amendment has to go over until tomorrow, under the request already granted. I would suggest to the Senator that he prepare such amendments as he thinks would result in the accomplishment of the real purpose of the act.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say most respectfully, again, that it would seem to me that the simplest way would be to determine the amount of money the Federal Government might wish to appropriate. We would leave the act as it is now, and would simply decide whether we wish to appropriate \$5,000,000 or \$75,000,000 or \$30,000,000; we would not attempt to insert any proviso.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. In other words, the Senator would be opposed to the 50-50 plan, would he?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would be, unless it were limited to the one State agency. I do not see that the 50-50 plan is of any value, anyway, because if a community can put up 50 percent of the planning money it should put up 100 percent, if it is going ahead with the work.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator understand that the provisions of title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act would apply to construction appropriated for by a State, even though such construction might not be fully owned by the State when completed, although it was fully paid for by the State?

Mr. McKELLAR. It would be difficult to express an opinion on that matter, unless the Senator could tell me what kind of an institution wished to get the fund.

Mr. AIKEN. For instance, let us consider a nonprofit educational institution supported by a State, or at least supported in part by a State; in other words, any deficit is made up by the State.

Mr. McKELLAR. It would be difficult to say as to that. I would not know off-hand. I should like to look into the matter.

Mr. AIKEN. But any construction would be paid for 100 percent by the States, I understand.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. In Ohio there are a number of universities which are partially supported by the State. I have no doubt

that this planning provision could be used as to them. Funds can be appropriated for the institutions so I am sure money for planning can be appropriated for the institutions. I do not see any difference between them. However, the State would have to have the right to do that under its constitution and laws.

Mr. AIKEN. That is exactly what I had in mind. The Senator from Ohio is reassuring in that respect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been requested that further consideration of the amendments in the first paragraph on page 19 go over until tomorrow. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Buildings Administration", on page 20, line 23, after the word "advance", to strike out "\$1,347,890" and insert "\$1,335,710"; in line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$639,650" and insert "\$638,540"; and on page 21, in line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$522,700" and insert "\$513,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 3, after "(45 Stat. 533)," to strike out "\$6,500,000" and insert "\$6,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 22, after the word "carfare", to strike out "the purchase of four passenger automobiles"; and on page 23, line 2, after the word "conductors", to strike out "\$26,495,000" and insert "\$25,495,000: *Provided*, That all furniture now owned by the United States in other public buildings or in buildings rented by the United States shall be used, so far as practicable, whether or not it corresponds with the present regulation plan for furniture."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 15, after the word "conductors", to strike out "the purchase of three passenger automobiles"; and in line 22, after the word "Administration", to strike out "\$12,160,000" and insert "\$11,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Roads Administration", on page 26, line 16, before the word "passenger", to strike out "seventy-three" and insert "fifty."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal-Aid Highway System", on page 27, line 19, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "\$30,000,000" and insert "\$25,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General Accounting Office", on page 32, line 18, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "purchase of one and", and in line 20, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$1,895,500" and insert "\$1,894,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Interstate Commerce Commission—Salaries and Expenses," on page 33, line 23, after the word "services", to strike out "\$2,910,445" and insert "\$2,619,400", and in line 24, after the word

"exceed", to strike out "\$2,620,000" and insert "\$2,358,000."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, with reference to the reductions affecting the Interstate Commerce Commission, I ask that the amendment go over. This matter has just been called to my attention today. I asked for a memorandum from the Interstate Commerce Commission showing in what way the amendment would affect the Commission.

Mr. McKELLAR. It will be entirely satisfactory to have the amendment go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 2, after the words "expenses", to strike out "\$431,465" and insert "\$388,319."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I also ask that that amendment be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 14, after the word "services", to strike out "purchase (not to exceed 30)", and in line 18, after the word "act", to strike out "\$2,532,619" and insert "\$2,502,619."

Mr. McKELLAR. I also ask that that amendment be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Housing Agency—Office of the Administrator," on page 41, line 24, after the word "expenses", to strike out "In addition to the amounts available by or pursuant to law (which shall be transferred to this authorization) for" and insert "For"; in line 5, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "\$449,825" and insert "\$400,000", and in line 19, after "\$500";, to strike out "purchase of one passenger automobile (not to exceed \$2,500) and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Home Loan Bank Administration," on page 44, line 18, before the words "to be", to strike out "\$7,502,583" and insert "\$7,490,127."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Housing Administration," on page 46, line 25, after the word "expenses" to strike out "In addition to the amounts available by or pursuant to law (which shall be transferred to this authorization) for the administrative expenses of the Federal Housing Administration in carrying out duties imposed by or pursuant to law not", and insert "Not", and in line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$10,537,747" and insert "\$10,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 21, after the word "exceed" to strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$2,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Public Housing Authority," on page 49, line 5, after the word "expenses", to strike out "In addition to the amounts available by or pursuant to law for the administrative expenses of the Federal Public Housing Authority in carrying out duties imposed by or pursuant to law, and not to exceed \$96,200 of the funds of the Defense Homes Corporation available for its administrative expenses (all of which are hereby merged with this authorization), not" and insert "Not"; in line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$2,327,400" and insert "\$2,072,241", and on page 50, line 4, after the word "agencies", to strike out the comma and "and expenditures by the Authority for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative expenses."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Securities and Exchange Commission," on page 51, line 9, after the word "gloves", to strike out "\$4,134,500" and insert "\$3,900,000."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the reduction which it is proposed to make? Would the amendment result in a reduction of the amount provided last year, or are we asked merely not to approve the total amount requested?

Mr. McKELLAR. We are proposing to do the same as we did last year. Last year the amount allowed was \$4,059,000.

Mr. AIKEN. What is the reason for believing that less money will be required this year? With the amount of loose cash floating around the country, and with people looking for investments, is it not necessary that they be as adequately protected now as they have been for a long time?

Mr. McKELLAR. An effort was made in the full committee to bring the item up to what it was last year, and it was voted down. I hope the Senate will sustain the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. AIKEN. What does the Securities and Exchange Commission have to do with rubber gloves?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee will yield, I will answer the question.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The gloves are used in photostatic work.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; the gloves are used in photostatic work. That is a perfectly proper use.

Mr. AIKEN. I did not know but that they were used in handling live wires.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there is one amendment with regard to the Federal Public Housing Authority which I was asked to have passed over until tomorrow. I do not object to it being passed over. I do not at the

moment know what amendment it is, however.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Action on the amendment referred to by the acting chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, which is on pages 49 and 50, will be considered as having been reconsidered and, without objection, it will go over until tomorrow.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Smithsonian Institution," on page 52, line 12, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "\$1,065,160", and insert "\$1,054,061."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 12, after the word "grounds", to strike out "\$583,207" and insert "\$549,727."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Tariff Commission," on page 54, line 5, after "(Public Law 364)", to strike out "\$914,900" and insert "\$823,410."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Tennessee Valley Authority," on page 55, line 14, after "Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1945", to insert a comma and "and in addition, \$4,000,000 for the continued construction of South Holston and Watauga Dams and \$3,000,000 toward the construction of a fertilizer-manufacturing plant at or near Mobile, Ala., said additional sums to be available and to remain available for no other purposes until expended: *Provided*, That said construction shall be proceeded with whenever the War Production Board or its successor shall have determined that manpower and materials are available for these purposes or in any event within 6 months following the cessation of hostilities."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the entire amendment concerning the Tennessee Valley Authority beginning on page 55, line 14, be passed over.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think there is any objection to this particular amendment, and I hope it will be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment last stated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "United States Maritime Commission", on page 56, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$28,290,000" and insert "\$28,287,450", and in line 23, after the word "services" to strike out "purchase (not to exceed three)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Veterans' Administration", on page 62, line 17, before the words "to be", to strike out "\$1,000,000,000" and insert "\$900,000,000."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Tennessee to state the reason for the proposed reduction.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I refer to the reduction of \$100,000,000, which has to do with the National Service Life Insurance Act.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, for the current fiscal year, Congress appropriated \$500,000,000 under this heading. The committee was advised that as of January 31, 1945, \$275,000,000 of the \$500,000,000 had been either obligated or expended, and that, based on the present rate of approval of claims, it is expected that the remaining \$225,000,000 will be obligated by June 30 of this year.

For the fiscal year 1946, the estimate is in the amount of \$1,000,000,000. The committee's recommendation that the estimate be reduced by \$100,000,000 is not intended to deny the actual amount that experience may prove to be necessary during the ensuing fiscal year, but rather the committee's recommendation is based on the recognized uncertainties of estimating accurately months in advance the actual demands upon this fund, such as, the ultimate strength of the armed forces, the rate of replacement, the type of action in which these forces will be engaged, and the uncertainties as to the length of the war. In view of these uncertainties in making accurate estimates months in advance, the committee feels that the amount of the appropriation can be fixed at this time in the amount of \$900,000,000. Should developments during the coming months prove that this figure is too low, the item can be reviewed further by Congress with a view to ascertaining the actual needs in the light of more recent facts and experience.

Furthermore, I may say to the Senate that before this recommendation was made the chairman of the committee took the matter up with General Hines, the head of the Veterans' Bureau, one of the best administrators in the Government service. He was asked if this sum could not be reduced, without stating the amount. He said he hoped it would not be reduced more than \$200,000,000. Of course, he recognized the differences between estimates and what is actually used, as we all do. In view of what he told us, out of an abundance of caution, the committee reduced the appropriation by only half the amount mentioned by General Hines. As a matter of fact, remembering that the appropriation was \$500,000,000 last year, and this year is \$900,000,000, it seems to me that amount will be sufficient, but if not, the Senate can be assured that the necessary amount will be appropriated.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. There is one other thing in which the Senator from Wisconsin may be interested, and I think it was told to the chairman of the committee, also. When the Veterans' Bureau made its estimate of a billion dollars, it was at the time of the so-called December bulge, and they did not know what would happen after that time.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct. As stated by the witnesses, the estimates were made during the time of the "December bulge," and it was not

certain what the future might bring forth. But since that time conditions have changed, and we hope that \$900,000,000 will take care of the situation. The Senate can be assured, however, that if it does not, the necessary appropriations will be made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 62, line 17.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 17, after the name "Veterans' Administration", to strike out "\$2,707,119,250" and insert "\$2,607,119,250."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, after line 19, to insert:

SEC. 107. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling a position formerly held by an employee who has left to enter the armed forces of the United States and has been honorably discharged therefrom and has within 40 days thereafter made application for restoration to his former position and has not been restored thereto.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I was contacted today by Mr. Ketcham, the national legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, concerning the amendment which appears on page 65, and if it is agreeable to the Senator from Tennessee, I should like to have that amendment go over in order that I might show him some amendments suggested by Mr. Ketcham which he thinks should be considered in connection with the amendment of the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. This was an amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and while he is not in the Chamber at the moment, I am sure it would be perfectly agreeable to him to let it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—General provisions," on page 66, after line 23, to strike out:

(c) Appropriations contained in this act, available for expenses of travel shall be available, when specifically authorized by the head of the activity or establishment concerned, for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the function or activity for which the appropriation concerned is made.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 5, before the word "appropriations", to strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 8, after the word "office", to insert "by the head of the department or establishment concerned".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 5, after the word "therefor", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That any transaction carried out under the authority of this section

shall be evidenced in writing and a copy filed with the General Accounting Office."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments with the exception of those which have been passed over.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider 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:

Sundry naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve and several citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, in accordance with the provisions of law.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Walter H. McKinney, of Michigan, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general;

Christian T. Steger, of Virginia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general;

Thomas McEnelly, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general;

James K. Penfield, of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general; and

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers, unclassified, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service: V. Harwood Blocker, of Texas; William H. Christensen, of South Dakota; Jack G. Dwyre, of California; and Marold Sims, of Tennessee.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

#### BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William T. Sherwood, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, to fill an existing vacancy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 13, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 12, 1945:

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Richard Ford, of Oklahoma, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Robert F. Fernald, of Maine, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Forrest K. Geerken, of Minnesota, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

##### THE JUDICIARY

##### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Hon. Albert A. Ridge, of Missouri, to be United States district judge for the western district of Missouri, vice Hon. Merrill E. Otis, deceased.

Robert Lewis Brown, of Montana, to be United States district judge for the district of Montana, vice Hon. James H. Baldwin, deceased.

##### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

J. Albert Woll, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois. (Mr. Woll is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 10, 1944.)

Randolph Carpenter, of Kansas, to be United States attorney for the district of Kansas, vice George H. West, resigned.

Bernard J. Flynn, of Maryland, to be United States attorney for the district of Maryland. (Mr. Flynn is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 4, 1944.)

Dennis E. Sullivan, of New Hampshire, to be United States attorney for the district of New Hampshire, vice Alexander Murchie, resigned.

George F. Troy, of Rhode Island, to be United States attorney for the district of Rhode Island. (Mr. Troy is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires March 10, 1945.)

##### UNITED STATES MARSHALS

W. Bruce Matthews, of Maryland, to be United States marshal for the District of Columbia, vice John Colpoys, deceased.

John J. Wein, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Ohio, vice George J. Keineth, deceased.

Ben Ivy King, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the western district of Tennessee, vice Charles W. Miles, resigned.

##### POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

##### ALABAMA

James G. Rea, Notasulga, Ala., in place of A. M. Stevenson, retired.

##### CALIFORNIA

William N. Parkinson, Canoga Park, Calif., in place of F. L. Cary, deceased.

##### ILLINOIS

Margaret M. DeCoste, River Grove, Ill., in place of E. O. Trumbull, removed.

Helen Elaine Varlas, Schiller Park, Ill., in place of H. J. Cheze, removed.

##### IOWA

Glen W. Heath, Rake, Iowa, in place of W. O. Thomas, deceased.

##### KANSAS

Marie F. Jehlik, Cuba, Kans., in place of E. C. Strnad, transferred.

Harvey E. Yauk, Durham, Kans., in place of E. R. Schwemmer, transferred.

##### MAINE

Hattie M. Higgins, Mapleton, Maine, in place of D. F. Smith, resigned.

##### MASSACHUSETTS

Eugene Matheson, Ipswich, Mass., in place of S. D. Conley, resigned.

##### MICHIGAN

Mabel E. McMichael, Lennon, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Martha E. Krzyske, Waltz, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

##### MISSOURI

Collis P. Lindimore, Montrose, Mo., in place of M. D. Cole, removed.

##### NEW YORK

Aleine Miller, Perrysburg, N. Y., in place of J. H. Vaughn, transferred.

##### NORTH CAROLINA

Clarence H. Mason, Timberlake, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

##### OHIO

Clayton L. Rupright, Beaverdam, Ohio. Office became Presidential Oct. 1, 1944.

Ruth W. Steuart, Brookfield, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

##### OKLAHOMA

Harry N. Patterson, Grandfield, Okla., in place of Audrey Teeter, deceased.

##### RHODE ISLAND

Alexander P. Bates, Oak Lawn, R. I. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

##### TEXAS

Hubert John Risinger, Bandera, Tex., in place of R. V. Roome, resigned.

Granville M. Knox, Bertram, Tex., in place of R. N. Gray, transferred.

##### VIRGINIA

J. Frank Walsh, West Point, Va., in place of R. T. Bland, resigned.

##### WASHINGTON

Charles L. Seavey, Winslow, Wash., in place of M. B. Start, retired.

##### WISCONSIN

Edgar H. Setzkorn, Arpin, Wis., in place of J. F. Loschky, deceased.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 12, 1945:

##### BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

William T. Sherwood, to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

##### POSTMASTERS

##### GEORGIA

Catherine R. Lanneau, Barney. Sarah W. Turner, Pelham. Margaret D. Cate, Sea Island.

##### MICHIGAN

Emma Keating, Allen. Mary L. Myers, Berrien Center. Lester Kittell, Riverside.

##### NEBRASKA

Harold C. Bruce, Verdigris.

##### NORTH CAROLINA

Byron U. Richardson, Pinehurst.

##### OHIO

George T. Meesig, Bellevue. F. Stone Trautman, Belpre. Sue A. Watts, Conesville. Alverda Wells, Dellroy. Inez S. Winget, Edison. Josiah Eikenberry, Laura. Pearl Burket, Rawson.

##### OKLAHOMA

Myrl J. Finch, Tupelo.

##### OREGON

Pearl A. Carsley, Malin.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 12, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O God of heaven and earth, who ridest on the wings of the morning, keep alive in our breasts the deathless desire for human service. What a kingly privilege to be a distributor of that life which is a lyric balm for every wounded heart. O lift us nearer to the Father, where our hearts go out faithfully and lovingly to our fellow men.

Thou whose light is the way of blessing, make us to realize the plain, searching words of Jesus: "Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." The upright thing we did yesterday and the unselfish act of last week will make the forces of good a little stronger. Herein is the sureness of an elevation of soul which comes to those who understand that no man liveth unto himself and no man dieth unto himself. For the sake of others, revitalize us with courage to attack every evil habit and check every wrong tendency. Impress us each day that we are sealing destiny which will meet us in the future years. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 9, 1945, was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on Thursday, March 1, 1945, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

On March 1, 1945:

H. R. 626. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amend-

ments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1752. An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

**MESSAGE SENT TO GENERAL EISENHOWER AND HIS REPLY**

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the unanimous-consent request agreed to on Wednesday, March 7, 1945, he did on Friday, March 9, send the following message to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Supreme Allied Commander, Supreme Headquarters, Allied Expeditionary Force:

At the request of the United States House of Representatives, unanimously expressed, I send to you, the officers and men of all services under your command, our congratulations and thanks for the magnificent victories recently achieved on the western front.

Through the War Department this message came back from General Eisenhower:

On behalf of myself and all troops under my command, please convey to the House of Representatives our appreciation and sincere thanks for your inspiring message which is being transmitted to the officers and men of all services.

**LT. GEN. COURTNEY H. HODGES**

Mr. **PACE**. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PACE**. Mr. Speaker, from time to time Members rise here to call attention to the accomplishments of one or the other of our great military leaders. Certainly we are blessed and should give thanks for our matchless leadership in this war.

I am sure you will forgive me this morning for pointing with pride to the leadership of my own distinguished constituent, Lt. Gen. Courtney H. Hodges, in command of the First American Army.

Aside from its official designation, it was first to land at Normandy, first to enter Germany, first to crack the Siegfried line, and now the first to cross the Rhine.

General Hodges was born and reared at Perry, Houston County, Ga. His mother, brother, and other members of the family live there today.

It is springtime down in Georgia. The sun shines bright and the air is scented with the sweet fragrance of the flowers. In my mind's fancy I can see General Hodges' devoted mother, there in the sunshine and among the flowers, lifting her voice to a gracious God for a son who has distinguished himself so greatly and has been given the opportunity to contribute so much to the cause of freedom.

**LEND-LEASE**

Mr. **BLOOM**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection.

Mr. **BLOOM**. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who met today in executive session, I read for the information of the House an amendment that was approved unanimously by that committee with reference to the lend-lease bill. This amendment was agreed to by all the signers of the minority report. It is an amendment to section 3 (c):

*Provided, however, That nothing in section 3 (c) shall be construed to authorize the President to enter into or carry out any contract or agreement with a foreign government for post-war relief, post-war rehabilitation, or post-war reconstruction; except that a contract or agreement entered into in accordance with this act in which the United States undertakes to furnish to a foreign government defense articles, services, or information for use in the prosecution of the present war and which provides for the disposition, on terms and conditions of sale prescribed by the President, of any such defense articles, services, or information after the President determines they are no longer necessary for use by such government in promoting the defense of the United States shall not be deemed to be for post-war relief, post-war rehabilitation, or post-war reconstruction.*

**SENATOR HENRY CABOT LODGE**

Mr. **MARTIN** of Massachusetts. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MARTIN** of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, shortly after his reelection by an overwhelming vote to the United States Senate Henry Cabot Lodge resigned his seat in that body that he might enter the armed forces of his country. He believed his country should have the benefit of his military experience in its most critical period. His many friends in Massachusetts and in the Congress of the United States and throughout the country were delighted to learn this last week that his outstanding services have won for him the French Legion of Honor and the Croix de Guerre with Palm. That he may return to us at the end of the war in good health, with even richer military honors, is the sincere wish of his legion of friends.

**CENSUS BUREAU REPORT ON WOMEN**

Mr. **ALLEN** of Louisiana. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. **ALLEN** of Louisiana addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

Mr. **OUTLAND** asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances in the Appendix of the **RECORD** and include in each an editorial on Bretton Woods.

Mr. **ROBERTSON** of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the **RECORD** and include therein a letter and a poem from a friend in Oregon on the subject *The White Flowering Dogwood*, a Memorial to Veterans.

Mr. **BLAND** asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the **RECORD** on construction of merchant shipping through February 1945, and to include a letter from Admiral Vickery and a summary by the committee.

**MAJ. PAUL DOUGLAS**

Mr. **SABATH**. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **SABATH**. Mr. Speaker, we hear with a great deal of pleasure and satisfaction the well-deserved and appropriate tributes being paid to those of our outstanding men, former Members, and other Americans, who have served the Nation well. In that connection, I call attention to Paul Douglas, of Illinois, who was a member of the Chicago City Council and a professor in the University of Chicago. He resigned and joined the Army as a private and it is not surprising that he has already distinguished himself and been decorated several times and advanced to the rank of major. He is the husband of our beloved Member, the gentlewoman from Illinois, Mrs. **EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS**, who was elected a Member at Large from our State. I cite this particular instance, Mr. Speaker, and make this brief observation in hearty appreciation of the patriotic and distinguished service to the Nation by the brave and courageous men of Illinois.

The **SPEAKER**. The time of the gentleman has expired.

**PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE**

Mr. **VOORHIS** of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on Thursday next for 15 minutes after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of other special orders heretofore entered.

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

There was no objection.

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

Mr. **VOORHIS** of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the **RECORD** and to include a portion of a recent report by the Judicial Council of the State of California.

Mr. **SPENCE**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the **RECORD** at the proper place in the proceedings on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill a statement of agricultural prices during 1932 and 1933, and also a statement of production payments on dairy products by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

#### INTER-AMERICAN CONFERENCE AT MEXICO CITY

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### BRETTON WOODS—WHY THE HURRY?

Mr. PLUMLEY. 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 Vermont?

There was no objection.

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

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HENRY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Mr. Marvin Jones.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Norman Thomas appearing in Human Events.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on international peace control of the air.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles on the repeal of the Use Stamp Act.

#### FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

Mr. FLOOD. 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. FLOOD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### DEATH THROUGH CARELESSNESS

Mr. GRANGER. 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 Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I dislike to sound the sour note this morning after hearing the fine tributes that have been paid to our men overseas, but at the same time I do not believe a thing I regard as almost criminal negligence should go unnoticed.

The son of my very close friend, a boy who was in training recently on a submarine on the Atlantic, was lost. This boy was on duty at his post when the order to submerge was given, and this young man was disregarded and left to perish as his submarine submerged. At least, that is the conclusion one must reach when the report merely states that when roll was called 3 hours later he did not respond. This to me is a very regrettable incident. It cannot be expected that his parents will look upon the loss of his life with anything but bitterness—as I do myself. This seems to be a careless disregard for life.

When boys are in combat parents naturally expect the worst might happen, but certainly in a peaceful training zone they have the right to expect that due diligence will be exercised in preserving the lives of their sons. I am asking the Committee on Naval Affairs to make a searching inquiry into this incident, not that it will bring this boy back, but in the hopes that such an investigation will safeguard the lives of other boys.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUNKER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short newspaper article.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include a resolution.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix.

Mr. CRAVENS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of Arkansas.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Lionel Calhoun Moise.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today after the conclusion of the other special orders.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a poem written by a grandfather of his grandson who was killed in action.

#### SGT. WILLIAM B. GOODSON

Mr. SPRINGER. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay a tribute, which is justly due, to Sgt. William B. Goodson, of Rushville, Ind., and from the district I have the honor to represent, who was in command and manned the first tank to cross the Rhine and to roll into the now solidly held bridgehead on the east bank of that river. Sergeant Goodson is a typical Hoosier, and he is a typical American. He is a true American soldier. With three other soldiers—Cpl. William E. Richard, of West Virginia, Pvt. Berthold Fried, of South Dakota, and Sgt. Robert A. Jones, of Kentucky—they crossed the Rhine and took up the fight on the east side and continued the drive into German territory. These men evidenced the fighting spirit of our armed forces on those far-away battle fronts, which is daily bringing this war to a victorious conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Goodson, and those with him, with Sergeant Drabik, of Ohio, who was the first foot soldier to cross the River Rhine in that daring rush to establish the First Army bridgehead, are heroes in this war. We salute them. All Americans salute them. We say to them "Well done, thou good and faithful soldiers." These soldiers have made a lasting contribution to our victory, and to the peace which must follow after this war.

#### MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION TO CONSIDER CRITICISMS OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

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 response to what has been said here and in the press relative to the treatment of our disabled men in veterans' hospitals, I wish to announce that I have called a meeting of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation on Thursday morning at 10 o'clock to go into this proposition.

I have made it a rule to ask Members of Congress—especially members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation—to visit veterans' hospitals and go through them from top to bottom whenever they have a chance to do so; and I am going to continue that policy. If we have an Easter recess, I hope to have every veterans' hospital visited during that time.

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

#### ELECTIONS TO COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged reso-

lution (H. Res. 177) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Judiciary, FRANK L. CHELF, of Kentucky.  
Irrigation and Reclamation, GEORGE P. MILLER, of California.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—ANNUAL REPORT OF THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In compliance with the provisions of section 10 (b) (4) of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12 (1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress, the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 10, 1945.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia Day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH.]

AMENDMENT TO ACT REGULATING HEIGHT OF BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2506) to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910, as amended, and I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from West Virginia, or the mayor of the District of Columbia, which is a better title for him, how high they expect these buildings to be built in the section which the bill covers?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I may say that this is an extraordinary case which apparently calls for legislation. It was presented by our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and has to do with the erection of a hospital as part of the Georgetown Medical School with facilities for 400 beds. That hospital is being erected with Federal Works Agency funds and approximately \$600,000 of the Georgetown University funds for the site and certain equipment.

The height of the building referred to, or that the legislation would permit it to be built to, is 110 feet, which would be approximately 8 feet higher than the

zoning laws will allow a building to be erected in that section. As a point of information it might be stated that the cupola of the medical school will be more than 20 feet higher than the highest point on this proposed building, which is to be built at Thirty-ninth Street, on the south side of Reservoir Road. I may say to the gentleman that that is a section of Northwest Washington that is wooded. On the north side of Reservoir Road is the estate of Mrs. Archibald. Ordinarily this sort of legislation would not be necessary because the Zoning Commission would have had sufficient time to notify interested parties, and they would either make objection or give approval. However, because of the emergency for hospital facilities in the District of Columbia and because of the fact that the Georgetown Medical School is carrying on such a worthy program, the District of Columbia Committee unanimously report this bill, H. R. 2506, as introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. RICH. How much higher will that building be than buildings in the surrounding territory?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It will be 8 feet above the height allowed in that section of northwest Washington. This building sets itself well into the Georgetown Dental School and the Medical School, and really beautifies that section as well as being a building of utility.

Mr. RICH. It will not in any way interfere with the surrounding buildings, make it different from the other buildings in that locality so that it might be distasteful to the residents of that section.

Mr. RANDOLPH. No. The gentleman is correct. As I said, it will be located well back from the street in a wooded section on the south side of the road, while the estate of Mrs. Archibald is on the north side. May I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. McCORMACK. I may advise the gentleman from Pennsylvania that it is also 165 feet back from the street. The total cost will be \$2,420,000, of which the Federal Works Agency made available \$1,820,000. The university contributed the difference, about \$600,000 for the site and part of the equipment. As the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia stated, this hospital is to be erected adjacent to the university medical school on Reservoir Road.

Mr. RICH. Will the money that the Federal Works Agency grants to this institution be paid back to the Government?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; that is part of the money appropriated under one of the provisions of the Lanham Act, a certain proportion of which has been allocated to the District of Columbia.

They have also made an allocation for a hospital for George Washington University. Georgetown University and George Washington University have both had an allocation, because there is a need for hospitals in the District. And it is connected with the war effort.

Mr. RICH. The only thing I might suggest there, where we are making these

allocations, that there is an obligation for the institutions who receive the money to pay it back into the Federal Treasury. Just remember that the Federal Treasury needs all of the funds it can get, and we ought to be careful to put it out only as a gratuity where it is going to do the Nation as a whole some good.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can assure the gentleman that the allocations of these funds have a national interest, and a very important local interest.

Mr. RICH. May I call to the attention of the majority leader that in all the things we do from this time on, just bear in mind that the Treasury is empty, and wherever we can get some money from our people to put back into the Treasury, certainly it ought to be a great incentive for the people back home, because it will lighten their tax burdens in the future. We must stop these gratuities from the Federal Government.

Mr. McCORMACK. No one can take issue with that observation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I inquire of the distinguished chairman of the committee if this legislation is at all in conflict with the bill for further hospitalization introduced by Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; it is not. Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, has a proposal for additional hospital facilities. It has nothing to do with the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That an act entitled "An act to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia," approved June 1, 1910, as amended, be, and it is hereby, further amended by adding at the end of section 5 of said act the following proviso: "And further provided. That the building to be erected by the Georgetown University for a hospital as a part of the Georgetown University Medical School on parcels 28/31, 28/36, and 28/37 located on the south side of Reservoir Road NW., in the District of Columbia, approximately opposite Thirty-ninth Street, plans for which building are on file in the office of the Inspector of Buildings of the District of Columbia, be permitted to be erected to a height of not to exceed 110 feet above the finished grade of the land, as shown on said plans, at the middle of the front of the building."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2552) to amend paragraph (c) of section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, as amended by the act approved February 27, 1931, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what is accomplished by this legislation?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The inquiry of the distinguished minority leader on this legislation, I think, is most appropriate for the reason that it concerns each and every Member of the House of Representatives. You will realize that we have given to us, each Congress, a tag issued by the District of Columbia especially for the use of Members of Congress and certain other officials attached to the personnel on Capitol Hill. It has been found that there has been an abuse of the use of these tags during the years, and we are attempting to correct it by this legislation. In other words, when Congress expires at the end of 2 years, certain individuals have continued to carry that tag upon their automobile. In many instances it is reported by the Metropolitan Police that the tags apparently have been taken from a congressional car and placed upon the car of some individual who perhaps never was a Member of the Congress. We believe that the time has come when these tags should be valid only for the 2 years that a Congress is in session, and under this legislation we would make it unlawful for these tags to be used on automobiles in the District of Columbia for more than 30 days after the conclusion of the Congress.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, supposing a car formerly belonging to a Member of Congress gets into the hands of somebody else and he continues to keep that tag on his car. If this legislation passes, will there be a penalty?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; there is a penalty of \$300 or imprisonment for 90 days. We do believe that a condition exists which should be stamped out. I think there are persons who are abusing this privilege, and that is the reaction of law-enforcement officials in the District of Columbia.

Mr. RICH. I quite agree with the mayor of the city.

Mr. PACE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have never found any advantage or benefit from having these tags. Of what benefit are they to the Members of Congress?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think that would be a matter for debate, perhaps, although I can say that the reason the District of Columbia issued the tags in the first instance and has continued the practice is that if a Member leaves his office on Capitol Hill to go downtown to visit a department, his car may be parked over-time, perhaps, or even in a spot that might not be used by the ordinary vehicle. In other words, this was done as a convenience for the Members of Congress as they do business with the departments downtown. Whether or not this privilege has been abused is a question certainly open to interpretation by the gentleman and others.

Mr. PACE. Is the advantage the gentleman has described the only advantage of the tag?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I know of no advantage other than the one to which the gentleman has called my attention; that

is that Congressmen who are here on official business are given certain privileges to which others are not entitled.

Mr. PACE. Does the gentleman think that is sufficient to justify the expense and the trouble of issuing the tags and passing special legislation?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am not sure. The legislation became law before I was a Member of Congress. I have not checked into the advisability of repealing the law. I am now simply trying to correct the abuse that has developed, by bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. MURPHY. If the gentleman will yield, there are scores of places throughout the city where special parking privileges are available to the holders of these tags, and it is an advantage to a Congressman who runs his personal errands in going to these departments.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I tried to state that I thought it was in the dispatch of official business that a Member might find the greatest value in the use of such a tag. Certainly it would be of no value in the Member's district.

Mr. PACE. It never has been to me.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think the gentleman might have much to endorse his thought.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the proviso of paragraph (c), section 6, of the District of Columbia Traffic Acts, as amended by the act approved February 27, 1931, be, and the same is hereby, further amended by adding thereto the following: "Provided further, That such congressional tags shall be valid only for the Congress in which such tags are so issued, and it shall be unlawful to display such congressional tags for a period longer than 30 days after the opening of the next Congress.

"At the expiration of the said 30-day period it shall be unlawful to display such tags and the Commissioners shall be authority and empowered to order removal of any such tags from any motor vehicle so displayed.

"Any person violating this section shall be fined not more than \$300 or imprisoned not more than 90 days, or both."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, on page 2, line 3, a mistake has been made by the printer. The word "authority" should be "authorized." I ask unanimous consent that this correction be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Long Beach Pacific News.

#### MANPOWER DRAFT BILL

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, the Senate has turned out an amended version of the manpower draft bill that will, in my opinion, do all we have to have done at this time and will not offend or fill with apprehension the laboring people of the Nation.

I hope the House will see its way clear to join with the Senate and pass the Senate version of the bill. That is my voice and will be my vote.

#### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say to the majority leader that some of us, and very likely the majority leader himself, are tremendously interested in the Lemke resolution (H. Con. Res. 29) that was reported from the Committee on Rules some days ago. It has not been considered in the House. More than 7 days have elapsed since the granting of the rule by the Committee on Rules. I take it that any one of us on the Committee on Rules could call it up. However, I dislike very much to do that. I would much rather cooperate with the majority leader and the majority leadership in carrying on the program of the House.

I am wondering what assurance we might have as to the calling up of that resolution?

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman desire to have it called up?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; I do. I think it is a matter of extreme consequence and importance.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the gentleman taking it up in the way he has. Several legislative days have transpired. I assure the gentleman if it is possible to get it up this week, it will be called up. If not, it will definitely be on the program for the early part of next week. I will do everything I can. If there is a break in the legislative program this week, it will be called up.

Mr. HALLECK. I am very hopeful that it can be called up this week. I understand we have quite a full program on matters that are of consequence. I would like to suggest, for myself, I think the matter covered by the Lemke resolution is of tremendous consequence to the country.

Mr. McCORMACK. I assure the gentleman if it is possible, it will be called up this week. But, in any event, it will definitely be called up in the early part of next week. May I state I am not referring to next week to create the impression that my statement is a coverall not to bring it up this week if it is possible to do so.

Mr. HALLECK. I appreciate the sincerity of the majority leader. I know

if it can be done, he will follow it up this week.

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

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SABATH. May I inform the gentleman from Indiana that it is not necessary to have it called up on Calendar Wednesday and that it can be called up at any time.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Indiana is not objecting to the request that business in order on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with.

Mr. HALLECK. That is not my purpose. I am not going to object to the passing over of Calendar Wednesday. I hope that the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts can be granted.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say to the majority leader, several of us intended to speak several times and somewhat at length. If we forego that privilege, will it help to get it up this week?

Mr. McCORMACK. No doubt, it would. Foregoing any such privilege by any Member will be of material assistance in bringing about the strong probability that it might come up this week.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Can the gentleman increase the probabilities even?

Mr. McCORMACK. I said strong probability. I will do all I can to bring it up this week. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has very kindly given the gentleman from Massachusetts notice, and that is all the gentleman from Massachusetts needs from any Member of the House when they are exercising their rights.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, but to show how serious this matter is, I would like to call to the attention of the House that this very morning I had a long-distance call about the case of a boy who had taken an appeal. He was the only help the farmer had. The farmer has 65 head of cattle and is a large sugar-beet grower. They have taken the boy, and they have turned down his appeal. This thing has been drifting along and drifting along. Something ought to be done, especially now when the situation has become so serious at home that efforts have been made to cut down on exports to save our own people.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

| [Roll No. 35]    |               |                |
|------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Anderson, Calif. | Fuller        | Madden         |
| Auchincloss      | Gardner       | Monroney       |
| Baldwin, N. Y.   | Gearhart      | Morgan         |
| Bates, Mass.     | Gerlach       | Mott           |
| Bender           | Goodwin       | O'Toole        |
| Bolton           | Gorski        | Pfeiffer       |
| Boren            | Gross         | Philbin        |
| Brumbaugh        | Hagen         | Powell         |
| Buckley          | Hancock       | Quinn, N. Y.   |
| Case, N. J.      | Hand          | Rains          |
| Oeller           | Hart          | Robertson,     |
| Chapman          | Heidinger     | N. Dak.        |
| Clark            | Herter        | Robinson, Utah |
| Clason           | Hobbs         | Sheridan       |
| Coffe            | Holmes, Mass. | Sikes          |
| Combs            | Izac          | Simpson, Pa.   |
| Curley           | Johnson,      | Slaughter      |
| Daughton, Va.    | Lyndon B.     | Starkey        |
| Dawson           | Kearney       | Stewart        |
| Dickstein        | Kelley, Pa.   | Taylor         |
| Dingell          | Kunkel        | Torrens        |
| Dirksen          | LeCompte      | Weiss          |
| Drewry           | Luce          | West           |
| Eaton            | McGlinchey    | Wood           |
| Fellows          | McKenzie      | Woodrum, Va.   |

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 359 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

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

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Chester Bowles addressed to the Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles from the Baltimore Sun.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each a newspaper article.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each a letter.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

#### COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2023, with Mr. THOMASON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state that when the Committee rose last Friday in the consideration of this bill the general debate had closed and the first section of the bill had been read.

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

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may read from the Clerk's desk a letter I have received from Judge Marvin Jones in regard to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the letter as follows:

MARCH 12, 1945.

HON. BRENT SPENCE,  
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, House of Representatives.

\*DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your inquiry as to statements made on the floor of the House concerning operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, as soon as these matters were brought to my attention I immediately instituted a thorough investigation into all phases of our operations.

I want to assure you and through you the Members of Congress that we are going to the bottom of these charges, secure the facts, and, if any evidence is found of criminality or improper conduct on the part of any officials or employees, I shall promptly remove them and shall ask that proceedings be instituted to punish them if the facts justify such action.

Frank Hancock, the president of the Corporation, joins me in this assurance.

The War Food Administration purchases and handles an average of more than \$5,000,000 worth of food per day, much of which is of a perishable or semiperishable nature. It deals with more than 1,200 warehouses. It arranges for the transportation of more than 700 cars of these supplies per day. Much of this in wartime must be done hurriedly.

Of course there has been spoilage. There always will be. This is inevitable in the handling of highly perishable foods.

In spite of severe floods on the Ohio River and the worst storm in years throughout the Northeast, our record shows that our losses to date from spoilage have been only a fraction of 1 percent of our total operations. It is less than has occurred in the normal channels of trade.

The great quantities of food that must be made available and the speed with which it must be handled make it impossible to avoid some mistakes as well as losses. In view of the manpower situation it is not always possible to secure the most efficient help or a sufficient number to do the work in the best possible manner in the vast network of activities that are essential to the production, gathering, processing, inspection, packaging, storing, loading, and transporting of this food.

It is significant that not a single battle has had to be postponed because of a lack of food. At the same time no one has gone hungry in this country.

The Commodity Credit Corporation operations have a vital part in the production and distribution of food for our armed forces, for civilians, and for our fighting allies. It is the means by which the commitments of the Congress to the farmers of America for support prices are carried out in order to secure the essential production. There is no other available way in which these obligations can be fulfilled.

We assure the Congress again that we will bend every effort to avoid losses and to prevent mishandling insofar as it is humanly possible to do so without undue delay in getting this food to shipside and making it available to our own and Allied soldiers at the battle front.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I had Judge Jones' letter read because I thought it would be of vital interest to the Members of Congress. I hope we are not going to try this great governmental agency on rumors. Rumors were abhorrent to the people who founded our

Government. Before a man can be convicted of crime, it is provided in the Constitution that he must be indicted by a grand jury. He is presumed to be innocent. He must be proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. He must have counsel for his defense and he must be tried by a jury of his peers. Not only that, but with respect to the most infamous of all crimes—treason—Congress was afraid that men might be the victims of rumors. After the country had been infiltrated by British spies and foreign sympathizers, they wrote into the Constitution itself a definition of treason, that treason consists of waging war against the United States, adhering to its enemies, and giving them aid and comfort. A man could not be convicted of treason except by the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act. That is one of the fundamental laws of the United States. We certainly are not going to try this great organization on rumors. If there is any wrongdoing, if there has been any criminality, it will be punished. Let us try this issue on the facts as presented and try it in the light of the great services that the Commodity Credit Corporation has rendered to the people of America.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Wolcott: On page 1, lines 5 and 6, after the word "thereof" in line 5, strike out the sign and figure "\$5,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the sign and figure "\$4,000,000,000."

Mr. SPENCE. I cannot accept that amendment for the committee. The Commodity Credit Corporation agrees to it. I think it should be adopted. I am sure there will be no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Subsection (c) of section 381 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 67) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) During the continuance of the present war and until the expiration of the 2-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not sell any farm commodity owned or controlled by it at less than the parity or comparable price therefor, except that the foregoing restriction shall not apply to (1) sales for new or byproduct uses; (2) sales of peanuts for the extraction of oil; (3) sales for export; (4) sales for seed or feed: *Provided*, That no wheat or corn shall be sold for feed at less than parity price for corn at the time such sale is made: *And provided further*, That in making regional adjustments in the sale price of corn or wheat for feed the minimum price need not be higher in any area than the United States average parity price for corn; (5) sales of commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality or of nonbasic perishable commodities where there is danger of loss or waste through spoilage; or (6) sales for the purpose of establishing claims against persons who have committed fraud, misrepresentation, or other wrongful acts with respect to the commodity. The method that is now used for the purposes of Commodity Credit

Corporation loans for determining the parity price or its equivalent for seven-eighths-inch Middling cotton at the average location used in fixing the base loan rate for cotton shall also be used for determining the parity price for seven-eighths-inch Middling cotton at such average location for the purposes of this section."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I misunderstood the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. I had no right to agree to that amendment. The amendment which I thought the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] submitted, and the only one that he ever submitted to me, was an amendment to increase dairy payments to \$568,000,000, and to increase the non-crop program from \$60,000,000 to \$120,000,000. That was a clear misunderstanding on my part.

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

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I can see very plainly where the gentleman might be perfectly correct in misunderstanding the amendment which I had offered. Frankly the gentleman rather surprised me when he said the amendment was acceptable.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask the committee, under the circumstances, to reconsider its action.

Mr. WOLCOTT. There will be no objection on my part.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the action by which the amendment was agreed to will be vacated.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania reserves the right to object.

Mr. SPENCE. It was a clear misunderstanding. It seems to me we should deal with the utmost candor and fairness with our colleagues.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RICH. I just want to ask you one question. In permitting this to go from \$4,000,000,000 to \$5,000,000,000 where will you get the one, two, three, four, or five billion dollars?

Mr. SPENCE. If you will reconsider, we can tell you that.

Mr. RICH. Then, Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SPENCE. The amendment will be debated. I am only asking that it be reconsidered. If the House wants to adopt it, it can do so.

Mr. RICH. Have you any idea where you can get this money?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment will again be reported.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I desire to ask that I will have an opportunity, if the unanimous-consent request is granted to withdraw the vote, to have an opportunity to make my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I object—until we can get some information on the subject.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is that the gentleman from Pennsylvania

has objected to the consent request of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to reconsider the action of the Committee by which the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Such a motion is not in order in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Inasmuch as business has been transacted since the original request was submitted by the gentleman from Kentucky, would it be in order for me to propound a consent request that the proceedings by which the amendment was adopted be vacated?

The CHAIRMAN. Such a request would be in order, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the amendment was adopted reducing the amount from \$5,000,000,000 to \$4,000,000,000 be vacated.

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

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman from Kentucky if he had any idea where he could get one billion, two billion, three billion, four billion, or five billion for this purpose. I wish to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] if he can give me a reply.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The amendment which I will offer will strike out the \$5,000,000,000 and substitute \$4,000,000,000, which I believe is in keeping with the gentleman's idea and my own idea with respect to their needs.

A billion dollars will be obtained by the sale of debentures and bonds of the Commodity Credit Corporation. They, of course, become contingent liabilities of the Federal Government. I believe in view of the fact that this is almost altogether a total loss, that eventually the billion dollars will have to be raised by a debt transaction or in the form of an appropriation to restore the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was a member of the Committee on Appropriations at one time and is conversant with the procedure in that committee. I am sure he will exercise his very best judgment, which is always good, as to whether he will consent that the impairment of the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation be restored by the Committee on Appropriations when the matter comes to it in a deficiency bill, probably next year.

Mr. RICH. Then we are going to ask the taxpayers of this country to make up this deficit.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I object.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Wolcott amendment; I should vote for it were it put to a vote. On the other hand, I recognize, and we all must recognize, that, under parliamentary proce-

ture, when we get back into the House a separate vote may be had upon this amendment. I should much rather see the amendment stand on the basis of the arguments the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] will be able to advance for it on the floor than to have it stand on the basis of the committee's refusal to reconsider the amendment. That was the reason I did not object to reconsideration. I am sure that is the reason the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] did not object.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is very apparent there was an honest mistake made, evident to everyone, and that the gentleman from Kentucky thought he was accepting another amendment which the gentleman from Michigan is going to offer.

Mr. TABER. That is true. Frankly, I believe we have a much better chance of keeping the amendment in the bill by further consideration than to have it held in and the opportunity for consideration refused.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Is it not true that the method the gentleman is advocating and which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] proposes is the only honest parliamentary way by which we can correct this mistake?

Mr. TABER. It is the only way in which there will be opportunity for fair consideration.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. As I understand the gentleman, under the present parliamentary situation he feels the merits of the amendment cannot be debated on the floor of the House and we will be forced to vote on the amendment in the House when the Committee rises?

Mr. TABER. Without any fair opportunity for its consideration.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I would be the last one here who would try to trick somebody into something that is not honest or honorable. I will not do that. But, as I understand it, the gentleman from Michigan offered an amendment to reduce this from \$5,000,000,000 to \$4,000,000,000 and I thought he did that because of the fact he honestly believed in reducing it from five to four billion dollars. Am I wrong in that contention?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is correct in that, there is no question about that.

Mr. RICH. Then it seems to me when we make mistakes in the House, the one who makes the mistake is the one who has to suffer. I want to see this reduced if it is possible to reduce it and if we can get enough sound sentiment in the House to cut down the Government

expenses and do something that will save this country from bankruptcy, then I will withdraw my objection and give you a chance to do something about this, but I want the Republicans to stand up here and fight and I want the Democrats who believe in sound government to get up and fight and try to save it because if we do not we will be overthrown, and it will not be very long until that happens.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania will realize that in offering the amendment, to begin with, I was most sincere, as I will explain if we have an opportunity to discuss it. It is very obvious an error has been made and I surely do not want to take advantage of any situation which has been developed because of that error in getting an amendment through which might otherwise be adopted after debate on its merits. We have taken our lickings on this floor, and we might take some more lickings, but they have always been fair and aboveboard, they have always been the result of discussions of amendments on their merits and, personally, I would feel much better about it if the amendment was defeated after debate on its merits than I would to have it adopted by default. I surely would not be in position in conference to argue very strongly for an amendment which had been adopted in the House by default or through error.

Mr. Chairman, I now renew my unanimous consent request that the proceedings by which the amount in this bill was reduced from \$5,000,000,000 to \$4,000,000,000 be vacated.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 1, lines 5 and 6, after the word "thereof" in line 5, strike out "\$5,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,000,000,000."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the Commodity Credit Corporation was organized back in 1933 to do a particular job. At that time farm prices were low. Farmers in very, very few instances were obtaining parity for their commodities, and it was found advisable, if we were going to have food enough to eat and farm income sufficient to create purchasing power by which we might put men back to work in our industries, to give the farmers some assurance of stability in prices.

Personally I believe that throughout the years the Commodity Credit Corporation has in the main justified its existence. The only controversy that there has ever been has been the controversy waged in the last 2 years with respect to the payment of consumers' subsidies by the Commodity Credit Corporation. We felt that nowhere in any law has there been any legal authority for them to pay

subsidies to maintain maximum prices; that the purpose of Commodity Credit was to maintain floors under prices or, as we say, support prices. This Corporation has been continued periodically from year to year. There might have been occasions when it was continued for more than a year, but there have been other occasions when it was only continued for 6 months, and seldom, if ever, has it been continued for periods longer than 1 year.

Regardless of whether there have been periods or times when we continued Commodity Credit for more than 1 year, we are confronted with this situation: This House through its committees is looking into the future, planning ways and means of stabilizing our post-war economy. We have no assurance whatsoever that the bill which we are now asked to enact is the answer to economic stabilization in the field of agriculture.

It seems to me that the only logical thing to do is to review not only this agency but all other agencies at least once a year so that if in 1946 the economic conditions throughout the world have changed, if our position in world affairs is different than it is at the present time, we will then have an opportunity to write new standards by which we may operate throughout the world. It seems to me that we would be making a grave error in continuing the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation for more than 1 year; thus we will be assured that next year we will be able to give them as much money as they need, to give them as much authority as they need to do the job which we intended they should do.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. I might say in that connection that I expect to offer an amendment to the last section of the bill with that object in view. Because of that it is necessary only that they have a billion dollars. As a matter of fact, a billion dollars is perhaps \$200,000,000 more than they will need during this period of 1 year.

I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I may say to the gentleman that he has answered the question I intended to ask him. I wanted him to say positively whether the amount which would be available, if his amendment is adopted, would be sufficient to take care of the obligations of the Corporation during the coming fiscal year.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Commodity Credit Corporation has asked for certain amounts which have been agreed to, which total in the aggregate, after giving them about \$100,000,000 to play around on, we will say, about \$900,000,000, so they will have at least \$200,000,000 more this year than they need.

The other body has cut this amount to \$1,500,000,000 already, and has continued the Corporation for 2 years. So if we want to take a look at this next year and continue it for a year, then \$1,000,000,000 is ample money for them to operate.

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

Mr. ROESION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that

the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The bill as drawn with the \$5,000,000,000 is based upon the idea that it is for a 2-year period.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman's amendment cuts the increase to \$1,000,000,000, and a subsequent amendment will make it 1 year; that is, \$1,000,000,000 for this year, and if next year we continue it for another year, then it may be increased \$1,000,000,000 or whatever may be required.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. It was agreed in the other body that the \$2,000,000,000 for the 2 years is \$500,000,000 too much, so we know that by cutting this down to \$1,000,000,000 we are giving them at least \$200,000,000 more than they will need this year.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand, the gentleman proposes to offer another amendment here fixing the payments that are to go to the producers. I note from that amendment that those payments are only for the year 1946.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. So that if this \$1,000,000,000 is cut off, will the remainder, \$4,000,000,000, be sufficient to meet all commitments for the year 1946?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. As a matter of fact, we will have about \$200,000,000 more than we need for that purpose. I may say that the amendment to which the gentleman refers I included in the Record as a part of my remarks. It appears on page 1976 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 9, last Friday.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman understands that the Commodity Credit Corporation now has commitments to the farmers of America for \$2,000,000,000 for the year 1945. These promises are commitments already made. How can they operate with an increase of less than \$2,000,000,000?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The 1945 program is as follows: \$568,000,000 for operation during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, with respect to the dairy program; \$120,000,000 for operations during the fiscal year with respect to other noncrop programs; and \$225,000,000 with respect to the 1945 crop-program operations.

The reason they need the additional \$68,000,000 which has been referred to is that they expect to increase their production materially during this year.

The break-down of the figures I have just given is as follows:

The \$120,000,000 is made up of the following items: Cheddar cheese, \$16,000,000; fluid milk, \$12,000,000; shorten-

ing payments, \$1,000,000; peanut butter, \$8,500,000; feed wheat, \$50,000,000; and for expanded or other programs, \$32,500,000.

The \$225,000,000 is made up as follows: Fruits for processing, \$26,500,000; vegetables for processing \$36,200,000; dry edible beans, \$4,800,000; soybeans, \$48,000,000; peanuts, \$7,000,000; sugar, \$54,100,000; and for expanded or other programs, \$48,400,000.

Therefore, we have given them in those programs alone a total of \$80,000,000 for expansion purposes, in addition to what they have asked for. That is their program, and it is about \$200,000,000 less than what we will give them if we give them a billion dollars and cut their program down to 1 year.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. As I understand the figures outlined by the gentleman from Michigan, he expects to put in an amendment that is not in the bill. But he referred to noncrop subsidies.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I referred to crop subsidies. I will explain in detail the \$568,000,000 when I get to it. But, as the gentleman knows, that is almost all for dairy products and the dairy program.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman realizes that the Commodity Credit Corporation is obligated to the farmers for \$2,000,000,000 this year?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Not in addition to the figures I have referred to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate my colleague the gentleman from Michigan on the attitude he has taken. The only amendment that had been submitted to me to be proposed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] was agreed to by the Commodity Credit Corporation. I thought that was the amendment, and inadvertently I agreed to it. I have never thought that I had to be so vigilant in dealings with my colleagues to prevent them from taking advantage of inadvertence. And I do not want to take any advantage of any inadvertence on their part. I think there ought to be a high standard of relationship between the Members of Congress. I congratulate the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] on the reconsideration of this amendment.

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

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I state that the amendment I have just offered was offered in the committee?

Mr. SPENCE. But it was not the amendment which we discussed, and it was not the amendment that I knew as the Wolcott amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is correct.

Mr. SPENCE. For that reason, I inadvertently agreed to it. I am glad it has been corrected in this manner. The Commodity Credit Corporation is a vast corporation. It has had a wonderful effect upon the prices of agricultural commodities. The other day I made a statement that at the time the Commodity Credit Corporation was organ-

ized, wheat was less than 30 cents, corn was 15 cents, cotton and tobacco were about 5 cents. This statement was challenged. I have received a statement from the Commodity Credit Corporation verifying the statement I made, which statement I have been authorized to put in the RECORD. The statement is as follows:

According to reports of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics:

1. The average price of wheat paid to farmers in the State of Kansas fell as low as 27 cents per bushel for the month of December 1932;

2. The average farm price of cotton in the State of Texas fell to as low as 4½ cents per pound in June 1932;

3. The average farm price of corn in the State of Iowa fell to as low as 12 cents per bushel in February 1933; and

4. The average price to farmers for type 23 (fire cured) tobacco for the 1932 crop in Kentucky was 4½ cents per pound.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has had a remarkable effect in obtaining for the farmer a higher price and stabilizing the prices of agricultural commodities. It has taken vast sums of money to do that. Some of these sums necessarily have been expended as subsidies and were a loss. Dairy products have received the greatest proportion of all commodities in subsidies. The Commodity Credit Corporation has written off \$400,000,000. But I understand by next June they will have written off \$1,200,000,000 in losses. They have now invested in commodities \$2,100,000,000. They must be given some leeway in order to continue their operations.

They feel that if you reduce this amount by \$1,000,000,000 it will seriously cramp them in the discharge of their onerous duties. The Commodity Credit Corporation is required to support prices for agricultural commodities before the planting season. They have done that. We want them to carry out their commitments. We have imposed upon them an additional burden. In the Senate there was a provision that \$250,000,000 should be used for 6 months for the dairy program, and that \$60,000,000 could be used for a noncrop program. That was limited to 6 months. We have made that program mandatory over the year, and we have increased the \$250,000,000 to \$568,000,000, and we have increased the \$60,000,000 to \$120,000,000. Judge Jones has said he will not use any more than is absolutely necessary to carry out the program. There is no reason that should persuade us to do anything that would weaken the Corporation or prevent it from carrying out the program and keeping our promise to the farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I am taking this time to ask some questions of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I was under the impression that he was going to explain to us about the commitments made by the Commodity Credit Corporation amounting to about \$2,000,000,000; but unfortunately he did not have the time to do so. I would like to have

that made clear to the Committee, as to the nature of the commitments and the amount of them. I will be very glad to yield now to the chairman, or any other member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, to tell us as to those commitments.

Mr. SPENCE. I made no such statement. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] made that statement.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I made that statement.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. They have made commitments of around \$2,000,000,000. That is contained in the report on page 28. Of that amount, what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] is talking about amounts to over \$800,000,000 which are direct subsidies, mostly for dairy products. The other is a revolving fund, cotton, wheat, and the regular commodities which we helped prior to the war. Since the war the others have been direct subsidies. The only subsidies we have here will be those contained in the amendment which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] expects to offer, which is practically the Taft amendment in the Senate bill. That is where he spells out in figures how much you can give as subsidies. The other amount will be just a revolving fund, and perhaps we will get most of it back. Now, suppose the war ends. If the war ends we may not have lend-lease to sell our products to. We will not have as large an Army or as large a Navy to sell products to. It means that we may have some losses, something like \$900,000,000, just because the crops will be dumped on the market. There is no place to sell them; no market in which to sell them. But we have guaranteed to the farmers, "You will get a certain price." For that reason they will need this \$2,000,000,000. The entire list of those commodities is spelled out on page 28 of the hearings. There is nothing covered up about it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I did not think there was. I am simply asking for information. It is quite apparent that the Commodity Credit Corporation now has enough money to meet its commitments on subsidies and other payments, and that the additional amount that is asked for here, which is sought to be stricken out by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] is to be placed in the revolving fund, rather than to be used in making commitments.

If I have not got it clear I certainly hope that the gentleman from Georgia will make it clear in his time; and if he needs time I think he should take it for this purpose.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Did the Commodity Credit Corporation have authority to make commitments up to \$2,000,000,000 before the passage of this legislation under consideration?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. This legislation, as I understand it, covers only commitments for the next fiscal

year. If I am in error in that I should like to have somebody point it out to me.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOPE. I call the attention of the gentleman from Georgia to the question I am asking of the gentleman from Minnesota. As I understand, the Senate authorized an increase of a billion and a half to cover a 2-year period. As I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, it authorizes a billion dollars to cover a 1-year period; that is, the gentleman from Michigan later will offer an amendment to limit the extension to 1 year. I wish the gentleman from Georgia would advise us if the \$1,000,000,000 will not be sufficient for 1 year if the billion and a half is considered sufficient for 2 years by the Senate?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. No. The evidence as to estimated obligations for loans, purchases, and expenditures, November 1, 1944, to December 31, 1945, show it will not. They make a list of all of them.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Another thing, if this war ends any time soon, under the estimate these obligations run for 12 months after VE-day and amount to \$900,000,000. If military needs and lend-lease do not take these goods, we will have no market for a great many farm products, the price of which we are obligated to guarantee to the farmers.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I understand, though, from the Commodity Credit Corporation that they do have enough funds to meet their commitments up to June 30, 1945. The gentleman is referring to certain contingencies. If those contingencies should arise, that is something we could act on quickly in Congress.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. From what has been said, it seems apparent to me that we have not provided enough funds if the amount carried in the bill is spread over 2 years.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sure none of us here, at least most of us, would not want to hamstring the Commodity Credit Corporation; but I feel that the facts should be brought out here as to whether a reduction in this amount of \$1,000,000,000 for a 1-year period would hamstring it.

Mr. HOPE. Is it the gentleman's idea that the additional money provided in this bill, added to the assets now on hand, will be sufficient to carry them through another year?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think it will.

Mr. HOPE. I should like to have the gentleman from Georgia clear that point up, for it seems very important to me.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The program of the Commodity Credit Corporation is based upon the money they have on hand, and they do not seek to go beyond those commitments in what they are to pay to the farmers. In fact, they are reducing payments in order to stay within the funds; and so I hope that somebody will attempt to make clear at least the actual amount of money that is necessary.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. If the Senate formula as written is adequate and the House only reduces the amount provided in the Senate by \$500,000,000 and provides for just one-half of the time, certainly it would seem to be more than adequate—if the Senate formula be correct.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The amount here should, of course, be stepped up \$568,000,000 above the Senate proposal as far as dairying is concerned. And another thing about the Senate proposal with reference to payments to farmers, the first program was for 6 months, up to December 31.

Mr. WOLCOTT rose.

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

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I must yield first to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott].

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say that the \$568,000,000 to which the gentleman has referred will provide \$183,000,000 more for 1945 than was actually spent in 1944, and that contemplates the milk payment of an amount of \$28,900,000. The reason for this \$28,000,000 is that in 1944 many milk producers did not collect the payments to which they were entitled and for which they were eligible. This amounts to about \$5,660,000. So \$28,900,000 is made available in the money the gentleman from Georgia has reference to in the \$568,000,000.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Here are the total estimated net obligations: November 1, 1944, to December 31, 1945, \$2,178,778,000, and for 12 months after VE-day, \$910,000,000. That is a total of \$3,089,578,000. Less estimated funds available, cash on hand on October 31, 1941, \$21,448,000, available borrowing power October 31, 1941, \$811,365,000. That makes the amount they should have after all these deductions of \$2,000,000,000, and they have estimated that, it is

their figure and they have made commitments to that extent.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman from Michigan says that cutting off this billion dollars will not make any difference.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I do not know who is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not know who is right either. We ought to find out who is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, as one who represents a district that is distinctly a city district, I have always supported legislation of this sort. I supported the original act and all extensions of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Without regard to the intent of the original act back in the depression days, and the original intent has been preserved for the benefit of the farmers of America, may I say that during the war the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation have extended themselves into other necessary fields for the best interest of our country and our people. While this bill directly is one that is of vital importance to the 6,000,000 farmers of our country and those connected with the soil, numbering approximately thirty millions of our people, today it is of vital concern to the consumer. I therefore look at this as not essentially a farm measure but, rather, as a farmer-consumer measure, and I go beyond that. It plays an important part in the conduct of our Government so far as the war is concerned. In addition to being a bill that is necessary for the farmer, from the practical angle and taking into consideration the exigencies which exist today, it is also vitally important and necessary for the consumer and of vital concern to all Americans in connection with the conduct of the war, because, as I see it, this agency plays a very important part in the conduct of this war.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to hear the gentleman make those remarks as to the importance of this measure to the consumers because, after all, when it comes to dairy products and other subsidized foods, it is a consumer subsidy. The price is being held down to the consumer. If it were not for that fact the consumers would pay about 25 percent more for their dairy products and other foods than they are doing at the present time in this country.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not take issue with what the gentleman says. As a matter of fact, I completely agree with the gentleman's statement and would say that it is probably more than 25 percent.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then, as some would have it, this is not so much a measure to help 6,000,000 farmers as it is a measure to lower the prices for the consumer.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think I have expressed myself. And if it were a farmers measure I would support it. It is far

more important than that. It is necessary to the consumers and it is a very important measure as a part of our war effort.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. What part does it play in the advantages to the American taxpayer?

Mr. McCORMACK. Addressing myself to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] that amendment is connected with an amendment that he will later offer, as I understand, to reduce the 2-year period to 1 year. I hope that neither one of these amendments will be adopted, and I have reasons which prompt me to take this position and to vote against both amendments.

As I see it, no one can tell in advance how much money it is going to take to carry out the important activities of this agency even during the next year, let alone the next 2 years. In any event, it is a borrowing power. But beyond that I am for the 2-year extension because Congress has guaranteed support prices to the farmers of America during the war and for a 2-year period thereafter. Congress has made its promise. I voted for it last year as did most of the Members.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is a definite promise made to the farmers of America by the Congress of the United States. The support price is 90 percent of parity.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I say to the gentleman that that was only on basic commodities.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The 2-year guaranty on nonbasic commodities depends largely upon whether the policy of the War Food Administration, or whatever other agency is in charge, encourages the production of other crops. But this has no relationship whatsoever to the so-called Steagall amendment, in that we are only setting up a year's program anyway.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has very ably presented his part of the argument and I am undertaking to give to the House what I consider to be the arguments against the adoption of the gentleman's amendment. Congress has made a promise to support prices for the farmers of America during the war and for 2 years thereafter; a support price of at least 90 percent of parity. Having made that promise, it seems to me that the 2-year extension provided for in this bill should be adopted by the House today.

I agree with the gentleman from Michigan in his statement the other day that the main purpose of the C. C. C. in these days is to assure the maximum amount of production, and, in doing that, to obtain for the farmers an adequate price for the products of the farm, thereby guaranteeing maximum production.

We must also keep in mind that we cannot very well appropriate money directly to the farmers. We appropriate money directly to produce and manufacture the weapons of war. The manufacturers and producers of weapons of war get cash but the farmer does not. The situation is such that it is difficult to make direct appropriations, but we have done the next best thing. We have promised the integrity of our Government to the farmers of America for a 90 percent, at least, support price during the war and for 2 years thereafter, and because of that promise I think the 2-year extension recommended in this bill should be adopted by the House.

With all respect to the gentleman from Michigan, appreciating his argument and differing with him as I do but respecting his views, I hope the Committee will reject both of the gentleman's amendments and pass the bill as reported out with the one amendment that has apparently been agreed upon.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that everybody on both sides of this aisle is for the Commodity Credit Corporation and wants the Corporation to have sufficient funds to carry out its obligations, though I think there is some misunderstanding.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] has an amendment which he expects to introduce and I expect to support it. It is practically the same as the Taft amendment in the Senate bill, that spells out just how much money is to go to dairy and other consumer commodities. This is a real gift. We do not expect to get any of this money back. That is what you call a consumer subsidy. You all remember that I helped lead the fight here against consumer subsidies. We lost out by a veto. Then we embarked on this program to get production to feed the armed forces and the civilians of this country. We have made obligations since that time and we cannot turn back. The Corporation needs this much money to carry out the obligations for loans, purchases, and expenditures.

As a matter of fact, the Corporation has made \$23,000,000 on the basic commodities up to this time. On cotton alone it has made \$93,000,000. On some commodities it lost, but on the total it has made \$23,000,000. I do not mean we are going to lose this \$2,000,000,000 by any means. A great part of this \$2,000,000,000 is a revolving fund for making loans on and buying corn, cotton, wheat, and other commodities, and on these particular commodities we do not expect to lose any money.

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

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. The table which is shown on page 28 and to which the gentleman referred in the course of his remarks seems to be based upon the situation that existed on October 31, 1944. I notice others in the hearings also seem to be based upon the situation existing at that time. I am wondering if there are any more up-to-date figures than those which are in the hearings.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. No. This is what the Corporation claims it will have to have.

There is some misunderstanding about direct subsidies and the revolving fund in the way of loans on the basic commodities, on which the Government has lost nothing. Therefore, the C. C. C. cannot carry out the commitments and needs of the farmers without this money. It does not mean a loss. We are helping the consumers on the \$900,000,000 that we expect to lose, and the balance is necessary if we carry on and make the loans on the basic commodities on which we have lost nothing. We guarantee the prices of certain food crops. If the crops do not reach those prices, we will make it good, and on many of these crops the Corporation has not lost a dime.

If this war ends in the next few days we know that a great many farmers producing food crops will not have any market in which to sell their food. Therefore, there will be some losses on those particular crops. The Corporation estimates that it will have to spend after VE-day something over \$900,000,000 within 12 months from that day, and it should know more about this than any one of us because it has given careful study to this phase of the operations.

Mr. HOPE. On October 31, 1944, which seems to be the date, by these figures, the Corporation had available, I notice, a buying power of \$811,000,000; there was listed an appropriation pending of \$256,000,000 and there was cash on hand of \$21,448,000, or a total of \$1,089,578,000. I assume that most of those funds are still on hand. Does not the gentleman think, if we limit the expense to 1 year and take that sum of more than \$1,000,000,000 and add another billion dollars to it, it will be sufficient to enable the Corporation to carry on its operations for the 1-year period?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. It might be if it were not for the estimated net additional obligations for 12 months' period after VE-day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman is right. The total estimated obligations from November 1, 1944, to December 1, 1945, are \$2,000,000,000. The estimated net additional obligations for 12 months' period after VE-day is \$910,000,000. That makes \$2,910,000,000. It had in cash on October 31, 1944, \$21,000,000; available borrowing capacity of

\$811,365,000; and appropriations pending, \$256,000,000. The last 3 items added up and subtracted from the \$3,000,000,000 leaves about \$2,000,000,000, which they will need. That is what they say it will need. It does not mean the money will be wasted, because the Government has made money on these basic crops. As a matter of fact, it has over \$600,000,000 of loans outstanding now, and the estimated value of the assets of the Corporation, in addition to these loans, is something over \$1,500,000,000.

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

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. What is the total loss during the coming year?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The total loss, as I understand it, is approximately \$900,000,000. That is the subsidy for the dairies and other subsidies where the consumer, and not the producer, gets the benefit.

Mr. COOLEY. If the bill provides an amount of money sufficient for a 2-year period, and you cut that period to a 1-year period, why could you not reduce the amount in proportion?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. This bill does not provide money for a 2-year period. It provides money for the period ending December 31 this year. The bill extends the life of the Corporation for 2 years. But the money is provided only through the year 1945.

Mr. COOLEY. That is the information we have been trying to obtain.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. If the Members will turn to page 1976 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I think we can tie this up. On that page you will find certain figures which I am informed the Commodity Credit Corporation has agreed to go into this proposition as an amendment. That gives a total of \$913,000,000. The \$913,000,000 is made up of \$568,000,000 for the dairy industry: whole milk payments, \$416,000,000; butterfat payments, \$152,000,000. That makes up the total of \$568,000,000.

Then, we have the noncrop programs, which are Cheddar cheese, fluid milk, peanut butter, for food wheat, expended on other purposes—that means something you cannot detail at the present moment—\$32,500,000, or a total of \$120,000,000.

Then, you have programs which are on a crop basis, crop-year basis, or to be provided for under the amount of \$225,000,000 total.

So, \$568,000,000 for milk, \$120,000,000 for noncrop program, and the programs which are on a crop year basis for \$225,000,000, gives \$913,000,000.

That, I might say to the gentleman from Kansas, brings these figures of October 31 down to date, you might say. I think that answers the question of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], about the later figures from October 31. So, on that basis, I shall be very glad to support the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. Chairman, there is another thought I want to express here. A lot has been said about an investigation. We have the letter today from the Administrator, Mr. Jones. Mr. Jones himself cannot personally make that investigation. I mean Marvin Jones, personally, cannot make it. I have been a friend of the Commodity Credit Corporation with all the other Members of Congress, and I have heard so much and I have seen so little—there has been so much said by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] and there is so much in the RECORD which we have not seen that insofar as I am personally concerned, for the benefit of the farmers of this country and for the benefit of Marvin Jones and Frank Hancock, let me say that I would not go any further than those two men to fill those two positions, but, to protect the farmers, to protect the Commodity Credit Corporation, to protect every Member of the House who supports Commodity Credit Corporation, to protect the public of this country, I personally am going to demand a thorough investigation by a committee of this House, of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I think I know enough to know that when the committee gets into it, it will find plenty that needs cleaning up. You must keep in mind that Administrator Jones and Mr. Hancock are new men on these Commodity Credit jobs. You will probably find that the dirty work—and I allege there has been dirty work—took place before either one of them joined the Corporation. If the house is clean let it be shown to be clean. If it is dirty, let us clean it up.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; I do not yield. I have kept my mouth closed up to this time. I do not propose to have something come out 6 months from now which will stigmatize me as a friend of Commodity Credit Corporation. Furthermore, passing this law at this time has nothing to do with that investigation. The Congress has authorized these parity and support price payments. The Commodity Credit Corporation is the machinery through which those payments are to be made. We mandate the Commodity Credit Corporation to make loans. I am going to vote for this bill. I am not going to vote to recommit the bill, because I am not going to mix the flour of the Commodity Credit Corporation with the red pepper of an investigation, if we can get one made.

There has been so much said here now that I do not know any way you can avoid an investigation. The Administrator sends a letter up here saying he is going to make one. The chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee says he is going to make one. That is a fine kettle of fish you have here. We should either make an investigation or nothing should have been said, and let the scandal come at some future time. So, if I cannot get the investigation taken care of in any other way, I will introduce a resolution, in order to clear my own skirts, and the rest of the Members can carry their own responsibility in whichever way they prefer to do it.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman believe that the resolution which has recently been passed by the House, authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to investigate all phases of marketing activities, might not be broad enough to include authority to conduct this investigation?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Personally, I do not think it is broad enough.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] has expired.

#### A WAR MEASURE

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

Mr. Chairman, if this were a bill to appropriate money for planes, tanks, guns, and ammunition, I do not think any question would be raised as to the amount to be appropriated, because we are all in accord with doing everything possible to successfully prosecute this war. Yet, we have a bill here providing for the use of money for the purpose of making those planes, tanks, and guns effective.

#### FOOD AS IMPORTANT AS BULLETS

Food is just as important as bullets, and when we vote against providing the necessary food to carry on this war we are in effect voting against the successful prosecution of the war. I do not care how many planes, tanks, and guns we have upon the battlefields of the world, unless we have food for our fighting men, those planes, tanks, and guns will be absolutely useless. So this is just as important as anything that can be done in this war.

#### MONEY TO PROVIDE FOOD

This bill provides for an increase from \$3,000,000,000 to \$5,000,000,000 in the amount of money that is available for the Commodity Credit Corporation. For what purpose? To provide needed food. We talk about deferring farmers—and we should, because they are engaged in work that is just as essential, just as necessary, as work in the war plants or upon the battlefields—and yet we quibble about whether or not it will be \$4,000,000,000 or \$5,000,000,000 in a program where we are spending from \$75,000,000,000 to \$100,000,000,000 every year for war supplies which cannot be used unless we provide the necessary food, which this \$1,000,000,000 difference will probably provide. Does not the gentleman think it is too small, considering the over-all cost of the war picture, to even quibble about or to run any risk about?

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. I have been informed in the last few minutes by the Commodity Credit Corporation that they have \$1,000,000,000 available; that their commitments for this year are \$2,278,000,000, and that if the war comes to an end this year there will be another billion needed.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. So this money is absolutely needed, not for next year but for the year 1945.

We are spending at least \$75,000,000,000 this year for war supplies. Think about that. Yet we are quibbling about the \$1,000,000,000 which will probably be necessary in order to make that \$75,000,000,000 effective in planes, tanks, and guns. We must not run that risk; it is too great a risk to run.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. The life of the Corporation by this bill is extended 2 years.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. And they are asking an increase of \$2,000,000,000.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Suppose an amendment is adopted limiting the extension to 1 year; would not one-half of the amount be sufficient?

Mr. PATMAN. No; the need would still be \$5,000,000,000, that is, if we want to carry out the solemn contract we have made with the producers of food in the United States. We cannot carry out that contract in any other way.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. It seems to me that \$2,000,000,000 increase being furnished here for a 2-year extension, that should an amendment be adopted reducing the extension to 1 year, that \$1,000,000,000 should be enough.

Mr. PATMAN. We are not discussing that now; we are discussing what will be necessary for 1945. We have outstanding obligations. We have voted to put Congress on record as favoring certain support prices and certain price increases to those who will produce the necessary food; and we cannot carry out those promises unless we vote for this bill as it is.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Instead of quibbling over this \$1,000,000,000, as the gentleman says, how about increasing the price of farm commodities so the individuals who get the commodities pay the \$1,000,000,000? Then we will not have to take it out of the Treasury.

Mr. PATMAN. That is a separate question, but I will tell the gentleman the reason why. If we do what the gentleman has sincerely suggested these wives, children, fathers and mothers of the fighting men will find their standard of living reduced.

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. The wives and children, the fathers and mothers of these fighting men we have voted to send to war—and we have voted to give their dependents a certain amount each month—if we were to increase prices as the gentleman suggests it would reduce their living standard immediately. The amount of money they would receive would not purchase as much. We owe

to them an obligation. If we were to do what the gentleman suggests we would place the greatest kind of burden upon the loved ones of our fighting men, upon the people who are drawing old-age assistance, upon people who are working for salaries and wages and who live upon fixed incomes. We would absolutely reduce it and do it quickly, immediately, reduce the purchasing power of those people, and we would be treating them wrong. It would cost them several times as much as \$1,000,000,000.

Mr. RICH. Then, \$1,000,000,000 in the gentleman's estimation not being worth quibbling over, it cannot be a very large sum to him. If it is not, and if you are trying to hold down the purchasing power of the people so that we do not have inflation, it seems to me that those who consume the goods should pay the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman has his opinion, and I have mine; a billion is a large amount, but when we consider that the whole war program, a hundred times that large, is involved, the amount is comparatively small, I suggest that a vote for this amendment is a vote against the loved ones of those fighting men whom we have promised to defend by keeping the cost of living down so they could live on the amount we have provided. A vote for this amendment is a vote against those loved ones.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The difference between the attitude of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] and the gentleman now addressing the House is on this \$910,000,000 which is estimated after V-day. V-day may come tomorrow or next day and it is estimated that it would be \$910,000,000 for 1 year after V-day. If that came tomorrow, then we would have to come back and appropriate more money.

Mr. PATMAN. I am giving the Members the benefit of my opinion. You can have your own opinion any way you want. My opinion is if I were to vote for this amendment and quibble about a billion dollars, which is small compared to the over-all picture, making ineffective the billions of dollars of fine war equipment and supplies we have, I would be voting against the interest of the loved ones of these fighting men, I would be voting against the interest of the fighting men themselves, I would be voting against providing sufficient food here at home as well as enough food for our fighting men. Please remember that 12,000,000 fighting men consume as much food as 24,000,000 civilians because the average soldier must have 4,500 calories every day, twice as much as the average civilian consumes. So we must make it possible to have produced 65,000,000 pounds of the best food on earth every day for an equivalent of 24,000,000 men in the armed services. In addition to that, we have to make it possible for civilians at home to have the right kind of food in order to keep up our health standards in the Nation. In addition to that, if we can furnish some food to our allies and our allies use that food to help destroy our common ene-

mies, thereby permitting more of our men to safely return home we are doing a grand thing. Therefore this program is too big for us to quibble about whether or not it should be \$4,000,000,000 or \$5,000,000,000. There is more involved than that.

Furthermore, this is a bill to help prevent inflation. I am not criticizing anyone who has a different viewpoint from myself, but I personally would feel, if I were to vote for this amendment, that I was taking a step in the direction of releasing inflationary pressures and permitting inflation to possibly engulf our country. It would be a definite inflationary step. Now, that is my opinion about it.

Another reason is that after we have voted here solemnly, practically every Member of this House has told the farmers of this Nation to go back to his farm, even with the shortage of manpower and machinery, double up, work harder, and produce more food and that the Congress will guarantee them for 2 years after the declaration of peace a certain price for their products. So if I were to vote for the pending amendment I would feel that I would be going back on that promise.

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

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I have listened very intently, as I always do, to the remarks of our very able colleague from Texas, but I take this opportunity to say that I cannot go along with his reasoning so far as his opposition to the pending amendment is concerned. It is all very well when anything is brought up here for consideration to come down here in the well of the House and talk about the boys at the fighting front, and because of my support of the pending amendment, I do not want any Member of the House or anyone else to think for one minute that I would do one single thing which would hamper the war effort in any way or that would sacrifice the life of one additional man in this war. However, there is a fundamental question involved here in which I am deeply interested.

I understand there is going to be another amendment offered to cut the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation from 2 years to 1 year. Unfortunately, that amendment has to be offered later and cannot be offered now. The particular amendment I wish to talk about at this time is the amendment to be offered cutting the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation from 2 years to 1 year. I am not speaking against the extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation at this particular time, but I do hope that the House will not vote for an extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation for 2 years.

The Commodity Credit Corporation was organized, as my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, said, to help the farm interests of this country, but it was not organized to do the work that it is doing at the present time, which is to perpetuate consumers' subsidies in this country.

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

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. It is true that it was not organized for that purpose; neither was the R. F. C. organized for three purposes, to help the banks, the railroads, and the insurance companies, but finally they were extended for good purposes, and this is being used for the same reason.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I will cover the gentleman's objection to my statement in a minute. We got into the war before the Congress knew what was happening. The Commodity Credit Corporation was subsidizing the consumers of this country when the first subsidy started in the canned vegetable industry in connection with the resale program. We have had several fights in the last 2 years about consumers' subsidies in this House. I, for one, was against it, but since the Commodity Credit Corporation, in cooperation with the O. P. A., developed that as a policy during this war, I am perfectly willing to go along and continue that program as long as the war lasts and as long as this emergency lasts because I, for one, in line with what my colleague the gentleman from Texas just said, do not want to do a single thing to upset the economy of this country which would in any way hamper the war effort.

May I ask the Members on the Democratic side to pay particular attention to this? I have heard quite a good many of you in the cloak room talking about the extension of the powers and the authorities granted as war emergencies. Why is the Commodity Credit Corporation asking for a 2-year extension? Just as sure as we are in this Chamber today, the Commodity Credit Corporation, or through a separate agency of this Government, expects to continue the payment of food subsidies after the war is over. An article published in the Baltimore Sun, emanating from a department here in Washington, made the flat statement that it was going to be the policy of Government, and the Congress would soon be given a bill covering it, that people in low income groups would have food subsidies as a permanent part of our Government. Members of the House, you are getting into something very dangerous. You are getting into something that is going to upset our whole system of government if that is done.

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

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. We have committed ourselves to the farmer to continue the support prices for 2 years after the war.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I agree with my chairman. But support prices, Mr. Chairman, and consumers' subsidies are entirely different things.

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

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. All I wish to say is this. We are in an emer-

gency; I do not think there is any question about that.

If we come back at the end of 1 year and we are in the same emergency, I am sure no Member of this Congress will be opposed to extending it again. But let us keep the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation under the scrutiny of the Congress so that we can watch the policies that have developed from time to time, so that after the emergency is over and we want to retrench, we will have a chance to do so.

I shall support this amendment, and if that amendment prevails and they need two billion for 2 years, certainly one billion additional would be enough for the 1 year.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support this amendment. I have supported consumers' subsidies. I have supported a good many other things. I am going to support it directly on the ground that it has been my observation that if you give people too much money in the Treasury to play with you get pretty lax methods. We talk about a promise to the farmers. You cannot tell me that this House will not at any time meet any legitimate payments that are required under its present laws. No one in this House can very successfully charge me with operating against the interests of plain people. If it becomes necessary as part of our economy by a food-stamp plan or otherwise to take care of the food requirements of the low-income group, I will be there.

But, primarily, I come just one speaker too late. I may fall into the habit myself, and anyone in this body can call me on it from now on, but I am beginning to retch a little at the stomach about hearing so much about our boys in the service. It has been my observation that men in this House who have lost sons are prepared to make their arguments upon sound grounds as to the merits of propositions and not go around here talking to us about the boys in the service every time they want to make an argument on anything.

I have come back from Europe and France and seen a few of those boys, and I have seen a good many of them who are injured. You are not going to fool them with a lot of tears about them. I think it is about time that somebody in this House at some time call some attention to the fact that some of those boys-in-the-fox-holes speeches are a little nauseating to most people of decent sensibilities.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have a feeling that the Commodity Credit Corporation and the O. P. A. have in an over-all way done a pretty good job of helping to keep down the rise in the cost of living. I think that as far as the cost of living can be cut down during this war period it is going to cut down our over-all debt at the end of the war. Those of us who are interested in the taxpayers will be doing something for the taxpaying public by helping to keep that cost of living down during this war. For that reason, I am going to vote against this amendment.

I have every confidence in the gentlemen who are running the Commodity Credit Corporation. One of them is a former Member of the House. I have confidence not only in their ability but in their integrity.

As I say, I think there has been a pretty good over-all job done in many ways. On the other hand, I feel that it is my duty to call the attention of the House to some things that have been developed in the hearings before the Committee on Insular Affairs during the last 2 weeks.

The vast powers that have been vested in the O. P. A. and the Commodity Credit Corporation, if wisely used, will, I think, as a war measure, do a great and beneficial service to this country. On the other hand, if they are unwisely used, they constitute a very powerful instrument of oppression and destruction. I feel that it is my duty to call to the attention of the House some facts that have been developed during the past 2 weeks in the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Our attention was called recently through cablegrams and letters to the fact that for 4 long weeks a strike has been going on in the biggest industry in the island of Puerto Rico.

We have read in the papers from time to time that we are to receive another cut in our sugar allowance for the next year. The biggest production of that island is sugar. They have what we call a sugar economy. From seven hundred to nine hundred thousand tons of sugar come out of there normally every year. Last year, the O. P. A. fixed a price on raw sugar below the cost of production and the Commodity Credit Corporation paid such a low subsidy that producers of sugar in Puerto Rico operated at a deficit last year. According to the best testimony we could get, eight companies alone lost about \$1,500,000 last year. They have been pleading with the O. P. A. to raise sugar prices to the point where they would not go on losing money or to get subsidies from Commodity Credit Corporation to offset the losses. The workers on the island faced, as they are elsewhere, with the rising cost of living, have struck for a higher wage. The producers of sugar, the little colonos, the larger people, and even large corporations, have all been faced with the fact that you cannot pay more than you take in. It has been a deadlock. According to the best estimates we have, they have been losing about 15,000,000 pounds of sugar a week because of the strike. In other words, the householders of America have already lost 60,000,000 pounds of sugar.

They took care of the continental producers by having the Commodity Credit Corporation pay them a subsidy large enough to make up the difference between the cost of production and the price fixed by the O. P. A. On the continent, they have kept the producers quiet and kept them operating by paying a subsidy to take up the slack between the low price fixed for raw sugar and the amount they have to have to produce it. For instance, down here in Louisiana, they are paying a subsidy of

more than twice the subsidy paid down in Puerto Rico.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. There is only one way that the householders of America are going to get sugar, and that is help the people who raise sugar to continue producing it. It cannot be produced so long as the price is forced down below the cost of production. I do not have to argue that point with any man in this Chamber. It is fundamental. It is a principle that we Americans have been raised upon.

There have been negotiations going on for 6 months, but the O. P. A. and the C. C. C. have stood pat and refused to give relief. They are now threatening to take over the sugar industry down there and to take over all the sugar farms and the sugar centrales, and operate them under Government control.

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

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the philosophy behind an order of that kind of fixing the price below the price of production?

Mr. BELL. I certainly do not want to charge the gentlemen running the C. C. C. with the kind of philosophy which you know is held by some people connected with the insular government. But you know what philosophy prevails down there where one after another of the island's industries has been taken over by the island government. That is common knowledge here. I do not have to expand on that.

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

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman believe the same philosophy is working in the States?

Mr. BELL. There may be some people here, but I think at least 98 percent of the people do not believe in that philosophy. I do not think that the people of this country will ever favor that sort of thinking.

Mr. RICH. I think the gentleman is right in saying that 98 percent of the people do not believe in that philosophy, but we are going right into it very rapidly. The people of this country are being fooled and they had better wake up pretty quick.

Mr. BELL. If this plan to take over that industry is carried out, it is going to mean a tremendous loss in sugar to the people of this country. In the first place, for every day that the cane is left standing in the fields there it is deteriorating. They should have been cutting cane for the last 30 days, but everything has been at a standstill. In fact, the longer that situation goes on, the worse it is going to get and, of course, it is going to mean that with a few more weeks like this, this year's cane crop will be lost and gone. It will mean, too, that the men who have spent their lifetimes down

there developing the greatest business of the island will be frozen out, and the business will be taken over by those folks in the island who do not know how to run it as well as the people who developed it. The result will be that we either will not have sugar here or else the price will be forced up to the point where it will be altogether too high.

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

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Who does the gentleman believe is responsible for that situation?

Mr. BELL. Well, I do not know all the ramifications back of it. I would say, however, that if the Commodity Credit Corporation would pay the same subsidy to sugar producers in Puerto Rico that it is paying on the continent, the strike could be settled immediately, and we would salvage something out of this cane crop standing in the fields down there.

Mr. COOLEY. Is there any reason why they should not pay the same subsidy?

Mr. BELL. I know of no reason why they should not, except I am convinced there are some people on the island who may be opposed to having it done.

Mr. COOLEY. I infer from what the gentleman said that there is some evil or sinister influence back of this thing.

Mr. BELL. I think there is.

Mr. COOLEY. That is on the island.

Mr. BELL. I doubt very much if the gentlemen running the O. P. A. and the Commodity Credit Corporation are fully cognizant as to the far-reaching influences down there in the island that may be back of this situation.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the amount of the subsidy per hundred pounds?

Mr. BELL. Forty cents per hundred pounds.

Mr. DONDERO. What is it in continental United States?

Mr. BELL. One dollar per hundred pounds.

Mr. DONDERO. How much is the total subsidy paid to both the insular possession sugar and the continental sugar?

Mr. BELL. Down there it is 40 cents per hundred and here it is \$1 per hundred.

Mr. DONDERO. Have you the over-all amount?

Mr. BELL. No; it depends on the amount of the production.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On page 28 of the hearings the Commodity Credit Corporation has requested \$63,000,000 on sugar. I assume that is the support price which they propose to pay to all domestic producers, which includes Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the continental beet sugar growers.

Mr. BELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to congratulate the chairman of the Insular Affairs Committee for calling this matter to the attention of the House, and also to point out that while this crop is standing in

the fields, remaining unharvested, not only is the sugar content being lost in the juices, but there are no new plantings going in for the year 1946, which means to say if we lose this crop we also lose next year's crop, or in round figures 1,800,000 tons of sugar.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

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

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I am very much interested in the statement the gentleman has made. I am sure most every citizen of this country is interested. Is the cost of production of sugar in the island as high as the cost of production of sugar in this country?

Mr. BELL. The cost of labor in the island, per ton, is higher than it is on the continent. There are many reasons for that.

However, before I close, I would like to say I am opposed to this amendment, because I think over-all, they are doing a good job, but I do think this body ought to know that hidden down there is a tremendous power of oppression and destruction that if unwisely used might bring disaster, not only down there in that little island, but here on the continent as well. Unless this thing is seen by the men who are operating O. P. A. and the Commodity Credit Corporation, there will be a time when some committee will come in here with an amendment to the law to protect the people of this country.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does that feeling originate with the Governor? Is he not spear-heading that sort of feeling in the island?

Mr. BELL. I cannot speak for the Governor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SABATH to the amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Strike out "\$4,000,000,000" and insert "\$4,500,000,000."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I am going to devote a few moments to a matter which, to me, is not so sweet as the sugar the gentleman has talked about.

In the first place, I presume most of the Members know that the Senate has already acted in this matter and that their bill provides for \$4,500,000,000. From the figures I have and from the evidence I have seen, I believe that \$4,500,000,000 will suffice; but in case it does not, we can always increase it should conditions justify it.

Before going into these figures, and lest I forget, I wish to compliment Judge Marvin Jones upon the letter he sent

down here. As I said in my remarks on the rule on this bill, I have always had the utmost confidence in Judge Jones and Mr. Frank Hancock, with both of whom I served here. At that time I did not recollect that Mr. Hancock is President of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I hope that they will clean house, and expect they will. They have already, as I am informed, dispensed with two men; and I am sure they will promptly do likewise with any and every person who shows himself to be unpatriotic, incapable, or who does not give honest service to that organization and to the country.

#### ARE SUBSIDIES NEEDED?

I have heard a great many arguments about subsidies. I do not know whether a majority of the Members realize that most of the money called for in the bill goes to the dairy industry. According to the figures given me, nearly \$930,000,000 goes to the dairy industry. If that industry needed a subsidy, and if milk prices had been kept down as we were led to believe they would be, I would not object to voting this or any other amount. Unfortunately, however, milk prices have not been kept down. Before we started this program milk was selling for 90 and 95 cents a hundredweight; today it is selling at \$2.75 a hundredweight, three times the former figure. No one can tell me this industry, in view of the high prices they are now getting for dairy products, should receive these additional millions provided in the bill.

I have been urged by Mr. Holman, representing the National Milk Producers' Association, and others, to favor an increase in the subsidy on butter or to increase the ceiling price 6 cents per pound, notwithstanding that today butter is selling for 50 cents per pound. The farmers already are receiving triple prices for milk and cream. But most outrageous is the high prices that consumers are paying for the various makeshift concoctions of cheese now appearing on the market, and which, in some instances, are selling for as high as 500 percent above the prices the consumer should pay.

Presenting the dairy industry with over \$900,000,000 surely is not, in my opinion, by any means responsible for the increased production of milk, because, according to the report of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the seasonal upswing in milk flow during February was somewhat more rapid than usual. On March 1 production per cow was about 8 percent above the 1934-43 average for the date and 2 percent higher than a year earlier. In the western group of States production per cow was 6 percent above the March 1 average for the 1934-43 period and slightly higher than last year. For the country as a whole milk production per cow averaged 13.99 pounds on March 1 this year, compared with 13.71 pounds for the same date of 1944 and a 1934-43 average of 12.96 pounds.

All the talk in the House concerning the sad plight of the dairy industries and the alleged necessity for authorizing these additional subsidies to stimulate milk production is the bunk.

I have expressed the belief that we should call a halt to appropriating these millions upon millions to the dairy and packer industries, or, if these subsidies are continued, that these industries be required to bring about an immediate and substantial reduction in the high cost of butter, cheese, milk, and other dairy byproducts, and meats and other foodstuffs that they process.

I think we are going altogether too far; but, as I say, had the price to the consumer been held in check I would not object to expending this money to provide sufficient food, not only for our servicemen, but for our underpaid American white-collar citizens as well, of whom we have nearly 20,000,000 earning less than \$1,300 a year.

#### PRESSURE GROUPS VERSUS CHESTER BOWLES

Mr. Chairman, I have noticed in the press the last few days the activities of the pressure group, their agents and lobbyists, exerting every pressure and influence they can to obtain higher prices, notwithstanding the enormous profits they are making now, and notwithstanding the hundreds of millions of dollars which have been voted to them by Congress as subsidies intended to hold down the prices of the necessities of life to the American people. These groups speak for the large interest holders in these various companies and corporations who have, as their financial reports will show, made tremendous profits.

May I suggest that Mr. Bowles obtain the financial reports of these avaricious corporations and industries whose representatives, with crocodile tears, urge higher ceilings in order to "aid" the Government in further prosecution of the war. Their sole interest is to make greater and more profits for themselves, and still more profits, and the public be damned. There may be one or two exceptions out of the many but I have not been able to detect them. The "poor" packers claim that unless they are permitted to do as they please they will be forced into bankruptcy, notwithstanding that most of them have made millions above what they made between 1935 and 1939, or even in the year 1940.

That applies also to the so-called dairy interests as well as to the vegetable and fruit growers. And to the "poor" tobacco millionaires who have doubled the prices of cigars and substituted weeds and sawdust for tobacco.

I must not overlook the poor sugar combination, and I quote from their report for 1945:

The consolidated net income of the company, as shown by the profit-and-loss statement, after Federal income taxes, and depreciation of \$2,029,523.15, was \$5,902,530.68. After provision for the dividend on the preferred stock, this net income is equal to \$6.11 per share on the common stock.

Dividends of \$7 per share were declared during the year on the preferred stock. On December 20, 1944, a year-end dividend of \$3 per share was declared on the common stock, which was paid on February 2, 1945.

Cash at the year end was \$17,574,728.70. Short-term United States Government securities were \$13,336,826.47 and other United States Government securities were \$933,584.87. Current assets were \$56,795,854.29 and current liabilities were \$14,309,855.91. Surplus was \$12,805,934.98.

There was credited to earned surplus \$233,505.89, representing reserves for taxes created in prior years, no longer required, and an additional sum of \$538,765.36, representing loans to colonos, no longer required.

#### INFLATION

I suggest the reading of a very timely article by Mr. Richard L. Strout on the danger of inflation. The article follows:

#### CAPITAL SEES RISE IN PERIL OF INFLATION

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON, March 15.—Inflation and fear of inflation are the motivating factors in half a dozen major fields in Washington today.

They are behind simultaneous House and Senate hearings on price control; they are involved in the hold-the-line efforts in the labor field, including the new coal-strike threat; they arise anew in the efforts of Chester Bowles to roll back the price of textile goods and put a ceiling on motion-picture tickets.

They figure in the statistics compiled by the Federal Reserve System, and the recent recommendation by Chairman Marriner Eccles for a heavy increase in the capital-gains tax.

They are the outstanding, compelling home-front factors considered in every current Washington financial discussion.

#### INFLATION THREAT GROWS

The inflation threat is greater today than at any time since price controls were put into effect, according to authorities, and with every day of successful war the inflation will grow. That is the situation that worries Washington.

Here is the situation in brief: In the biggest boom in history, the public is accumulating savings that have no place to go. The reduction in things to buy is vividly illustrated in new austerity developments and almost every day—less meat, empty store shelves, midnight curfew, city dim-out, and manpower regulations. Meanwhile potential purchasing power is advancing by leaps and bounds, and controls are threatening to bend or break in certain directions.

Here is the latest compilation of figures, illustrating the situation:

1. Expenditures on war are pouring money into the financial stream. World War No. 1 to its end cost \$32,000,000,000. World War No. 2 in the same period cost \$153,000,000,000, and to December 1944 has cost \$245,000,000,000. Living costs in the first war went up 84.4 percent and ultimately rose to 108 percent by June 1920. Controls in this war have so far held down the balloon to only 28.8 percent increase, but the upward pressure is increasing.

2. The public's income after taxes was only \$58,000,000,000 in World War No. 1, but in 1943 alone it was \$124,000,000,000. In 1944 it was \$137,000,000,000.

3. In World War No. 1 only 25 percent of the national production went to war; the balance was left for civilians. Now in this closer-to-total war, 44 percent of goods are going to war; only 56 percent is staying at home.

4. Currency in circulation tells the alarming story of the amount of money available for purchase of dwindling amounts of goods. In 52 months (to armistice) in World War No. 1 the amount jumped to almost \$5,000,000,000. But after 52 months of this war the figure was \$20,000,000,000, and by now it is \$25,000,000,000—24 percent increase over a year ago. Bank officials are vitally concerned on this single tell-tale statistic.

5. Checking accounts in banks shows the present staggering total of \$60,000,000,000—7 percent higher than a year ago. This is so much hip-pocket dynamite so far as the possibility of sudden spending spurts go.

6. Summarizing some of the foregoing figures, the present excess of public income over goods and services available to buy with afore-

said income now totals \$40,000,000,000. This is the difference between \$137,500,000,000 in income after taxes and \$97,500,000,000 of available civilian goods and services. This is the little red pointer on the inflation-pressure gage that is constantly pointing to a higher and higher explosive force inside.

7. Finally latest statistics indicate that public savings have increased by \$100,000,000,000 from Pearl Harbor to the end of 1944. What is the public going to do with this money? Nobody knows. If a sudden fear of inflation should sweep the country, everybody would start bidding for the insufficient supply of civilian goods in order to turn rubber dollars into real goods.

That is what would happen now in many lines if there were not price controls, even though the public has confidence in the dollar. The savings so far are equal to three times the total cost of World War No. 1, and they are accumulating at the rate of \$3,000,000,000 a month.

Mr. Chairman, under leave given me I insert an editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of March 12 entitled "Homeside Readjustment." I feel this editorial should be read by the present-day faultfinders:

#### HOMESIDE READJUSTMENT

There is a growing uneasiness among those close to the readjustment problem of the returning veterans which calls for prompt recognition.

The source of this feeling is not to be found in the provisions of the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944—the G. I. bill of rights—with its broad program for rehabilitation through hospitalization, education, loans, and unemployment benefits. The Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, with their newly functioning separation and adjustment divisions are sounding a note of helpfulness.

No, the framework of readjustment as provided by law and regulation is ample, in fact more than ample in the opinion of many. As a Nation, the United States has marched far from the land-grant benefits given to the ragged Continentals mustered out after the Revolution. There is no evidence of hurdy-gurdies being handed out by a befuddled Government such as were given the blue-clad veterans of Bull Run and Gettysburg, and apple-selling such as the doughboys from Belleau Woods and the Argonne were reduced to after World War No. 1 is definitely not a post-war probability for today's G. I.'s.

Where, then, shall we look for the cause of this feeling—now no larger than a spot on the peacetime horizon? Right in our own mirrors. We, the families of our servicemen, are causing this vague but growing feeling of uneasiness among those studying the readjustment problem.

Farsighted, experienced observers call now for a "homeside readjustment." Too much, they say, has been emphasized about readjusting the fighting men. Incidents of naval veterans removing their combat ribbons to avoid ill-advised questioning, and of infantrymen from the Italian front taking off their honored shoulder patches to escape thoughtless inquiries are straws in the wind. Let the family circle make a more thoughtful effort to get into harmony with the G. I.'s.

It is the wartime duty of us all to search deeply into our motives as we eagerly step forth to help in the great opportunities of readjustment. Let there be no unwise probing into combat-packed hours. Let the Golden Rule guide our every step and temper our grateful enthusiasm.

Naturally enough we can find our readjustment guide in the Bible. Can we not turn as did Solomon when he was called on to face great problems and great opportunities

and ask for "an understanding heart"? That might well be the start for "homeside readjustment."

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

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. We have, I admit, perhaps due to the need for haste, allowed manufacturers large sums for the war material they furnish the Government. But when we realized that we had been too generous we passed the Renegotiation Act, which is bringing back into the Treasury most of these unusually high and unwarranted profits. If we can do that with the manufacturers, why can we not also hold dairy prices down?

What applies to the dairy industry applies to other industries whose prices we are boosting; and, Mr. Chairman, if we continue to permit the boosting and maintain these prices, I am afraid for the future, when we will not be able to appropriate these large sums of money, we will suffer a crash the same as we suffered when the \$500,000,000 was expended in 1928 and 1929 to support wheat prices. That is what alarms me. I dislike very much to see the farmers and agriculture generally placed in that unfortunate position they found themselves in when the \$500,000,000 was expended.

#### ABUNDANT CROPS AND SURPLUSES

Now, we have great surpluses in wheat, we have great surpluses in corn, we have surpluses in nearly everything, through the aid of God Almighty; and if we shall have as favorable weather as we have had the last 3 years we will, of course, with the aid of the farmers, continue to raise great crops—larger crops than ever before.

Farm implements have been frozen and the prices that farmers pay for the things they need have been frozen.

Why not freeze the prices on some of the agricultural commodities on which they receive these tremendous subsidies, and which they unload upon the people, like cheese and partially synthetic cream, which is only about 50 percent cream but still sells for double the price real cream used to sell for? I really think that something remedial should be done in the interest of the consumers, so that they may be protected in this important matter of food prices.

I have observed in the hearings of the Committee on Banking and Currency that the Commodity Credit Corporation has sustained a loss of \$1,208,084,481 in subsidizing agricultural commodities to date; and we shall have to write that off. Of that sum dairy products received \$603,186,335 and fluid milk received \$23,617,062; wheat received about \$273,317,759, and corn received about \$39,813,207.

If, as I maintain, these millions and millions in subsidies for the dairy interests, meat packers, livestock producers, and feed interests have not benefited the consumers, how can it be logically said that these subsidies avoid and minimize the effects of inflation?

## FARMERS PROSPEROUS

The Commodity Credit Corporation bill continues the guaranty that 90 percent of parity will be paid farmers for 2 years after the war. Since farm prices are now 114 percent of parity and only a few instances of temporary gluts have occurred, little thought is given at this time to this guaranty.

Farm debt is declining. This is particularly true of mortgage debt, which has decreased in a few years by one-half. During and after the last war such debts rose sharply.

Farm operators' reserves of about \$12,000,000,000 in cash and other liquid resources are the largest in history. Included are about \$2,400,000,000 invested in United States savings bonds.

Largely as a result of price increases, and also because of reduced debts, increased cash and bonds, and increased quantities of livestock and other assets, the equities of the owners in agriculture increased about \$30,000,000,000 in the 4-year period ended January 1, 1944.

Concerning the importance of price controls to farm prosperity, the Office of Price Administration points out that during this war we have had a widespread and generally effective system of price controls. These price controls have held down the farmers' own costs for food and clothing, for fertilizer, machinery, and other supplies. During the last war, the farmers' costs rose almost as much and as fast as his prices.

The rise in prices of farm commodities, real estate, machinery, and equipment accounts for \$19,700,000,000 of a \$21,100,000,000 increase in the valuation of tangible farm assets in the 4-year period. The other \$1,400,000,000 reflects an increase of physical working capital. Of the total increase of nearly \$30,000,000,000 in proprietors' equity, \$8,000,000,000 was in cash, bank deposits, War bonds, and other quick assets, and from \$500,000,000 to \$800,000,000 was in debt reduction.

Real estate is the most valuable single asset owned by farm proprietors, including as proprietors the absentee landlords as well as the owner-operators. Bureau of the Census figures show the value of farm land and buildings to have been \$33,600,000,000 in 1940. By 1944 such property was valued at \$45,600,000,000.

## MUST GUARD AGAINST RUN-AWAY BOOM

And now let me remind you of the dangers of a run-away boom in farm lands. Surveys made by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics indicate that about two-thirds of all farms bought during the last few years have been bought by farmers for operation by themselves. Buying both by farmers and nonfarmers has been active. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics further says that forces that could lead to a run-away boom like that of the last war are numerous and strong, including exceptionally high annual returns and an expectation on the part of a good many that good times will last at least for a year or two after the war; low interest rates on mortgages; small down payments, and low annual payments on mortgages; assistance to servicemen un-

der the G. I. bill may increase demand for farm land; farm-land holders already have larger equities in higher-priced real estate, and thereby have been encouraged, in some cases, to buy additional tracts; and farmers have more money on hand, in banks and in United State Savings bonds than at any other time in the history of our country.

## FARM MACHINERY AIDED RECORD PRODUCTION

We hear a great deal about the scarcity of farm machinery, and this subject was mentioned by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] before the Committee on Rules the other day. While the availability of machinery on farms has probably decreased somewhat during the last 2 to 3 years, many of the major types of machinery have increased in number. For example, the number of tractors on farms on January 1, 1942, was 1,845,000 and climbed to 1,940,000 by January 1, 1944. The number of combines increased from 269,000 to 303,000 during the same period. The number of milking machines jumped from 256,000 to 339,000.

Farm machinery and equipment was valued at \$3,135,000,000 on January 1, 1940, and at \$4,198,000,000 on January 1, 1944.

Purchases of farm machinery during the last 4 years were as follows: 1940, \$956,000,000; 1941, \$1,281,000,000; 1942, \$718,000,000; and 1943, \$577,000,000. These statistics disprove the charges of a great shortage of farm machinery.

I have offered my amendment providing that the appropriation be reduced to \$4,500,000,000 which is the amount provided in the Senate bill, and, as I have said, I feel that should be sufficient. However, I realize that the powerful dairy interests, aided and abetted by the equally powerful milk combinations, livestock, and packing interests, will exert their utmost influence to defeat my amendment looking to this reduction in the amount proposed.

Mr. Chairman, I have devoted a great deal of time to studying this subject, and I regret exceedingly that I feel it to be my duty to call the attention of Members to the fact, among other things, that it is too far-reaching. As I stated last Friday on this floor, I have voted for and supported all these measures for extensions of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and in fact for all other measures designed to help agriculture, when I have felt the help was really necessary and that it would obtain for farmers a sufficient price for their products to leave them some profit for their labors. But today, when they are receiving, as I have said, from 200 to 400 percent more than they received for their commodities in 1932 and from 100 to 200 percent more than they received only 4 years ago, I feel there is no justification for voting these millions and millions of the taxpayers' money for the dairy interests, and livestock and packer combinations who twice have been indicted for conspiracy and wrongdoing and who are so hungry to make even greater profits that they continue to urge these additional hundreds of millions of dollars to put in their own jeans.

Most of the gentlemen from Wisconsin, Michigan, Nebraska, Minnesota, the Dakotas, and especially the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] have stated and restated that the Congress has pledged this additional financial help to the farmers to induce them to produce more milk.

They pointed out how badly food is needed to feed the Army and the civilian population. I restated that the prices farmers are receiving now and which they are permitted by the Office of Price Administration to receive, are high enough to be a sufficient inducement to them to put in large crops and also get all the milk they can from their cows. The gentlemen to whom I have referred are trying to make us believe that there is a shortage of food, including milk and cheese, and especially they point out the shortage of meat and butter. As to the last two commodities, I concede there is a shortage, but we have tremendous surpluses of all other agricultural commodities. Surely, there was a shortage of corn last year because the farmers refused to sell their corn, believing they would be able to obtain still higher prices, due to the magnanimity of Judge Marvin Jones, the War Food Administrator, and Mr. Chester Bowles, Price Administrator.

At that time we did have a great surplus of wheat, but by shrewd and selfish manipulation it was not permitted to be used as a substitute for the withheld corn.

## GRANTING UNDESERVED SUBSIDIES MUST STOP

I repeat, I want farmers to receive good prices for everything they produce, but I do not want them or the processors of their products to be receiving unjustifiably high prices and at the same time demanding millions and millions more from the Public Treasury in the form of additional subsidies for dairy and livestock products. In addition thereto, we are allowing farmers millions of dollars for feed; a reduction in transportation costs; supplying them with war-prisoner labor at very reasonable costs.

I hope these unjustifiable, unnecessary, unreasonable appropriations for undeserved subsidies will be stopped.

Every reasonable and well-informed man knows that milk was selling for 95 cents a hundredweight a few years ago, and now it is selling for \$2.75 a hundredweight, as I have heretofore pointed out. I have told you that synthetic cream is selling for 34 to 36 cents a pint. The same applies to cheese, eggs, poultry, and everything else that the farmers are producing.

I have also called attention to the high prices of meats, vegetables, and fruits. The President intended to hold down the prices of food and that is the reason he insisted on the payment of subsidies, but the farm- and dairy-interest lobbyists, the same as the livestock and packing-house lobbyists, are all crying for, urging, and demanding from the O. P. A. higher ceilings and from the C. C. C. greater subsidies.

I am informed that some of the farmers are ashamed to accept these subsidies,

and many manufacturers and businessmen feel that prices have gone high enough.

The biggest dairy interests, and the processors, of course, are receiving the larger portion of these subsidies; and I realize that, in spite of anything I may say or do now, in view of the lobbying activities of the dairy interests, and of these other special interests, the grainmen, livestock interests, vegetable producers' organizations, and meat packers will have their way in connection with this pending bill.

As to the packers, inquiry into their alleged heavy losses has so far been only perfunctory; and I urge that a deliberate, detailed, and thorough inquiry be made at an early date.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the price of meat has risen about 13 percent over the average price during the base period of 1936-39. During that base period the annual average earnings of the Big Eight packers was \$22,383,000 a year; and, note this, earnings of \$153,193,000 for the year 1944 alone—approximately seven times higher than the pre-war level, and their profits were three times higher, even after deducting taxes, than the peacetime average.

I wish I had conveniently at hand some statistics for this year, but apparently no conclusive figures are yet available to show the earnings of these packers since the beginning of 1945. However, with unprecedented numbers of livestock now available, with the exception of hogs, and the profits so great, no responsible and informed Government official will trustfully accept the assertions of some of those speaking for the packers and meat processors that they are confronted with ruin and will be forced out of business unless the present price controls and regulations of the O. P. A. are promptly modified or adjusted to their special advantage.

I again express the fear that if these unconscionable subsidies are continued we will have the same condition we had under Mr. Hoover when we spent more than \$500,000,000 in 1929 to keep up the price of wheat.

#### ADVISORY GROUPS

As I have stated, I have complete confidence in Judge Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator; Mr. Frank Hancock, president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, with both of whom I served here in the House; and Mr. Chester Bowles, able Price Administrator. All are able, honest, and sincere gentlemen, but they are surrounded by advisory committees and are being urged daily by the various special interests and combinations to hike the prices higher and higher and they find it extremely hard, almost impossible, to resist the pressure.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and others call attention to the losses that have been sustained due to spoilages. Naturally, when handling millions and millions of tons of perishable food some of it is going to spoil, as it does even in the best regulated and most efficient private companies and among experienced and cautious shippers.

#### GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS MUST BE TRUSTWORTHY

As to the charges or implications now afloat concerning the Commodity Credit Corporation, I have called attention to the fact that I feel that some of the Commodity Credit Corporation employees and officials, and some of the members of the advisory committees thereof, have not the interests of the organization or country at heart. I am sure that some of them have played into the hands of speculators, but in this connection I also know from experience in the fight I made in 1929 and 1930 against the stock exchange and board of trade manipulations that there are always some selfish men giving wings to groundless rumors which do not come from official sources but which are given out for the purpose of affecting the markets.

I shall soon introduce a bill for the imposition of heavy penalties upon anybody who makes these false reports or circulates them, or upon anybody who may give out advanced confidential official information before it is authorized to be given to the public generally. I am not going to contend that some of these officials, in whom we have complete confidence, may not have been misled by some of these advisory committeemen; in fact, I believe they have been in many instances, but I know further that whenever their attention was called to it, they endeavored to correct their action. I was, therefore, much pleased to hear the letter from Judge Marvin Jones read here, in which letter he assured the Congress that he is investigating alleged wrongdoing by anybody connected with the Commodity Credit Corporation or the War Food Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I must confess that the figures we have heard today, in addition to the figures shown in the hearings, leave me very much confused. It is pretty difficult to get any idea from these figures as to how much is really needed. In my opinion, the principal difference between the figures submitted by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott], and the figures in the record of the hearings which have been referred to by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Brown], is that the figures of the gentleman from Michigan apparently do not take into account any amounts which may be necessary to support the price of the basic commodities and other commodities upon which price supports rather than subsidies are in effect.

Undoubtedly we are going to need some additional funds for that purpose, but when you come to look at the figures in the record on page 47, showing the amount of stocks on hand at this time, you will find that there are over \$2,000,000,000 worth of farm commodities now owned or under loan by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Some of those loans are going to be liquidated, some of the stocks are going to be sold during the coming year. That money will go into the revolving fund and will be available for making new loans or acquiring new stocks. So I am constrained

to believe that we do not need \$2,000,000,000. It seems to me the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, however, should take care of the situation during the coming year, assuming that we extend the life of the corporation for 1 year only.

I call your attention to the further fact that \$910,000,000 of the figures which are in the hearings and which have been referred to by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Brown] are contingent figures based upon what may be necessary after VE-day. Of course, no one knows when this is coming after VE-day, and no one knows just what effect it may have upon commodity prices. I think perhaps if we do not take those figures into consideration we will still be safe and prudent, because if there are further amounts necessary as a result of changes after VE-day, the Congress will provide them if they are needed to make good our commitments.

Then as a final conclusion as to whether or not the amounts covered in the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan are sufficient, I want to read just an extract from the statement of Marvin Jones before the Banking and Currency Committee, which is shown in the hearings on page 71. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] asked the following question of Mr. Jones:

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask one question about this \$2,000,000,000 figure which I believe the Senate has reduced to one and a half billion dollars. What about that, Mr. Jones?

Mr. JONES. We preferred the \$2,000,000,000 because we felt, from the psychology of the situation, it was better to have an assurance, with this commitment lasting for 2 years, that we would have the full amount; that is, it would be desirable from every standpoint. The Senate committee took action cutting it to \$1,500,000,000. I think it is probable that that will be sufficient for the period intended. If it is not, we can come back and ask for additional authority. I should have preferred that it be \$2,000,000,000.

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

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. We have there the opinion of the head of the War Food Administration that they would have preferred \$2,000,000,000 for the 2-year period, but that they thought they might get along with one and one-half billion. Based upon that statement it seems to me that we are safe in adopting the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan, especially knowing that we will be in session most of the time and can come back and increase this amount if it is necessary.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if we want to aid and assist the farmers of this country permanently, we have got to do something different than we are trying to do here in this bill. May I quote from the remarks made by the President

of the United States in his acceptance speech of July 2, 1932? I quote:

We should repeal immediately those provisions of law that compel the Federal Government to go into the market and purchase, to sell, to speculate in farm products in a futile attempt to reduce farm surpluses.

If the President made that statement in order to reduce farm surpluses, he certainly would make the same statement or, at least, he should, in order to try to help the farmer secure a fair price for his commodities and his labor.

I have a great agricultural district, the finest in the land. I want to help the farmers, but I do not want to aid them for only 1 year now or for 2 years after the war. I want to aid them permanently. I want the farms on a sound business basis. The farmer does not want a hand-out or a dole. He wants a fair price for his commodities.

When I think of some of the things we do in order to get the farmers in that position, certainly I cannot acquiesce in the things we are doing here to help them, because I think we are only leading them to the greatest fall this Nation has ever seen, especially when the time comes that we cannot pay the farmers subsidies. You are taxing the farmer and giving him a hand-out. If you Members of Congress think for a minute that the time is always going to be here when we will have \$1,000,000,000, as was said awhile ago, to quibble over, or \$2,000,000,000, to quibble over, you will find that some day we will not have any dollars to pay the farmers any subsidies. A billion dollars to me is more than a quibble.

I heard John Brandt, president of Land O' Lakes, give an address at the Mayflower Hotel a few weeks ago. He deals altogether with farmers. He said: "The quicker we have the farmers get behind the Government's paying the cost of production and giving them payment for the hours they spend in working on the farm, the better it will be for the farmers." I quite agree with him, because then we will give the farmer a price for his commodity that will not drop down after the war is over, and he will be able to continue to furnish the foodstuffs this country and other countries of the world would like to have, at a fair price to the farmer. We should do it without paying the farmers a subsidy or a dole.

How many farmers in this country want to be on the charity of the Government? I say none of them. I do not believe in it myself. I would not want it for myself. What are they doing to me on my farm? They give me lime, they give me fertilizer, they give me a subsidy for milk, and they give me a subsidy for the program of the agriculture adjustment program this administration has adopted. I receive their checks, and I pay them out to charity, because I believe I can do more good with that money that way than if I turned it back to this administration to let them squander it. I would just like to give you a list of the money I have gotten for my farm in the last 2 years, and most every farmer gets subsidies in lime, fertilizer, or checks from a Treas-

ury that is drained dry. Farmers, wake up before it is too late; these checks cannot always come to you, but taxes can, and they will. So beware if you would save your farm.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman knows that while he was not here we did our best to stop these subsidies in the last session of Congress, but the President vetoed the bill.

Mr. RICH. Did the gentleman hear me read what the President said? Let me give the gentleman another quotation from the President.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. He did not mean it.

Mr. RICH. He does not mean it; no. He has fooled more people in this country than any man who ever lived.

The President said in his address at Atlanta, Ga., on October 24, 1932:

We are certainly paying enough for the Department of Agriculture to get something more useful than we are now getting. I have always proposed its reorganization. I am going to insist that we get more service for the farmers for less money.

Would not that make you laugh? What a joke he is making out of his promises. He has no respect for his word.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. May I point out that this measure is not in whole a measure to help the farmers, because \$913,000,000 of it is a consumer subsidy that is paid to the consumers of this country. If the farmers are going to produce food, they must be reimbursed for what is given to the consumers.

Mr. RICH. If we wanted to help the farmer we would get him what it costs to produce the food plus a profit for his time, for the articles he produces, and we would stop having to subsidize the farmers for their work.

Farmers, just remember some day you will be sorry for this procedure of subsidies. Farmers, you will not always receive subsidies but you will always pay taxes. Let us farmers fight for honest prices for our labor and for our produce. That is what we need and want and that is what I am for, to help the farmer and to keep our country solvent.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Reserving the right to object, may I say to the gentleman that I have been on my feet now for 1 solid hour seeking every 5 minutes to get recognition. I have not been able to get recognition for reasons best known to the Chair, and I have no objection; but I want to ask some questions about this proposition. There are a lot of things I do not yet understand, and I think there are a lot of men on this floor who do not understand the situation yet. Why does not the gentleman let us go on for just a little while?

Mr. SPENCE. We have been going on for quite a while. I have no disposition to close debate, but if we continue

at this rate we will not get through today.

Mr. KEEFE. I think we will get through much faster, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SPENCE. I withdraw the request, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that he gives prior recognition to members of the committee, and then alternates between the respective sides.

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

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the statement of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] and also in the letter which came down from the Chairman of the War Food Administration.

The gentleman from New York, Representative TABER, asked about soap. I notice that at page 1972 of the RECORD, March 9, the distinguished and able gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] included in his attack upon the Commodity Credit Corporation a charge that 20,000,000 pounds of lard in storage tanks at Cincinnati, Ohio, had been allowed to spoil and, therefore, had to be turned over to soapmakers for manufacture into soap.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] does well to raise question concerning this transaction. The inquiry he suggests should be pressed, I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will pursue it diligently, even after he begins to learn the facts.

Now my understanding of this affair differs somewhat from that of the gentleman from New York. In the first place I do not believe the Commodity Credit Corporation was at fault. I believe that the investigation the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] requests will show that the Office of Distribution in the War Food Administration exercised a controlling influence in what was done.

Now let us see what that was. Of course, I only report on the basis of hearsay evidence. I do not make charges. I will reserve accusations until the matter is investigated. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] demands investigation. I support him in that demand.

On hearsay, then, I suggest that perhaps the facts of the matter were something like this. A year ago lard was being produced in great quantities. It was a banner year. The War Food Administration claimed it could not find storage space for all the lard. Lard was removed from the rationing list. And lard, edible lard, was released to soapmakers for manufacture into soap.

This was done because, as I said, the Food Administration claimed there was not enough storage space for all the lard, and I do not want to be understood to confirm that claim. On the contrary it is one of the matters I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will seek to have investigated, because we and the whole wide world stand at this

moment in great need of additional fats and oils, both edible and inedible, and there are many in liberated nations of Europe who are desperately hungry for food fats, and for soap fats, but they shall not receive them from us because we cannot supply them in adequate quantities. Why we cannot supply them, within 1 year of the greatest fat glut in our domestic history is one of the things that needs to be investigated, very thoroughly investigated, and I trust the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is going to follow through on that to the bitter end. He will find me standing right by his side.

So, as I said, lard was turned over to soapmakers and they used it and made soap with it. Two hundred million pounds of edible lard went into soap, I understand.

By the fall of last year the glut of lard had disappeared. Indeed there was no glut but an increasing scarcity. What every economist in the Department of Agriculture knew very well in the spring of 1944, finally became apparent to the War Food Administration in the fall of 1944. A sharp reduction in hog breeding late in 1943 had resulted in a smaller number of baby pigs being born in the spring of 1944 and a sharply reduced supply of hogs to market in the fall of 1944.

So by November the lard glut had been turned into a lard shortage, and the War Food Administration on November 13, 1944, issued an order saying "No more edible lard is to be made into soap."

Now the soap industry had seen this 2,000,000 pounds of edible lard sitting in soap makers' tanks at Ivorydale, Ohio, and belonging to the War Food Administration. It wanted that lard because it wanted more soap to sell. Soap sales are profitable, very profitable, especially when sold at very fancy prices with very fine perfume to the American consumer. How profitable they are you only have to turn on your radio to discover. You will find endless, and I might say tedious, hours of soap entertainment—if you call it that—pouring out of your loudspeaker. And I do not need to tell any of you that those hours cost money. They cost plenty of money, and they are not being paid for by soap makers unless there is a good profit coming back to them as a result of that expenditure.

Well, mind you, when you have a commodity that is highly profitable to make and sell, and you want more raw material to make it with, there is likely to be some way to get hold of that raw material. A good profit is a strong magnet; it attracts unto itself that which has an affinity with it.

And, as I heard told—and again this is only a hearsay which the gentleman from New York and I are going to get investigated if we can—the soap companies did get that 20,000,000 pounds of edible lard.

Here is how they went about it: It so happens that the Army needs a lot of soap. It wants more soap, I understand, than the soap companies have been willing to sell it. The trouble with the Army is that it wants cheap soap, yellow bar soap. It wants this for its own use

and for civilian populations in Europe and elsewhere.

Now yellow bar soap is just plain, ordinary soap, good for washing and not good for much else. At any rate, it is not good for high-powered radio puffing at a high profit. The Army is a generous buyer, I am sure, pays a good price for everything, but obviously the Army is not paying the soap companies a price for yellow soap that is anything like so profitable as the dainty little smelled-up soaps and suds that are sold to housewives by means of the soap operas.

Knowing what comes first in the minds of so many manufacturers—and surely is not missing from the minds of soap manufacturers—I do not find it hard to understand why the Army had trouble getting enough cheap soap when there is such a fine market for expensive and highly profitable soap right here at home.

At any rate, as I understand and want the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to find out about, the soap companies promised the Army they would sell it more of the kind of soap it wants if it would get them that 20,000,000 pounds of edible lard owned by the War Food Administration and stored in tanks at Ivorydale.

Some time late last year—I am not sure when this was—the War Food Administration offered this lard to packers to be used as food. In December the lard was inspected by Government inspectors and found to be in need of reconditioning to make it suitable for food use. It was found that this could easily be done, and that 98 percent of the 20,000,000 pounds could be recovered as edible lard. So it was offered to the food trades on that basis, and the offer was accepted. It was just about to go back into our total supplies of food fats, where, as anyone can see now, it was badly needed.

That is when the soap companies stepped in. By offering to meet military soap requirements more adequately if the Army would do this little favor for them, they persuaded someone in the Army to go to the Office of Distribution and say that the Army wanted to buy that 20,000,000 pounds of edible lard.

The War Food officials complied. They canceled the arrangements to deliver it to the food trade and turned it over to the Army. Shortly thereafter, or to be exact, at 2 p. m., eastern war time, on January 18, 1945, the War Food Administration announced that "approximately 20,000,000 pounds of off-condition prime steam lard has been released to the Army." Further, the announcement said, the War Food Administration, acting as agent for the Army, was offering this lard to five soap manufacturers who had soap contracts with the Army, the amount each soap maker was to get being determined by Army allocation.

So that is how Mr. TABER's lard got to be turned into soap, and if he wants to investigate how it happened I want to suggest to him that he start with the soap companies to see by what kind of pressure, through what extremities, they were able to persuade the Army and the War Food Administration to turn edible lard into soap. If it will help him with

his inquiries, I can tell him what soap companies got that lard and how much went to each. Here they are:

|  | Pounds    |
|--|-----------|
| Procter & Gamble Distributing Co., Cincinnati..... | 8,600,000 |
| Colgate-Palmolive-Peet Co., Jersey City.....       | 6,045,000 |
| Lever Bros., Cambridge, Mass.....                  | 2,790,000 |
| Armour & Co. Soap Works, Chicago.....              | 1,865,000 |
| Manhattan Soap Co., New York....                   | 700,000   |

Now I want it to be very clearly understood I have made no charges against the soap companies, or the Army, or the War Food Administration. I have recited hearsay for the benefit of Mr. TABER's investigation, and I wish him Godspeed.

And by the way, it may be true that when this lard was delivered to soap companies, it was, as the War Food Administration said on January 18, "off condition." I have heard that U. N. R. R. A. learned that this lard was about to be taken out of the food supply and diverted to soap, and wanted it very badly for food use and tried to get it, and learned that it had been inspected not long before and was found, as I said, 98 percent edible after reconditioning. But U. N. R. R. A. possibly was no match for soap companies in getting what it wants. At any rate, it did not get it. Shortly thereafter, as I understand, the lard was denaturalized so that there would be no question then that it could not be used for food. After being denaturalized, soap was all it was good for.

I say we should have an investigation but we should place the responsibility. By the way it may be true that when this lard was delivered to the soap companies it was, as the War Food Administrator said on January 18, off condition. U. N. R. R. A. wanted that food but U. N. R. R. A. did not have, well let us say, the pull that the soap companies of this country had. It is about time we investigated this thing to find out exactly where the fault lies.

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

Mr. HOOK. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. If the lard had spoiled, what earthly reason would U. N. R. R. A. want it for?

Mr. HOOK. The lard was not spoiled. By a renovation process they could make it 98 percent edible, and only 2 percent would have been lost.

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly U. N. R. R. A. would not want any spoiled lard.

Mr. HOOK. But there was only 2 percent of it spoiled. They could have renovated 20,000,000 pounds and only lost 2 percent. Ninety-eight percent would have been edible.

Mr. BREHM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Is it not true, that the points on lard were raised to the consumers at the same time this lard was in storage and being permitted to spoil?

Mr. HOOK. That is right. The gentleman is absolutely correct and I wish to thank him for his able contribution.

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

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Wisconsin may proceed for 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to see if we cannot agree to close debate on this section and all amendments thereto.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes after the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has concluded.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to note that so many individuals are now pressing for an inquiry and demanding an investigation of the facts which were very sketchily disclosed on the floor of this House by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself recently. In order that they may be accommodated, may I say that I have prepared a resolution to cover this whole subject matter and it will be offered at a very appropriate time. Then all of the gentlemen who are so vociferously seeking to clear the air I hope will get behind that resolution and provide a very searching inquiry into the operations of all Government corporations as well as the Commodity Credit Corporation itself.

Mr. Chairman, I should like the attention of the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, if I may, because I confess to some confusion of thought, and I am satisfied that there are a lot of other Members on this floor who are confused in their thinking, and that the argument thus far has tended to increase the confusion rather than to clarify it.

With reference to the particular amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] called attention to the fact that the hearings on page 28 disclosed the attitude of the Commodity Credit Corporation in asking for an increase of their borrowing authority from three to five billions. The gentleman from Michigan seeks to cut that borrowing authority to \$4,000,000,000. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] seeks to cut it to \$4,500,000,000. There is the choice that now rests with the Congress. As one Member who has been somewhat critical of the operations of the War Food Administration and the Commodity Credit Corporation may I say that I think the spirit and purpose behind the law is one that cannot be dispensed with and that I would not support a motion to recommit this bill.

I believe that the farm support program that has been announced in the

way of a contract with agriculture in this country, must be carried out. The only question in my mind is how much borrowing authority does the Commodity Credit Corporation need in order to carry out its commitments?

If you will turn to page 28 of the hearings you will find that the Commodity Credit Corporation gave the committee these figures: Their estimated net obligations for loans, purchases and expenditures from November 1, 1944, to December 31, 1945, was \$2,178,778,000. You will note that is for a period of 14 months. For the period from November 1, 1944, to December 31, 1945, they say they will need \$2,178,778,000.

They further say that they have as against that obligation \$811,365,000 in available borrowing capacity as of October 31, 1944, and in addition they say they have \$21,448,000 in cash. They further say that they have an appropriation estimate pending before the Congress in which they are asking for \$256,765,000 to make good an estimated impairment in their capital structure.

Now here is what concerns me: This is a bill to extend the Commodity Credit Corporation for 2 years—2 years, not from October 31, 1944, but for 2 years from June 30, 1945. Please note that. They say, "We need a portion of this \$2,178,000,000 to carry us from June 30, 1945, to December 31, 1945." If I read the figures correctly, this proposed increase they are asking for will only carry them to December 31, 1945, which is 6 months of the 2-year period of extension. Am I right or wrong?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman is right.

Mr. KEEFE. Very well, I am right. Then what you are asking in effect is this: You are asking for \$2,000,000,000 of additional borrowing authority which it is estimated will only carry this Corporation through to December 31, 1945, and you are asking that the Corporation be extended for a year and a half further. What do you expect to do in the other year and a half? Do you expect to come back here and get additional borrowing authority?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. We will have to, and I thought everybody understood that.

Mr. KEEFE. All right; just so we understand it. Then you will expect on the same basis that the increase in borrowing authority sometime between now and December 31, 1945, will have to be extended another two or three billion dollars; is that right?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. No, sir. If VE-day does not come before then, we will not, but if VE-day comes before that time we will have to ask for more money. This \$910,000,000 is included in the \$2,000,000,000.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; the \$910,000,000, which is purely speculative as to what may happen in the event the war ends, is included in the \$2,000,000,000.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. But if you require \$2,178,000,000 to run your program for a period of 14 months, as contemplated by these figures, you will have to have, to conduct your regular program, in addition

to this speculative program, at least half again as much as that in order to carry out your program for the year and 8 months.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman understands that these are commitments already made.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand. But the point I am making is this: I cannot see where you are going to have money enough to carry this program through further than to December 31 this year; is that right?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. They certainly cannot pay the gentleman's dairy people or the other commodity growers nearly as much money—

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman misunderstands me. Please listen to what I say.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman is asking me a question and I will either answer it or not answer. I know the gentleman is a friend to the farmers and I will do my best to give him a correct answer.

Mr. KEEFE. Are you going to have more than enough money to carry you under this borrowing authority beyond December 31?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. If we do not get the \$2,000,000,000, we cannot carry out the commitments to the farmers, including the dairy people.

Mr. KEEFE. I am sorry the gentleman does not answer my question. I am not in opposition to the thing. I am seeking information. I hope the gentleman will take time to answer it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the afternoon the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] made a statement, in all sincerity, I am sure, but nevertheless an erroneous statement, which should not go unchallenged or uncorrected. The gentleman from Missouri said, in calling attention to the strikes in the insular island of Puerto Rico, that some people down there were opposed to increasing the subsidy paid by Commodity Credit there to a sum comparable to that in continental United States, because they wanted the Government to take over the sugar industries. The inference should not be that Governor Tugwell or other insular officials are opposed to either increasing the price or paying the higher subsidy.

As a matter of fact, in the last few days Governor Tugwell testified before the Committee on Insular Affairs in positive and strong terms in favor of increasing that subsidy and, in fact, said that it was an outrage that the insular sugar producers were not paid the same subsidy as in this country.

It must be said, however, in all fairness to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] that he was not present at some of those hearings. If these strikes down there continue and if a Federal administrator is appointed, it would not be fair for this House to be under the impression that the people in the island or Governor Tugwell were responsible. The full responsibility for the lack of higher payments of subsidies to the sugar industry

of Puerto Rico lies with the Commodity Credit Corporation here and not with any officials in the island government. All of the people from the island who attended the hearing that we had in the last few days testified in favor of it in the strongest terms possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to make a correction in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] and also our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], stated here on the floor that the administration, or that we as a Congress, have guaranteed a 90 percent parity floor for 2 years after the war is over. Of course, we have as far as the basic commodities are concerned, because they have loan provisions; and with that also goes basic legislation that controls that production. These nonbasic commodities do not have any guaranty of 90 percent of parity for 2 years after the war unless the Secretary of Agriculture so desires. I think that that should be made very clear not only here, but everywhere. I read many agricultural papers, and the information is going across the country that there is nothing to worry about; that the farms are going to get 90 percent of parity for 2 years after the war. If anybody is familiar with the production of food after the last war, he will find that most of our difficulties came in the production that took place after the war was over.

The facts should be given that these and loose statements about 90 percent of parity guaranty 2 years after the war.

Therefore, I do not think it is a good policy for the country to get the idea that they are guaranteeing that. I might say that this year they have limited the support of 90 percent of parity to some commodities, and limited it to the amount of the commodity that they want, which is surely in the line of reason, something that I think the War Food Administration should follow. It is a good policy to follow.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of urging the chairman or another member of the committee to answer the question propounded by the gentleman from Wisconsin a moment ago. I would like to know, How long will the money provided in this bill enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry on, on an efficient and effective operating basis?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Until the 31st day of December of this year.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Wisconsin was correct.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. They estimated in October or the 1st of November what it would take them to run them up to the 31st of December of this year, and their estimate was \$2,000,000,000. They estimated that on VE-day, if it came any time soon, they would need

\$910,000,000 to operate the Corporation to carry out its obligations to the farmers for 1 year, and that is included in the \$2,000,000,000. I think the main difference between what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] had in mind and this figure is the VE-day expectations.

Mr. COOLEY. Without getting into the discussion of VE-day, what I have in mind is this: Is the gentleman from Wisconsin correct in his summary of the situation, and is the gentleman from Georgia correct in his statement that the funds provided here will carry the activities until the end of this calendar year?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. If this is cut \$1,000,000,000 by the Wolcott amendment, have we not destroyed the Commodity Credit Corporation for the remainder of the year? I hope somebody will clear that up.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I trust this Congress and the country will understand that the legislation under consideration today, providing for millions and billions for food subsidies, is really a consumer food subsidy bill and not a farm subsidy bill. Our Government has put ceilings on farm products below cost of production. So the Government, through the Commodity Credit Corporation and other organizations, authorizes payments to make up what the farmer would otherwise lose, and to further stimulate the production of food. So the increase of \$2,000,000,000 requested is for consumer protection. So long as the limit or ceiling price on farm commodities is fixed below the cost of production, under the policy established by the Government, there is nothing else to do but provide subsidies to take care of the difference of what the producer would have been entitled if he had received a parity price for his products.

Mr. Chairman, the particular thing to which I want to direct your attention at this time is that the Commodity Credit Corporation is not the only Government agency that is disbursing subsidies from the Federal Treasury. We have another agency, the Defense Supplies Corporation that distributes millions and billions of dollars in subsidies. A big share of subsidies paid out by the Defense Supplies Corporation is to make up for what is known as the roll-back on particular items of food. Most of it really is paid to the meat packers and other food processors.

We have heard a lot of discussion today about the need of subsidies on milk and milk products. As a matter of fact we are going to need more subsidies than are now being paid if we are expected to keep up our production of milk in this country. We have been talking also about subsidies on butter, flour, meat, and sugar.

In order to make up for the so-called "roll back" price on butter alone, the Defense Supplies Corporation \$6,500,000 per month. Our Government has already expended approximately \$120,000,000 on butter "roll back" subsidies. Let

us look at flour. In order to hold flour in line, the processors are getting subsidies at the rate of seven and a half million dollars a month. We have already spent about \$90,000,000 in flour subsidies. Sugar has been mentioned. The Defense Supplies allocated approximately \$25,000,000 for sugar last year.

Now let us take a look at the meat situation. I mention that in particular because there is discussion about meat shortages, and about the ceiling price on live cattle as well as on the various grades of meat. You will recall that some time ago the O. P. A. "rolled" the prices of meat back. On beef it was 2 cents per pound. Do you know that the "roll back" on the price of meat has already cost the Federal Treasury \$650,000,000. Right now we are turning over to the meat processors, to take care of the "roll back," the sum of \$40,000,000 per month.

Mr. Chairman, incidentally here are some further figures that might be of interest. There is being spent from the Federal Treasury subsidies to the tune of \$2,500,000 a month on meat shipped to countries abroad. I assume mostly under lend-lease. Subsidies on butter shipped abroad cost approximately \$500,000 per month. Last year foreign shipments of flour cost our Government around \$4,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know the extent of the commitments of the Defense Supplies Corporation in subsidies. Perhaps some member of this committee can supply this information.

Mr. STEFAN. I think these commitments of the Defense Supplies Corporation would run about \$1,000,000,000. But that is in every category, including materials, and so forth. It is true it includes flour, meat, and butter. Those are some of the items.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank my distinguished colleague from Nebraska for this information. He is one of the diligent members of the great Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I feel the Congress and the people of this country ought to know we have at least two big corporations of Government dealing with, and paying, subsidies on certain foodstuffs and farm products. I believe a member of the committee in charge of this measure explained there had been a cost of \$838,000,000 under the Commodity Credit Corporation to support and stabilize the price of farm products. To make the picture complete, you will need to take into consideration the sum of \$860,000,000 to support the program of "rolling" them back. Do not forget it must all be paid in taxes. Why not have one agency, instead of two, deal with this problem. As it stands we have a sort of paradox. One agency disburses funds from the Federal Treasury to support and stabilize prices, the other distributes funds from the Treasury so it can "roll" the prices back.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there are only 2 questions involved here. One is whether or not we are going to authorize an agent to make a contract with producers and others

and then supply him with the funds with which to carry it out. I am struck with this situation in addition. The gentleman from Michigan has announced he proposes to offer an amendment to increase the dairy production subsidy payment from \$526,000,000 to \$568,000,000. Then, as appears on page 28 of the hearings, cheese will get \$18,000,000; fluid milk, \$14,000,000; and it would give dairy products \$600,000,000 of the \$1,000,000,000. Yet, the same gentleman who proposes to offer that amendment proposes to cut the money down from \$2,000,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000. It does not seem to me a proper position for 1 commodity to take \$600,000,000 and limit the funds to \$1,000,000,000. I believe there are, including the basic and war crops, between 25 and 30 crops which must be protected under this fund. It seems to me that it is improper for 1 commodity to take \$600,000,000, and you will get that on page 28 of the hearings, and then leave only \$400,000,000 for wheat, for corn, for cotton, and for all of the war crops. I would much rather see you vote to cut this authority down from 2 years to 1 year than to see you vote to cut this money from \$5,000,000,000 to \$4,000,000,000. I say to you quite candidly, from my study of this matter, I think it would be a very serious mistake.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to use these 2 minutes at my disposal for one purpose only, and that is to call the attention of the House to remarks made a few moments ago in debate on this bill by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. I tried to get him to yield to me at that time. I am sorry he did not yield to me because I dislike very much going back to a point previously made. If I am not misquoting, the gentleman from Pennsylvania at that time said the person who had fooled more Americans than any other person was the President of the United States. I am astounded that any Member of Congress should make such a remark. Now, ladies and gentlemen of the House, we can debate honorably on the floor of this House; we can debate issues; but when we are engaged in war, it is no time to make remarks like that in committee or on the floor of this House about the President of the United States. They reek of partisanship, prejudice, and politics.

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

Mr. OUTLAND. I certainly will.

Mr. RICH. I do not apologize for that statement in any sense of the word. I mean every word of it.

Mr. OUTLAND. The gentleman should apologize, however.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ROE].

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, having been engaged extensively in the grain business for the last 40 years, I am keenly interested in this question. To corroborate what the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] just said a few moments ago, grain is now being redeemed freely daily by the hun-

dreds of thousands of bushels. In our own bank we had Commodity Credit Corporation loans of nearly \$300,000. They are nearly all paid off.

We have two different propositions in this proposal. We have the support proposition for the farmers for their basic crops. I am in favor of that. We have the consumer subsidy proposition. I am opposed to that. It is absolutely unsound economically. I am going to vote for this amendment and the following amendment for this reason, that I want subsidies to stop just as soon as the war stops; and I hope that will be soon.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] is recognized.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to what I have been talking about for a long time in this House, namely, the fact that in the State of Nebraska there have been over 100,000,000 bushels of corn on the ground, much of it in danger of spoilage. I repeat that statement in order to get the attention of the War Food Administration in an effort on the part of the farmers, businessmen, and various organizations in Nebraska to save that corn and put it to some use. I understand some effort has been made to get us some cribbage material and additional box-cars, but that is not solving the question. I understand that 75 percent of that 100,000,000 bushels of corn is still on the ground and must be moved. It contains considerable moisture. I think it is vitally important for the War Food Administration and agencies of the Government to take some recognition of the fact that in Nebraska the farmers raised the corn that the Government asked them to raise, and that it is on the ground, in danger of spoiling.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. The same situation prevails in the State of Kansas and other States in the Southwest with respect to grain sorghums, and also corn. Unless we get some relief soon many millions of bushels of grain will be lost.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is absolutely right. That situation exists not only in Kansas and in South Dakota, but mainly in the State of Nebraska. I think something should have been done about it a long time ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, in 2 minutes I cannot begin to say how I feel the danger that would accompany the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], and at the same time advert to observations made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], to the effect that surely we have not reached the point where, in passing on this bill, we will try somebody that may have committed some wrong in the Office of War Food Administration or the Food Distribution Service. I think we might just as well authorize nothing as to authorize less than the \$2,000,000,000. Already since we have been in this House considering the bill and amendments offered, we have been told that instead of the need being \$2,000,000,000, it is \$2,178,000,000, with

the definite probability that if the war in Europe should come to an end that amount would be increased. The extension of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation has nothing to do with the amounts required in this authorization for borrowing. We will come to that when that time comes.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. What effect will the Wolcott amendment have, if adopted, upon the effective operation of the Corporation?

Mr. FOLGER. I will not make any "ifs" about it. In my opinion it will make it impossible for the War Food Administration to operate or the Commodity Credit Corporation to meet the obligations which it has already under authority of Congress, made with the farmers of this country, and led them to believe they would receive.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, this amount has been increased from \$2,000,000,000 for 2 years up to over \$2,000,000,000 for the balance of this year. It has gotten to the ridiculous stage, so let us get back to the figures. Who knows more about this program than Marvin Jones? But first let me say that the total losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the 4 years 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945, the last year being an estimate, are only \$1,208,098,481. They have under loan and owned, crops of the value of \$2,031,392,046.03, much of which will come back to them in cash when it is disposed of. All right, they have had losses of \$1,200,000,000 over 4 years. They have assets in warehouses and as security for loans amounting to \$2,031,000,000.

If you will turn to page 71 of the hearings, you will see where Marvin Jones testified as follows:

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask one question about this \$2,000,000,000 figure which I believe the Senate has reduced to one and a half billion dollars. What about that, Mr. Jones?

Mr. JONES. We preferred the \$2,000,000,000 because we felt, from the psychology of the situation, it was better to have an assurance, with this commitment lasting for 2 years, that we would have the full amount; that is, it would be desirable from every standpoint. The Senate committee took action cutting it to \$1,500,000,000. I think it is probable that that will be sufficient for the period intended.

Marvin Jones thinks \$1,500,000,000 is all right for 2 years. Surely \$1,000,000,000 is enough for 1 year.

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

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] is recognized for 2 minutes to close the debate.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, on page 3 of the hearings is the statement of Judge Jones who told the committee in commenting on the amount of money that was requested that \$2,000,000,000 additional authorization is needed by the Commodity Credit Corporation. I quote his language:

That is a considerable amount of money, but, as we see it, it is needed in

order to have assurance in advance that we will be able to comply with the policy laid down by the Congress, and it is a policy that I regard as a wise one.

It seems to me that many of these questions that disturb us because they are terribly complicated and hard to answer can often be resolved on the simple basis of faith in the man who administers the fund. It would be hard to find a man who holds the confidence of this Congress any more than Marvin Jones does. He has had legislative experience, he is a man of integrity, he is a wise man; and now he has had administrative experience. He states on the basis of that experience that the \$2,000,000,000 is needed.

On page 4 of the hearings he tells us why this money is needed, and then he does what every wise man does, to regard a figure as relative; and he places it against the enormous amount of money that we are spending for other munitions of war; and in the light of war costs it is a small amount of money. If all of the \$2,000,000,000 were lost to the Government it would be less than 2 weeks' cost of the war that is now in its fourth year; and I submit to the Congress that there is not any way for us to give assurance to the farmers of the country that the commitments heretofore made with them will be carried out except to continue this authorization for 2 years and to grant the full amount that Judge Jones says is necessary. The difference between dealing with industry and agriculture is that we can pay the manufacturer prescribed cash sums, we can make a contract with him, individually or at least with a few persons—but when we deal with six and one-half million individual farmers, the only way we can increase production is to lay out a plan, invite these six and one-half million farmers to make commitments and assure them that Congress will do its share by maintaining adequate prices. We must not weaken in those commitments which the Congress has previously made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment to the amendment be read again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment will be read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SABATH to the amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Strike out \$4,000,000,000 and insert \$4,500,000,000.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 109, noes 103.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. SPENCE and Mr. WOLCOTT to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 125, noes 154.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. The last paragraph of section 2 (c) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944, shall not apply to the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation designed to support prices or obtain production of agricultural commodities, or to absorb abnormal costs in connection with the transportation of agricultural commodities and foods.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, frankly, I feel very much relieved now that the Wolcott amendment is defeated. I am very much afraid the House did not fully appreciate the ultimate effect the amendment might have upon the operations of this very important agency.

I want to speak generally about the pending measure. Perhaps a motion will be offered to recommit the bill. Much has been said about rascality of some type or another in the Commodity Credit Corporation. I agree with what the gentleman from Kentucky said in opening this debate today. We are not now dealing with individual crooks or criminals. The issue clearly before Congress at the moment is the issue of the life or death of the one agency of the Government which has contributed more to the welfare of agriculture than perhaps all the other agencies of the Government combined.

Another important issue involved in this controversy is the faith and integrity of Congress itself. The question is whether or not we intend to redeem the pledges we have heretofore made to the farmers of this Nation. Certainly there can be no political considerations in deciding questions of this importance. I think the Republicans have exactly the same interest in this measure as Democrats. Certainly I could have no interest in the passage of this law that you and you and the whole House should not likewise have.

This agency serves not only those engaged in agriculture, as has been pointed out here and as is understood by all of us, it serves the Nation at large. Through the subsidy program it protects the consumers of the Nation. By protecting the consumers of the Nation in the manner in which they are protected, to that degree the forces of inflation are controlled.

Speaking of inflation, may I divert a moment from the bill to say that I am not in accord with the views of some of our farm leaders in America who are constantly warning the investing public against investing in farm lands in this Nation. They are telling the people that land values have reached inflationary proportions; that it is no longer safe to invest in farm lands; that such an investment will bring the investor to great

grief. I cannot be alarmed about inflationary farm values. Cotton, one of the great agricultural commodities of this Nation, is now selling below the cost of production, and is now being supported in a price program by the Government to the tune in an aggregate sum of \$100,000,000. I cannot get excited about the possibilities of land values going to inflationary levels when I realize that flax, another important crop, is selling below the cost of production; when I realize that the peanut crop of America, the entire production, is now being purchased by the Federal Government; and when I realize that other agricultural commodities are being heavily subsidized by the Government. Frankly, I do not believe that land values have reached an inflationary level. I believe that every acre of American farm land is well worth the price it will bring today on the open market. Yet these leaders of ours, some in and some out of Congress, are saying to the investing public, "Do not invest in farm land." Can you imagine the president of some public utility such as a power company or railroad company or even a banking institution, going on the radio, saying to the public, "Do not invest in the stock of this corporation; it has now reached inflationary levels." You and I know that such an officer would be faithless to his trust and would be dismissed. Yet, we from the agricultural sections, apparently countenance such propaganda as that which is being spread throughout the country warning the public not to invest in farm land. This measure, of course, is calculated to control the forces of inflation.

How can it be said that land values have gone to inflationary levels when we realize the fact that farm income has doubled in recent years and land values have not gone up in proportion nor even to where they were during the last World War.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I agree with the gentleman that land values, in most cases at least, are not now at inflationary levels. But the gentleman will recall that following the last war when we did really have inflationary land values, most of the increase took place after the war ended, and that at the present time land values have gone up further during this war than they did during the last war.

Mr. COOLEY. At the same time I will remind my friend of the fact that income on the farms likewise has gone up. I will remind the gentleman further of the fact that we did not control the forces of inflation during the last war and immediately thereafter as we are attempting to do today. Neither did our national debt reach the level it has now reached. The things that alarm me are items such as this which I saw in the press yesterday, indicating that some suggestion has been made that a ceiling of some sort be placed on farm land values or that some profit tax be imposed upon the farmer when he sells his property. Pray tell me how can there be any fairness in such a proposition?

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do I understand the gentleman correctly to have said that the Government is now purchasing the entire peanut crop?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And other crops?

Mr. COOLEY. The Government is purchasing the entire peanut crop and selling it at a profit of \$13 a ton.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the Government can do that, how do you figure that farm values are going to fall, if the Government is going to purchase the farm crops?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman must have misunderstood me. I have not suggested that farm values were going to fall. They will not fall. They are going up.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They will not fall because the Government is going to purchase the crops after cutting the price; is that it?

Mr. COOLEY. No, sir. I do not think they are going to fall under our present economy nor immediately in the post-war period.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield briefly.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Is it not true that Secretary Wickard has proposed legislation that would take 90 percent of the profit on any increased value on farm land, though other corporations get away with 25 percent?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know about that. No such a bill or suggestion as that has been brought to my attention. Certainly, it would not be seriously considered by the Congress. With reference to this subsidy program, I am interested primarily, of course, in the tobacco crop. I am interested in cotton. I am likewise interested in the peanut crop and in naval stores. On those four crops, gentlemen, the Government has made money under this program. On peanuts, in round numbers, \$10,000,000; on cotton, in round numbers, \$106,000,000; on tobacco, in round numbers, \$8,000,000; and on naval stores approximately \$4,000,000. That is where the profit has been made. Money has been lost on other crops but I am sure that much good has been accomplished.

Just one more word about inflation: If we are not able to maintain land values and commodity prices at or about present levels, and if we are not able to maintain our national income at or about the present level, we cannot pay the national debt, which is steadily mounting. We must, therefore, maintain a high national income and to do that we must have a continuity of employment, high land values, and commodity prices.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, it looks as though we will be going until about 7 o'clock. I am going to object to any extension of time under the 5-minute rule. We must clear this bill tonight if we can.

#### AN ATTEMPT TO SUPPRESS THE PRESS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Labor Digest, purporting to be published

in behalf of labor at Indianapolis, Ind., finds the National Labor Relations Board on its trail.

It appears to be an independent labor publication, published monthly. It carries an editorial on the first page of its February 1945 issue, stating that it is in agreement with William Green, John L. Lewis, and the Tobin leadership of the teamsters' union on the proposition that the National Labor Relations Board is not all it pretends to be.

It calls attention to the fact that Lewis and many A. F. of L. leaders are now demanding repeal of the National Labor Relations Act, and then charges that an examiner for the N. L. R. B., Dorothy Craig, is touring the territory served by the Labor Digest, on Government salary and at Government expense, slandering the publication to its advertisers and subscribers because the N. L. R. B. does not agree with the editorial policy of the paper.

A letter from Miss Craig, dated January 19, 1945, on the stationery of the National Labor Relations Board, St. Louis, Mo., addressed to the H. A. Douglas Co., Bronson, Mich., reads as follows:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,  
St. Louis, Mo., January 19, 1945.  
H. A. DOUGLAS CO.,  
Bronson, Mich.

GENTLEMEN: I am investigating a matter involving an Indianapolis publication, edited by Norman A. Zolezzi, called the Labor Digest. Investigation discloses that employees of your company have in the past received this newspaper at their correct addresses. Would you please advise me whether or not the subscription was paid for by the company, and, if so, when were these payments made? Since the company may not have subscribed or placed ads in the newspaper in the past few years, I should appreciate it if you would check your files back to 1937. Please designate whether payments were for ads or subscriptions.

I should appreciate your prompt attention to this matter.

Yours very truly,

DOROTHY L. CRAIG, Field Examiner.

That letter was called to my attention and I addressed a letter to the National Labor Relations Board at Cincinnati and at Washington, enclosing a copy of a letter received from the editor of the paper, complaining of Miss Craig's activities, and asking as to the objective of Dorothy L. Craig in making inquiries of the advertisers of the Labor Digest as to ads inserted by them and as to their subscriptions to that paper.

On March 6, I received an answer from the Washington office of the N. L. R. B., stating, among other things, that:

The sole purpose of the inquiry made of the Douglas company was in connection with the investigation of a charge filed by the United Furniture Workers of America in our St. Louis regional office. That charge alleges that Norman A. Zolezzi and others specifically named have engaged in and are engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of section 8, subsections (1) and (2) of the National Labor Relations Act by dominating and interfering with the formation and administration of Tri-State Wood Workers, Local No. 1, a labor organization, and by carrying on a campaign of vilification of bona fide labor organizations, and favoring an employer-dominated labor organization through the medium of the Labor Digest.

From what congressional enactment does the N. L. R. B. get authority to supervise the editorial policy of the Labor Digest or its editor?

Where does it get authority to attempt to destroy the circulation of that paper?

Whatever other purpose Dorothy may have in mind, it is quite evident that one of the results of her inquiries—the inevitable result—is to lessen the circulation of the paper; to intimidate, if that be possible, its editor.

To get more of the facts, I today introduced a privileged resolution directed to the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board.

To me it would appear that Dorothy Craig, an examiner for the N. L. R. B., is attempting to aid a C. I. O. labor union in its organizing campaign; is endeavoring to muzzle the Labor Digest, to diminish the revenue it receives from advertisers; in short, to intimidate all who oppose the C. I. O. activities of the Tri-State Wood Workers, Local No. 1, of St. Louis, Mo.

On the theory advanced by the N. L. R. B. here in Washington, its examiners have the right to control the editorial policy of any paper which ventures to express an opinion which may be in conflict with that held by the Board's examiners or by the members of a union.

Apparently the Board claims the right to go around to the advertisers of a daily, weekly, or monthly publication and ask them whether they subscribe to the paper and their purpose in so subscribing, if they do.

Apparently it also claims the right to intimidate advertisers of any publication by threatening to show that those publications, if given to or circulated among employees, make the publisher a conspirator engaged in unfair labor practices within the meaning of the National Labor Relations law.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on the 1st day of April, the farmers of the New York milkshed will receive a body blow which will well-nigh put them out of business for the rest of the war program. I refer to a reduction in the subsidy being paid on milk, from 80 cents to 35 cents per hundred pounds on milk produced. When I say the New York milkshed I can refer in like manner to every part of the country. They are all getting about the same treatment. I cannot be reconciled to the statement I heard here today, and which has been constantly made on this subject, that the dairymen are being helped by this bill. If the policy of reducing milk subsidies by over 50 percent is carried out after April 1 every dairyman will be on the spot and will have to sweat to survive his increased production costs.

Only today I received a letter from Mr. Fred H. Sexaner, the president of the Dairymen's League Cooperation Association, a cooperative which takes care of the whole New York milkshed. He says that the farmers of that milkshed will lose \$7,500,000 under the new program that is contemplated after April 1.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am very much interested in what the gentleman says but did I observe correctly or incorrectly when I thought I saw the gentleman going down the line voting to reduce the amount of money authorized for this corporation?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman saw correctly, but let me remind him I have had no assurance on the floor or any other place that the subsidy policy will be continued as it is going at the present time. I will vote an increase when I am assured there will not be a reduction of over 50 percent in milk subsidies if we vote to increase this bill to \$5,000,000,000.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Does not the gentleman think the dairy farmers will be tremendously interested in his vote to reduce that amount?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The dairy farmers know where I stand and I will be on record in their favor. I will show the gentleman when I cast my vote for increased subsidies for the dairy farmers. However, I would like to have him answer me on the floor, or someone else if he cannot, what policy will be inaugurated after the 1st of April. Are they going to reduce the milk subsidy from 80 cents to 35 cents? That is what they said they intend to do. Or will they raise it to \$1 per 100 pounds as I have advocated for so long? I would like to see a subsidy of \$1 prevail after the 1st of April.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I do not think I can answer nor can anyone else answer what the reduction will be after April, but it is better to put enough money in the bill to pay these farmers than to vote on the other side and perhaps not have enough money to pay them.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. There has been no assurance that there will be any attempt to keep the subsidies the way they are being paid out at the present time. The policy which has been announced by the War Food Administration states exactly the opposite. I think, if I understood the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] correctly, he mentioned that there would be enough money to play with, even if the amendment which he offered was not adopted. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri, I am ready to vote for an increase if it will go to the farmer. There would be enough money anyway for the present subsidies on milk to be paid.

I wish this program would be kept in effect. I hope that somebody will be able to answer the question I have asked again and again. Why is it necessary to cut the milk subsidy from 80 cents to 35 cents per 100 pounds after the 1st of April? I would like to have that question cleared up, and I hope somebody will answer it before we get through. To this very minute, my question has not been answered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall] has expired.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words,

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

#### NO POST-WAR LEND-LEASE

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, last week five of us on the Foreign Affairs Committee filed a minority report on the lend-lease extension bill voted out of our committee. We urged that lend-lease should be confined to the war effort and not extended into the post-war period as a measure for relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom], chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, has announced today the text of an amendment to H. R. 1013, the lend-lease extension bill, which was unanimously adopted by our committee today and will be offered on the floor tomorrow as a committee amendment. I wish to announce that this amendment meets the objections of the minority, and, in fact, carries out the specific recommendations in the minority report, which said:

For unity we should confine its extension to the field in which we are all united on lend-lease, as a mutual war-aid measure.

Over the week end I helped to draft the amendment the committee unanimously approved this morning. It carries out in appropriate legal language the suggestions in our minority report:

To provide specifically that no agreements for post-war relief, rehabilitation, or reconstruction should be made. \* \* \* That agreements should be made for the post-war purchase by foreign governments of war materials furnished or agreed to be furnished by our country for use in the prosecution of the present war.

Insofar as Congress can define a policy for administrative purposes the committee amendment limits lend-lease to the war period and prohibits lend-lease as a post-war policy.

I congratulate the majority of the committee upon their willingness to consider our suggestions, and I believe this amendment will be accepted overwhelmingly in the House.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Wolcott: Page 3, line 6, strike out all of section 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 3. The last paragraph of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944, shall not apply to the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946: *Provided*, That the making of subsidy payments and the buying of commodities for resale at a loss, by the Commodity Credit Corporation, shall be limited as follows: Obligations for making such payments and absorbing such losses may be incurred and paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation (a) in such amounts as may be necessary (1) to complete operations with respect to 1944 and prior year crop programs and (2) to fulfill obligations incurred prior to July 1, 1945, with respect to 1945 and prior fiscal year noncrop programs; and (b) in amounts which do not involve subsidy payments or

losses in excess of (1) \$568,000,000 for operations during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, with respect to the dairy production payment program, (2) \$120,000,000 for operations during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, with respect to other noncrop programs, including the feed-wheat program, and (3) \$225,000,000 with respect to the 1945 crop program operations: *Provided*, That not to exceed 10 percent of each amount specified in clauses (b) (1), (2), and (3) shall be available interchangeably for the operations described in such clauses but in no case shall the total subsidy payments and losses absorbed under any one of such clauses be increased by more than 10 percent.

"*Provided further*, That in carrying out the dairy production payment program, beginning April 1, 1945, the rate of payment per pound of butterfat delivered shall not be less than 25 percent of the national weighted average rate of payment per 100 pounds of whole milk delivered."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, that is the amendment I thought I was agreeing to some time ago. While I cannot speak for the committee, because it has not been formally presented to it, the amendment meets with the approval of the Commodity Credit Corporation and it meets with the approval of the membership of the committee so far as I have been able to consult with them and is acceptable.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment to the Wolcott amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE to the Wolcott amendment: Following the Wolcott amendment insert a new provision as follows: "*Provided further*, That any schedule for subsidy payments for milk and butterfat shall be upon a uniform basis and shall be in effect for a period of at least 12 months after announcement."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have tried to make it clear that the purpose of the Commodity Credit Corporation in handling these subsidy programs must be preserved and that it must have sufficient funds with which to operate. I could not maintain any other position than that.

This amendment goes to the very heart of the proposal in this subsidy program for the dairy farmers of this country. Let me show you what I have in mind. The Commodity Credit Corporation and the War Food Administration have announced their subsidy program for the current year ending December 31, 1945. At the present time they are paying subsidies in a range of scale from a low of 60 cents per 100 to a high of 90 cents per 100. Beginning on April 1 and carrying through to June of 1945, that scale will drop from a low of 25 cents a hundred to a high of 55 cents a hundred. In July it will be from 35 cents to 65 cents and from October to December it will go back to 60 cents low to a high of 90 cents.

That range of payment means simply this: Take, for instance, the State of Wisconsin; at the present time the farmers are receiving 60 cents a hundred for milk. That subsidy will drop on April 1 to 25 cents a hundred for milk. It will go up to 35 cents on July 1 and it will go back to 60 cents on October 1.

Down in Alabama the subsidy payments at the time the Wisconsin farm-

ers are receiving 60 cents is 90 cents, in Arizona, 70 cents, in certain counties in California it is 80 cents, in other counties it is 70 cents, in Connecticut it is 80 cents, in Delaware 70 cents, in Florida 90 cents, in certain other States 70 cents, in Massachusetts 80 cents, and so on down the line.

The point I am trying to make is this: The War Food Administration in determining the payment of these subsidies says that there are two factors entering into this variation in payment. They say, for example, that in Minnesota where they pay a subsidy of 60 cents and in Arkansas where they pay a subsidy of 70 cents there is a variation in labor costs as well as a variation in feed costs which accounts for this differential.

I have a table before me furnished by the Department of Agriculture which shows the labor costs in each one of those cases.

I defy anybody with a sense of fairness to examine those figures and show how there can be a reasonable justification for this differentiation in these subsidy payments. The amendment which I am offering simply means that these subsidy payments will be placed upon a basis of equality. There are only four States in the Union that would be affected, according to my computation, in any way by the proposal I have offered. It would put the producers of milk on a basis of equality. Can anyone say that if a subsidy of 60 cents is paid to the farmers of Wisconsin, that the milk which they produce is not as valuable in the war effort as that produced by the farmers in Florida, who receive 90 cents a hundred, where the wage scale in Wisconsin is more than double the wage scale in Florida?

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Can the gentleman tell us something about the comparative value of dairy feed in the different sections? He has mentioned labor, but he failed to mention the feed as a factor.

Mr. KEEFE. As to feed being a factor, may I say that time will not permit me, and I do not want to be diverted to go into that, for I only have 5 minutes. But we have made a pretty fair examination and estimate of that situation, and I say that when you take the factor of labor and set it alongside of the feed factor, there is no possibility, in my judgment, of justifying these differentials that are to be found in the War Food Administration announcement.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. And also the factor of weather.

#### IN OPPOSITION TO AMENDMENT TO WOLCOTT AMENDMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is adopted to the Wolcott amendment, the chairman of the committee the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] says that

he will be under no further obligation to support the Wolcott amendment. He will be opposed to it and I will too, as well as other Members on our side. It would ruin the amendment entirely. We expect to support the Wolcott amendment if this amendment is not tied on. This amendment cannot be discussed intelligently in 5 minutes. It is a far-reaching amendment. We have never had a hearing before our committee on it. We do not know how far it goes. The gentleman did not present his proposal to our committee in order that we might give it consideration.

I appreciate the fact that one should be on the alert to help the people in his own State and in his own district, and I congratulate the gentleman for trying to help his own dairy farmers. It so happens that Wisconsin will be helped, that is true, but I dare say there are other States that will receive a reduction in dairy production payments. If the Keefe amendment is adopted it will probably reduce the production of dairy products in the following States. This information was given to the chairman of our committee the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the War Food Administration. So while Wisconsin will get an increase, these States will have a reduction in price and probably a reduced production of dairy products.

Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, Arizona, Nevada, California, Oregon, and Washington. Those 31 States will have definite reductions at once. So I do not think this amendment should pass. It will be very harmful to the industry. There has never been a charge to my knowledge that Mr. Marvin Jones, of the Commodity Credit Corporation, has been unfair and arbitrary in fixing—

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I am sorry; I cannot yield now.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am going to make that charge right now.

Mr. PATMAN. Has been unfair and arbitrary in fixing these rates. The gentleman from South Dakota makes a charge, so he is one. Possibly there are many others; I do not know. But, anyway, if we do not get the prices that we want, sometimes we are prone to exaggerate just a little bit about the unfairness of the entire program. Certainly we do not want to adopt an amendment here on the floor which we do not know how far it goes. We appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from Wisconsin and know that he looks after the interest of his constituents. I congratulate and commend him for it, and I know he is sincere in placing this amendment before the House. But he has not given us an opportunity to consider it the same as he has considered it. So I suggest to him that he introduce a bill and let it

come before our committee, and I suggest that the chairman will be glad to give him a hearing on it, and let us go into it, see how far it goes, and see how it will affect the entire production. This is no time to cut down production. This is the time to increase production. This amendment, if I have the information correctly, will have a tendency to and probably will reduce production of dairy products in this country and seriously affect the dairy farmers in 31 different States.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman have any objection to the proposal that would provide that the announcement of subsidy payments shall be for a period of 12 months?

Mr. PATMAN. I would love to hear the gentleman on that before the committee, where we could hear the other side, if there is another side. Sometimes things sound very good on this floor, and we do not have the other side; we do not have all the information. That is the object of the committee hearing. If the gentleman will present that to the committee—and I know he will present it in a very effective and intelligent way—then if there is another side to it, we can get the other side and bring it over here in the form of printed testimony, and every Member can take this testimony and read it and be in a position to vote intelligently on it.

Mr. KEEFE. I submitted both of these amendments to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SPENCE. Not until long after the hearings; not until the day before yesterday.

Mr. KEEFE. Was I incorrect in the assumption that the gentleman would have no objection to that part of the amendment which provided that the announcement of the dairy payments should be for a 12 months' period?

Mr. SPENCE. I expressed no opinion about the gentleman's amendment, except that I was opposed to the amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Do not ask us to bring up something here that we know so little about, and ask us to vote on it and make it a part of the law, when we have had no hearings on it. We have had no testimony except just the word of the gentleman. I am not disputing him, I am not saying he is not correct, but I want to know all about it before I vote on it. I hope the gentleman will not insist on it.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. The gentleman said 31 States would suffer. Is Kentucky listed in there any place?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; I think Kentucky is, but I am not sure.

Mr. CHELF. The gentleman did not call it.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on

the Wolcott amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I tried to appear before this committee and give the facts that the gentleman is now saying he does not have. I want the privilege of giving these facts to the House.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment to the Wolcott amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the Wolcott amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has the following Members listed as those seeking recognition: Mr. VOORHIS of California, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Mr. GROSS, Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. Do I understand the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is that the time on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto, shall be limited?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; that debate close in 20 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment to offer to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] cannot offer a further amendment until the pending amendment, which was offered by him, is disposed of.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Chair note that I am on my feet as one of those seeking recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be so noted.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Do I understand the interpretation of the Chairman with regard to the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], is that it covers the Keefe amendment and all amendments thereto?

The CHAIRMAN. It covers the Wolcott amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet seeking recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be included in the list.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet seeking recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The name of the gentleman will be added to the list.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, is it to be hoped that the Wolcott amendment will be adopted? I trust that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] will also be accepted. About one-third of the milk supply which goes into commercial channels of this country comes from 3 or 4 Northwestern

States. Those States have been discriminated against so far as the ceiling price to the farmers is concerned. On the average, the State of Wisconsin farmers received about 59 cents less per 100 pounds for their milk than the farmers of the other 47 States of the Union. Undoubtedly, the same ratio is true as to Iowa and Minnesota.

That is a differential which has been fixed by another administrative bureau, so that the 60 cents subsidy which the Wisconsin farmers have been supposed to be receiving for milk does not bring up the price of their milk to the average throughout the country.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has enumerated a number of States which would have a reduction in subsidy if this amendment were adopted. However, he fails to state that it is the higher prices which the farmers of those States receive for milk which bring up the average price for the whole country. Iowa, to get the same average price of other States, leaving Wisconsin out of the computation, would have to have at least 65 cents merely to equalize that differential in price.

The purpose of this subsidy program is supposed to increase production. I can say to you people that out in the Northwest, where the larger part of your milk comes from, there is going to be a steady decline in production. In the last 3 weeks, in my own district, which is one of the largest districts of the Northwest, there have been not less than 100 farm auction sales. Only this morning I received an urgent letter from a man by the name of John Carter, a Republican, a prominent businessman of Menominee, telling me there are going to be 7 farms vacant on one highway in the midst of that very rich farming section, all relatively close to each other.

He wanted to know if something could not be done about it. I am not so sure there is anything that can be done at this time about those particular farms, but even with the incentive payments, which by the way are consumer subsidies and not farm subsidies, of 60 cents per 100 pounds, the farmers are selling off their stock and leaving their farms, and many farms will be idle.

Another phase of this situation is that some of this same milk, for which the farmers of our State receive a less amount in subsidies after April 1, when it is going to be only 25 cents per 100 pounds, is shipped out by the large dairy companies into eastern States where they have a higher price and a higher subsidy, and is being sold on the consumer markets in the eastern States on the same price level with that milk which receives a higher subsidy and a higher price, produced in nearby sections.

It does seem to me if we are going to increase production, or if we are going to hold up production, something must be done so that the farmers out there in the Northwest shall receive equality of treatment as far as these payments are concerned.

There is another angle to this situation. There is a great shortage of butter in this country, and it is getting worse every

day. That shortage of butter is largely due to the fact that under the so-called subsidy system a higher subsidy has been paid for milk which goes into cheese, whole milk sales, and whole milk powder than for butter. The effect of that 6 or 7 cents a pound more for butter fat for those commodities is being reflected in the lessened butter production.

Unless something is done, in another year there will be a very serious situation as far as dairy products are concerned. They are highly important. They are not only important to the health of the people of this country, but they are of vital importance to the health of our armed forces. Thirty-nine percent of the food cost for the armed forces is for dairy products.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to address my remarks to the Keefe amendment. It ought not be adopted and I will tell you why. The gentleman who just preceded me said the purpose of the subsidy was to increase production. That is only one of the purposes. Another purpose of the subsidy is to prevent inflation, but the principal purpose of the subsidy was to enable the dairymen to operate without a loss.

You will remember when the first stabilization act was passed there was a provision in there that the price-fixing authorities could not fix the maximum price of certain agricultural products below parity. At that time the price of feed products or dairy feed was away below parity. Under that act the price of feed rose to a considerable extent. While the price of feed was rising the maximum ceiling price on milk did not rise. It remained where it was. In various parts of the country feed can be raised much cheaper than in other parts. In Detroit, Mich., they can make automobiles a great deal cheaper than we can make them down South. Down South we can raise cotton cheaper than you can in Michigan. You know and I know that the price of dairy feed varies in various parts of the country. The Commodity Credit Corporation has made a study of the varying prices of feed products in various parts of the country. They have found that in some parts of the country dairymen have to buy their feed, whereas in others they are able to grow it. By reason of the fact that they have to buy it in some places, those who had to buy it would have been crushed to death if it had not been for the subsidy. By reason of the investigation of the Commodity Credit Corporation different subsidies are allowed in different States to make up the differential in the cost of producing that feed. If the Keefe amendment were adopted it would crush the farmers in those States where subsidies would be decreased. The gentleman addressed his remarks to the difference in the cost of labor. He did not have time to answer the question of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], who asked him to direct his attention to the difference in the feed cost. He said he did not have time to do that. If he had had time and if he

had called to your attention the diversity in the cost of producing feed in various parts of the country, his argument would have fallen of its own weight and he would have proven conclusively that his amendment should not have been adopted.

I hope it will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Gross] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to more ridiculous arguments on this agricultural subsidy here today than I ever thought I would have to. The farmers of the country are laughing at the ignorance displayed in this House on this matter. Here comes a gentleman from the South pleading for us to help the poor peanut growers, and then telling us in the same breath that the Government has taken their entire production and they are making \$13,000,000 out of it. It is ridiculous that such a statement should be reported to a body that is supposed to have the intelligence this body has. Why did not the Government let the growers make those millions?

The farmers in my district are not asking for this milk subsidy. I know of one man who has refused a \$700 subsidy on his milk. This paternalistic Government is simply trying to throw the money around like the Lord causes the rain to water the earth, thinking they will get votes. Behind it all is the desire to get votes on the part of the administration and on the part of Congressmen who are voting for such programs. This will not help the farmer any more than putting a ceiling price on cattle helped him. I was on the fat-cattle market this morning, and well-finished cattle were bringing just a dollar and a half below the ceiling because nobody would recognize that they were thoroughly finished. The Government is penalizing the farmer on the one hand yet trying to help him on the other. Because of the ceiling on hogs there were not enough hogs to make a market. The black market is getting the livestock.

As far as the milk subsidies are concerned, in Wisconsin they make the cheapest milk in the country. There comes an up-State Representative from New York demanding 100-percent milk subsidy. Ridiculous. I know what I am talking about. What we need is for this administration to be honest with itself and with the people, for the Congressmen to be honest with themselves and the people they represent. Admit the facts and be guided accordingly. The many farm sales talked of is the regular spring procedure. If the farmers need so much help now where will the help come from in the post-war period? At the many farm sales now being held livestock and equipment is selling high and farmers are paying cash. That speaks for itself.

To boast about farmers paying their loans from Commodity Credit is foolish; you must remember they paid because they had the good fortune of a rising market, and the rising market was due to the war and not because of anything the administration did during the preceding 12 years. And still the Commodity

Credit lost a lot of money. Had we not had a war only God knows how much money it would have cost the taxpayers. If the whole subsidy program were thrown out of the window the farmer would be better off, feel more independent, and the taxpayers would be relieved.

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

The gentleman from California [Mr. Doyle] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I cannot fail to speak extemporaneously for the 2 minutes allotted to me in this important debate. I speak in behalf of the great dairy industry of the great Eighteenth Congressional District of my native State of California. Regardless of what the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has just preceded me, had to say about milk producers not asking for or needing subsidies to survive, one of the first important groups in my district which called upon me after my election to this high post was a responsible group of leaders of the dairy industry from that portion of Los Angeles County which I represent in this House, and which group also included responsible leaders of this vital industry from other portions of this great county of Los Angeles as well. Gentlemen, they made it emphatic and clear that the dairying industry in this time of global war with its emergencies, demands, and necessary controls could not survive very long unless they continued to have subsidies on their production. I shall therefore vote against the proposed amendment, which would take away all, or practically all, of their subsidies. I shall vote for the bill which not only does that which is so vital to the dairy industry in my district, but likewise protects the Nation against an apparent result of slight inflation, at least, if the bill is defeated.

For your information, the Eighteenth Congressional District of California contains the great shipbuilding industries of Consolidated, Craig, and the great aircraft industries of Douglas and Consolidated Vultee, and the great naval base named Roosevelt, and the great naval drydocks—the largest in the world. The total war workers population of these industries and plants above enumerated, together with thousands upon thousands of war workers in lesser war plants and industries numerically, but not strategically, must be computed in figures around at least 200,000. Besides these already there, the great and rapidly rising population, as a result of the influx to southern California, the thousands upon thousands every month from most of the States you gentlemen represent, in order to aid in the war effort, indicates the strategic importance of the Eighteenth Congressional District, as to population, as to war production, as to housing problems, as to food necessities. In one corner of my district is the great dairy industry of which I speak. It produces the sinews of war in the content of milk and dairy products. It is equally important with ammunition. Wars must cease. We cannot aid the war effort by now upsetting the economy of the dairying industry.

The dairies of the great Eighteenth Congressional District of California, which I have the honor to represent, as well as dairies throughout my native State; the men and women of the armed forces as are located in California; and thousands and thousands of war workers in my district working hard in essential war industries will be affected if this bill fails to pass. It is presently an order providing for payment of adjusted dairy feed payments to milk producers and will expire March 31, 1945—so the War Food Administration interpreted that the Price Control Act of 1944 only permits payments of a subsidy if that program of production was provided for at the specified time the act was finally passed.

In southern California the dairy subsidies vary from 55 cents per hundred pounds for a short period to 90 cents per hundred pounds for a short period. In April 1944 War Food Administration gave notice that faith payments to dairies could be continued for only 11 months; but this assured producers the necessary financial aid to guarantee a steady flow of milk until the expiration of 11 months. This 11 months ends March 31, 1945—the 31st of this very month.

There is no question but that dairy-feed subsidies must absolutely be continued. Milk is basic food for civilians, the armed forces, at home and abroad, our allies, and to the nations we have already and will liberate. The great dairying industry of my congressional district is needing their checks from War Food Administration every month instead of every 3 months, as is the present practice—not every producer of milk—but many. I find the administration of this necessary security for a steady flow of milk is very cooperative, and Mr. Dodds told me this very morning that they would try to see that this further cooperation is extended. Congress must not break faith with this great section of agriculture.

We must defeat this amendment, which would almost immediately react with destruction to great dairying interests and to the supply of food and necessities in my district.

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

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Murray] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, there is no Member who can stand here and justify a difference in subsidy on this milk who wants to be fair minded, who wants to be honest about it. When you talk about the fixed price of milk you must realize that that was pretty well established before we got into the war. But on this subsidy question there is no man who can give any logical reason why there should be any difference in subsidies. Of course out in the State of Washington they have a labor scale of \$149 a month, in California, \$145, and down South they pay as low as \$38. If the representatives from Washington, Montana, and these other States with high labor costs want to humbly submit to a subsidy program that gives States with \$38 to \$50 per month labor costs a subsidy much greater

than their States are to receive that is their responsibility. One has to have many sips from the New Deal fountain of philosophy to like this kind of legislation. There is much difference in the cost of farm labor. Then there is the difference in the cost of feed. You will find all these figures in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A809. This table shows that cottonseed meal O. P. A. ceilings are \$47.50 per ton in North Carolina; \$46.50 per ton in Atlanta, Ga.; \$53.90 per ton in Minneapolis, and \$51.50 in Milwaukee. A year ago cottonseed meal was \$10 a ton cheaper in North Carolina than in some of the Northern States.

Naturally the linseed meal produced in the North would be cheaper in the North than in the South because there is the cost of transportation entering into the picture. But when you take the cost of labor and feed, the cost of producing milk, there is no living man who can justify any difference in the subsidy payments that is based on what the W. F. A. has done in the past or on what it has shown it intends to do in the future.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman know that in some dairy sections there is a feed shortage, and they are definitely known as feed deficit areas; that in those areas, North Carolina, for instance, they pay as much as \$55 a ton for hay? I dare say the gentleman is not paying any price like that in Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not want to get into any sectional argument in connection with this thing, but I do want to call attention to the fact that no living man can stand up here and justify the statement that a hundred pounds of milk in one State will win this war any more than a hundred pounds of milk in any other State. Anyone that wishes to take any other position is welcome to do so. I usually use the term "sectional favoritism," but cheap New Deal politics would be a more appropriate phrase to use in connection with a subsidy program that gives one small group a subsidy two and one-fifth times greater than the large group that produces the milk of the Nation.

The New Deal cannot change its ways even during wartime. In the parlance of the barnyard, these New Deal calves are hard to wean.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to say that it is regrettable that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], the chairman of this committee, moved to cut off the debate on this important question of equality of subsidy payments. This is all the more surprising when one notes that Kentucky is to receive 25 cents per hundred subsidy on April 1, though Kentucky received only \$3.20 per hundredweight market price in 1944, less than the national average. When one compares this Kentucky price of \$3.20 per hundredweight and the 25-cent subsidy, or a total price of \$3.45 per hundredweight, with the market price of \$4 to \$4.80 in the States that are to have two and one-fifth

times the Kentucky subsidy, it is still all the more surprising.

Of the increase in national milk production in 1944 over 1943, over one-third of this increase in production came from Wisconsin alone.

The War Food Administration provided the Wisconsin farmer \$2.70 per hundredweight for their milk in 1944 when the national average price of milk was \$3.24. Wisconsin farmers received forty-nine millions in so-called subsidies in 1944, but if they had had the additional 54 cents per hundredweight they were entitled to they would have received over 70,000,000 more for their milk. If the W. F. A. administration had provided the Wisconsin producers \$3.24 per hundredweight for their milk, as they did the other States on an average, there would not need be any talk about subsidies as far as Wisconsin is concerned.

However, the New Deal is for the few at the expense of the many. It could not even pass an act based on equality for all. There would have to be "special privilege" for the few and this bill provides the "special privilege" for the few, so it is typical New Deal legislation.

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

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, during the remarks of the gentleman from Texas I made the charge that these subsidy prices are arbitrary. Let me give you the figures on that.

Let us take a comparison between the States of South Dakota and Texas. The farmers in South Dakota last year received an average price of \$2.65 per hundredweight for milk, while in Texas they received \$3.60 per hundredweight, \$1 more per hundred. In North Carolina they received \$4 per hundredweight, \$1.35 more. That is 50 percent more than they received in South Dakota.

Now, what about labor costs? In South Dakota the composite labor cost as given in the tables placed in the Record of February 26 by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], was \$94. In Texas it was only \$74, and in North Carolina it was only \$50.90.

What about feed costs? Here are the figures I have, which show that the price of cottonseed meal at the St. Paul-Minneapolis terminals in Minnesota was \$53.90. On the other hand, in North Carolina it was only \$47.50.

Now what about the subsidy payments? In spite of the fact that the O. P. A. price ceilings are such that milk producers averaged \$4 in North Carolina per hundred pounds and \$3.75 in Texas in 1944 against \$2.60 in South Dakota with wages and protein feed costs higher in South Dakota, the administrators of the subsidy program, whoever they are, paid a 55-cent subsidy in North Carolina and a 35-cent subsidy in Texas against a 25-cent subsidy in South Dakota.

The program as announced for this year is even worse in that the subsidy goes up to 90 cents in some States and to 70 in some of the 55-cent States for certain periods while the comparable advance in South Dakota in those months is to 35 cents only.

In other words, there is rank discrimination in that, while feed and labor costs are higher in South Dakota, and while O. P. A. ceilings held prices lower, the milk subsidy was lower. And that continues in the new program. Therefore, I make the charge and I repeat it, that the subsidies allowed by the operators of this program have been arbitrary and discriminatory and do not reflect a proper consideration of the elements supposed to be considered.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I favor the Wolcott amendment because I believe that when adopted we will secure a greater production of dairy products and also a larger production of butter which is so necessary to maintain our civilian economy and meet our war commitments. This amendment will equalize the payments for dairy products and place butterfat on an equal basis with milk.

I also favor the Keefe amendment. I never could quite understand why sections of the country where they produce dairy products in large quantity should be penalized as against other sections. All the Keefe amendment does is to make the payment of subsidies uniform as long as the subsidy program is the policy of the present administration.

The dairy farmers of Minnesota and other States do not want subsidies, but they are forced to take them to maintain incomes, and as long as we have this policy we believe the payments should be uniform throughout the country. The historic dairy sections are in a much better situation to increase milk and butter than new producing areas, and I believe it only fair that all dairy farmers should receive the same payments. Therefore, I hope that both the Keefe amendment and the Wolcott amendment will be adopted.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Wolcott amendment, but I am against that portion of the Keefe amendment that would make equal payments mandatory everywhere, because I understand the purpose of the subsidy is to enable dairymen to continue to produce milk. In some sections of the country where the costs are unusually high that would not be possible if the cut was made, which I believe the amendment would entail. I subscribe wholeheartedly to what my colleague [Mr. DOYLE] has just said so ably.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to speak on behalf of an amendment of my own which I cannot offer now but which I shall offer as soon as the Keefe amendment is disposed of. My amendment reads as follows:

*Provided further,* That subsidy payments to milk producers under the program dealt with in this section shall upon application by a recipient of such subsidy be made once each month.

All my amendment would do would be to provide that these payments shall be made once a month instead of once every quarter as they are now doing pretty generally. The Commodity Credit Corporation is not adverse to making payments once a month. They say, however, that it will entail some additional administrative expense, about \$100,000 per year, in order to make monthly payments in the areas of the country where it is important since those dairymen conduct their business so largely on a cash basis, and have to buy almost all their feed and have very large cash expenses currently. I believe that if a dairyman can make a case and show where in his business he needs to receive monthly payments rather than less frequently, monthly payments should be authorized by the Congress and that is the purpose of my amendment. It is very much desired, I may say, by the dairymen of southern California.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I cannot go into this matter as I would like to in this very limited period of time. It was my purpose to offer the amendment which I did offer and in the event that amendment was not acceptable to the House, I proposed to offer a further amendment which would simply provide that the schedule of subsidy payments for milk and butterfat shall be announced to be in effect for a period of 12 months. That is a perfectly sensible amendment as I believe every man on this floor who knows anything about the dairy program will concede. I hope that you just will not throw this out of the window as being another foolish amendment and say that it is dictated by sectional desires or because the gentleman from Wisconsin is trying to get something that he is not entitled to. I hope that when this amendment is offered you will accept it, and especially you people who know what the dairy business of this country is and why it is so necessary that the farmer know what his program is to be for a year. They have to plan their feed: They have to plan their production schedule, and as the matter stands now under the prevailing announcement they do not know what to plan for, because the announcement ends December 31, 1945. If you want dairy production you have got to assure the people that really produce the milk that they can afford to go out and pump high concentrate feed into their cows in the winter time so that they will bring the milk out in the spring and in the fall.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California to the amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: At the end of the Wolcott amendment add the following: "Provided

further. That subsidy payments to milk producers under the program dealt with in this section shall upon application by a recipient of such subsidy be made one each month."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE to the amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: At the end of the Wolcott amendment insert a new proviso as follows: "Provided, That any schedule of subsidy payments for milk and butterfat shall be in effect for a period of at least 12 months after announcement."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. The first two sentences of section 1 of the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"As of the 30th of June in each year and as soon as possible thereafter, beginning with June 30, 1945, an appraisal of all of the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of determining the net worth of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury. The value of assets shall be determined on the basis of the cost of such assets to the Commodity Credit Corporation, or insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is the lower, and a report of any such appraisal shall be submitted to the President as soon as possible after it has been made."

SEC. 5. The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1936 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1945" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1947".

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 4, line 8, strike out "June 30, 1947" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1948."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any particular reason why the debate on this amendment should be prolonged. We covered it very well, I think, when we were discussing the first amendment, which had to do with the amount which we were to make available to the Commodity Credit Corporation. But there is a fundamental reason, it seems to me, why we should restrict the life not only of this Corporation but of all the Government agencies which come up here periodically, and it is simply that we live today in a changing world. We do not know from one week to the next what the demands are going to be on Government. No citizen knows from one week to the next what his obligation to the Government is going to be. Surely

we cannot look much beyond a year and determine with any degree of certainty what demands are going to be made on the Government in respect to this and many other programs. Because of these constant changes, it seems to me that we do our duty to our constituents only when we make it possible for us to review these agencies periodically, and "periodically" in this case means at least once a year.

Seldom, if ever, have we continued the Commodity Credit Corporation for more than a year. There is no reason why we should continue it for more than a year. Next year we might want to write entirely new standards in respect to its operation. We might want to enlarge the operation of this Corporation or we might want to limit its operation, to fit it into the post-war economy. There are many things we must consider next year. This is but one element, one factor, and but one piece of a major program. To name some of the other elements beside the Commodity Credit Corporation, there is the O. P. A., the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Lend-Lease, the Export-Import Bank, Bretton Woods, and many others. We owe it, not only to our constituents, but to ourselves, to review this agency and the other agencies at least once a year. I plead with you as representatives of a constituency, which I think demands of you at least that you consider what is going on in Government, to make it possible to review this agency next year. It is all the more advisable because of what has been brought up here in the last few weeks, whether we believe it or do not believe it. The fact that there are rumors indicates the necessity of keeping our hands on the Commodity Credit Corporation and all of the other agencies. We should not lose the opportunity to check this and the other agencies just as often as we possibly can. We are not doing our duty under the Constitution to our constituents unless we do. For that reason, I think we are doing all we are expected to do by continuing the life of this Corporation for 1 year. They have to come back here next year anyway. The subsidy provisions which we have just adopted make it essential that the Commodity Credit Corporation come back to us next year. Then, if we want to continue it beyond that time, we will have the opportunity just as we will have the opportunity to limit the scope or broaden the scope of its activities at that time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that this amendment would be offered after the amendment to reduce the amount to \$4,000,000,000 was defeated. It seemed to be part of the same thing. Therefore, since that amendment was defeated, it occurs to me there should not be any question about the defeat of this amendment. The Commodity Credit Corporation has always been extended for 2 years every time until last year when we had the subsidy

fight and then we extended it for 1 year on account of that fight. But the people who opposed subsidies are now in favor of subsidies. That subsidy fight being no longer in existence, we should back its extension for 2 years.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly, I yield to the gentleman if he insists, although I hardly have any time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman from Texas misspoke himself when he says we have always continued the Commodity Credit Corporation for a 2-year period.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, that is my understanding, until we had the subsidy fight, and then it was extended 1 year.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It was extended then for 6 months when we had the subsidy fight, after that it was extended for a period of a year.

Mr. PATMAN. I know that was temporary, and then we extended it for 1 year. I am speaking from memory and could be mistaken about the 2-year period with the one exception of 6 months and the other of one year, but I do not think I am.

The Committee on Banking and Currency carefully considered this bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman will not insist. My time is very limited.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if he remembered any year in the last 8 or 10 years when we did not have Commodity Credit Corporation before us on this floor?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not going into that.

The Committee on Banking and Currency carefully considered this bill. It should be passed as it is. Judge Jones says it is necessary. The administration says it is necessary. It is a war measure. We need it not only to help keep down prices and to prevent inflation, but we need it for the purpose of getting needed food for our armed forces and the civilian population at home and for our allies abroad. It is just as much a war measure as a measure appropriating billions of dollars to make planes, tanks and ships and guns and munitions. It is purely a war measure and we should not be running any risk about it.

The Hon. Marvin Jones has made a wonderful record. Something was said about spoilage. Last year the War Food Administration bought \$2,700,000,000 worth of food. Do you know how much spoilage there was? Only \$7,000,000. That means that \$1 out of \$385 was lost in spoilage. That means about 25 cents on every \$100 only was lost in spoilage. I do not think any organization, whether Government or whether private business, can make a better record than that. They are now buying \$5,000,000 worth of food every day.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. When the first amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan was under consideration, reducing the amount from \$5,000,000,000 to \$4,000,000,000, of course, we all understood that this particular amendment was involved in that also. The gentle-

man from Michigan, [Mr. WOLCOTT] has said "we are living in a changing world," and that is true. He also said, "we do not know what the demands will be on government," but in connection with this, there is one fact that cannot escape my mind and that is something that the Congress itself did. In the last Congress we promised support prices of 90 percent of parity or upward, on certain farm commodities for the period of the war and for 2 years thereafter. I do not think the changes that will take place in the post-war world for 2 years in relation to farmers will be so marked that the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan should be adopted. I hope the Congress will keep its promise to the farmers of this country by continuing this act for 2 years and that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] will be defeated.

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

All time has expired.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were—ayes 101, noes 119.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 2023, and pursuant to House Resolution 167, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 353, nays 8, not voting 66, as follows:

#### [Roll No. 36]

#### YEAS—353

|                |                |               |
|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| Abernethy      | Bennet, N. Y.  | Camp          |
| Adams          | Bennett, Mo.   | Campbell      |
| Allen, Ill.    | Blum           | Canfield      |
| Allen, La.     | Bishop         | Cannon, Fla.  |
| Andersen       | Blackney       | Cannon, Mo.   |
| H. Carl        | Bland          | Carlson       |
| Anderson       | Bloom          | Carnahan      |
| N. Mex.        | Bonner         | Case, S. Dak. |
| Andresen       | Boykin         | Celler        |
| August H.      | Bradley, Mich. | Chelf         |
| Andrews, Ala.  | Bradley, Pa.   | Chenoweth     |
| Andrews, N. Y. | Brehm          | Chilperfield  |
| Angell         | Brooks         | Church        |
| Arends         | Brown, Ga.     | Clements      |
| Arnold         | Brown, Ohio    | Cochran       |
| Bailey         | Brumbaugh      | Coffe         |
| Baldwin, Md.   | Bryson         | Cole, Kans.   |
| Baldwin, N. Y. | Buckley        | Cole, Mo.     |
| Barden         | Buffett        | Cole, N. Y.   |
| Barrett, Pa.   | Bulwinkle      | Colmer        |
| Barrett, Wyo.  | Bunker         | Cooley        |
| Barry          | Burch          | Cooper        |
| Bates, Ky.     | Burgin         | Corbett       |
| Beall          | Butler         | Courtney      |
| Beckworth      | Byrne, N. Y.   | Cox           |
| Bell           | Byrnes, Wis.   | Cravens       |

|                 |                 |                  |
|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Crawford        | Holmes, Wash.   | Price, Fla.      |
| Crosser         | Hook            | Price, Ill.      |
| Cunningham      | Hope            | Priest           |
| Curtis          | Horan           | Quinn, N. Y.     |
| D'Alesandro     | Howell          | Rabaut           |
| Davis           | Huber           | Rabin            |
| De Lacy         | Hull            | Rains            |
| Delaney         | Jackson         | Ramey            |
| James J.        | Jarman          | Ramspeck         |
| Delaney         | Jenkins         | Randolph         |
| John J.         | Jennings        | Rankin           |
| Dickstein       | Jensen          | Rayfield         |
| Dingell         | Johnson, Calif. | Reece, Tenn.     |
| Dolliver        | Johnson, Ill.   | Reed, Ill.       |
| Domengeaux      | Johnson, Ind.   | Reed, N. Y.      |
| Dondero         | Johnson         | Rees, Kans.      |
| Doughton, N. C. | Luther A.       | Reza             |
| Douglas, Calif. | Johnson, Okla.  | Richards         |
| Douglas, Ill.   | Jonkman         | Riley            |
| Doyle           | Judd            | Rivers           |
| Drewry          | Kee             | Rizley           |
| Durham          | Keefe           | Robertson, Va.   |
| Dworshak        | Kefauver        | Robison, Ky.     |
| Earthman        | Kelley, Pa.     | Rockwell         |
| Eberhart        | Kelly, Ill.     | Rodgers, Pa.     |
| Elliot          | Keogh           | Roe, N. Y.       |
| Ellis           | Kerr            | Rogers, Fla.     |
| Ellsworth       | Kilburn         | Rogers, Mass.    |
| Elston          | Kilday          | Rogers, N. Y.    |
| Engel, Mich.    | King            | Rooney           |
| Engle, Calif.   | Kinzer          | Rowan            |
| Ervin           | Kirwan          | Russell          |
| Fallon          | Knutson         | Ryder            |
| Feighan         | Kopplemann      | Sabath           |
| Fellows         | LaFollette      | Sadowski         |
| Fenton          | Landis          | Sasser           |
| Fernandez       | Lane            | Savage           |
| Fisher          | Lanham          | Schwabe, Mo.     |
| Flannagan       | Larcade         | Schwabe, Okla.   |
| Flood           | Latham          | Scrivner         |
| Folger          | LeFevre         | Shafer           |
| Forand          | Lesinski        | Sharp            |
| Fulton          | Lewis           | Sheppard         |
| Gallagher       | Link            | Short            |
| Gamble          | Ludlow          | Simpson, Ill.    |
| Gathings        | Lyle            | Smith, Va.       |
| Gavin           | Lynch           | Smith, Wis.      |
| Gearhart        | McConnell       | Snyder           |
| Geelan          | McCormack       | Somers, N. Y.    |
| Gibson          | McCown          | Sparkman         |
| Gifford         | McDonough       | Spence           |
| Gillespie       | McGehee         | Springer         |
| Gillette        | McGregor        | Stefan           |
| Gillie          | McMillan, S. C. | Stevenson        |
| Goodwin         | Mahon           | Stigler          |
| Gordon          | Manasco         | Stockman         |
| Gore            | Mansfield       | Sullivan         |
| Gorski          | Mont            | Sumner, Ill.     |
| Gossett         | Marcantonio     | Sumners, Tex.    |
| Graham          | Martin, Iowa    | Sundstrom        |
| Granahan        | Martin, Mass.   | Taber            |
| Granger         | May             | Talbot           |
| Grant, Ala.     | Morrow          | Talle            |
| Grant, Ind.     | Michener        | Tarver           |
| Green           | Miller, Calif.  | Thom             |
| Gregory         | Miller, Nebr.   | Thomas, N. J.    |
| Griffiths       | Mills           | Thomas, Tex.     |
| Gross           | Monroney        | Thomason         |
| Gwynn, N. Y.    | Morrison        | Tibbott          |
| Gwynne, Iowa    | Mundt           | Tolan            |
| Hale            | Murdock         | Torrens          |
| Hall            | Murphy          | Towe             |
| Edwin Arthur    | Murray, Tenn.   | Trimble          |
| Hall            | Murray, Wis.    | Trimble          |
| Leonard W.      | Neely           | Voorhis, Calif.  |
| Halleck         | Norrell         | Vorys, Ohio      |
| Hancock         | Norton          | Vursell          |
| Hare            | O'Brien, Ill.   | Wadsworth        |
| Harless, Ariz.  | O'Brien, Mich.  | Walter           |
| Harness, Ind.   | O'Hara          | Wasielewski      |
| Harris          | O'Konski        | Weaver           |
| Hartley         | O'Neal          | Weichel          |
| Havenner        | Outland         | Welch            |
| Hays            | Pace            | Whitten          |
| Healy           | Patman          | Whittington      |
| Hebert          | Patrick         | Wickersham       |
| Hedrick         | Patterson       | Wigglesworth     |
| Heffernan       | Peterson, Fla.  | Winstead         |
| Hendricks       | Peterson, Ga.   | Wolcott          |
| Henry           | Pfeifer         | Wolfenden, Pa.   |
| Heseltan        | Phillips        | Wolverton, N. J. |
| Hess            | Pickett         | Woodhouse        |
| Hill            | Pittenger       | Woodruff, Mich.  |
| Hinshaw         | Ploeser         | Worley           |
| Hoch            | Plumley         | Zimmerman        |
| Hoeven          | Poage           |                  |
| Hollfield       | Powers          |                  |

#### NAYS—8

|           |       |             |
|-----------|-------|-------------|
| Buck      | Jones | Smith, Ohio |
| Clevenger | Kean  | Winter      |
| Hoffman   | Rich  |             |

#### NOT VOTING—65

|                  |        |             |
|------------------|--------|-------------|
| Anderson, Calif. | Bender | Case, N. J. |
| Auchincloss      | Bolton | Chapman     |
| Bates, Mass.     | Boren  | Clark       |

|               |                 |                |
|---------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Clason        | Johnson,        | Robertson,     |
| Combs         | Lyndon B.       | N. Dak.        |
| Curley        | Kearney         | Robinson, Utah |
| Daughton, Va. | Kunkel          | Roe, Md.       |
| Dawson        | Lea             | Sheridan       |
| Dirksen       | LeCompte        | Sikes          |
| Eaton         | Lemke           | Simpson, Pa.   |
| Elaesser      | Luce            | Slaughter      |
| Fogarty       | McGlinchey      | Smith, Maine   |
| Fuller        | McKenzie        | Starkey        |
| Gardner       | McMillen, Ill.  | Stewart        |
| Gerlach       | Madden          | Taylor         |
| Eagen         | Maloney         | Traynor        |
| Hand          | Mansfield, Tex. | Vinson         |
| Hart          | Mason           | Weiss          |
| Heldinger     | Morgan          | West           |
| Herter        | Mott            | White          |
| Hobbs         | O'Toole         | Wood           |
| Holmes, Mass. | Philbin         | Woodrum, Va.   |
| Izac          | Powell          |                |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Taylor.  
 Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.  
 Mr. Slaughter with Mr. Clason.  
 Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Gerlach.  
 Mr. Izac with Mr. Hagen.  
 Mr. Weiss with Mr. Anderson of California.  
 Mr. Curley with Mr. Hand.  
 Mr. Vinson with Mrs. Luce.  
 Mr. Chapman with Mr. Mason.  
 Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mrs. Smith of Maine.  
 Mr. Madden with Mr. Auchincloss.  
 Mr. Philbin with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.  
 Mr. Lea with Mr. Kearney.  
 Mr. Powell with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. Clark with Mr. Fuller.  
 Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Eaton.  
 Mr. Colmer with Mr. Dirksen.  
 Mr. Hart with Mr. Case of New Jersey.  
 Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. LeCompte.  
 Mr. West with Mr. Kunkel.  
 Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Lemke.  
 Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.  
 Mr. McGlinchey with Mrs. Bolton.  
 Mr. Maloney with Mr. Herter.  
 Mr. McKenzie with Mr. Elaesser.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 298) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, strike out all after the enacting clause, and substitute the provisions of the bill just passed, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the Act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 108), as amended, is hereby amended by deleting the term "\$3,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the term "\$4,500,000,000".

SEC. 2. In the event the War Food Administrator determines that there is danger of loss or waste through spoilage in the stocks of any nonbasic perishable commodity owned or controlled by the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Corporation may sell or cause to be sold such stocks of such commodity below the parity or comparable price therefor and the Corporation shall, insofar

as practicable, make such sales, or cause them to be made, in such manner as to prevent the depression of the farm price of the commodity.

SEC. 3. The provisions of subsection (c) of section 381 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 67) are suspended until the expiration of the 2-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date on which the President, by proclamation, or the Congress, by concurrent resolution, declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated.

SEC. 4. The last paragraph of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944, shall not apply to the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946: *Provided*, That the making of subsidy payments and the buying of commodities for resale at a loss, by the Commodity Credit Corporation, for the purpose of maintaining maximum prices established pursuant to provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended and supplemented, shall be limited as follows: Obligations for making such payments and absorbing such losses may be incurred and paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation (a) in such amounts as may be necessary (1) to complete operations with respect to 1944 and prior year crop programs and (2) to fulfill obligations incurred prior to July 1, 1945, with respect to 1945 and prior fiscal year noncrop programs; and (b) in amounts which do not involve subsidy payments or losses in excess of (1) \$250,000,000 for operations during the 6-month period ending December 31, 1945, with respect to the dairy production payment program, (2) \$60,000,000 for operations during the 6-month period ending December 31, 1945, with respect to other noncrop programs, including the feed-wheat program, and (3) \$225,000,000 with respect to the 1945 crop program operations. Should hostilities in the present war extend beyond December 31, 1945, such dairy production payment program and other noncrop program operations involving such subsidy payments and losses may be continued on a basis which, taking into account seasonal variations in rates and production, will not involve such subsidy payments and losses in excess of \$250,000,000 for operations during the 6-month period ending June 30, 1946, with respect to the dairy production payment program, or \$60,000,000 for operations during the 6-month period ending June 30, 1946, with respect to other noncrop programs, including the feed-wheat program: *Provided, however*, That if hostilities cease before June 30, 1946, no additional obligations provided for in this sentence may be incurred by the Commodity Credit Corporation with respect to such programs after the date on which hostilities cease.

SEC. 5. The first two sentences of section 1 of the Act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended, are hereby amended to read as follows:

"As of the 30th of June in each year and as soon as possible thereafter, beginning with June 30, 1945, an appraisal of all of the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of determining the net worth of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury. The value of assets shall be determined on the basis of the cost of such assets to the Commodity Credit Corporation, or insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is the lower, and a report of any such appraisal shall be submitted to the President as soon as possible after it has been made".

SEC. 6. The first sentence of section 7 of the Act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1945" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1947".

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of H. R. 2023, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings by which the bill (H. R. 2023) was passed were vacated and that bill laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO REVISE AND EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] be permitted to address the House for 1 hour on Tuesday, March 20, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT] be permitted to extend his own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF ACT TO PROMOTE THE DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BATES of Kentucky, from the Committee on Rules submitted the following privilege resolution (H. Res. 178, Rept. No. 308), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1013), to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

# PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next after the legislative business of the day I may address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

## RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

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

MARCH 12, 1945.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee.

Genuinely yours,

FRANK L. CHELF,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include two letters and a news clipping from this morning's Washington Post.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a manuscript entitled "The American Scholar." It exceeds the limit. I have an estimate from the Public Printer and I am informed the cost will be \$138.80. Notwithstanding that fact, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the legislative business has been completed and any other special orders I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

## FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES COMMITTEE

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker. On April 14, 1944, I brought to this House what I considered pertinent facts with regard to the organization and operation of what is known as the Fair Employment Practice Committee, which has until now existed and operated under an Executive order of the President.

In that report I showed to this body that this organization in the central office here in Washington and throughout the Nation maintained 106 paid employees, 61 of whom were Negroes, and 45 whites. I showed further that the

existence of this committee cost the taxpayers of the Nation \$317,160 per year; that the white employees drew \$143,000 and the Negroes \$173,000 per annum.

Realizing that the populace of this democracy has no means of obtaining the truth with regard to this committee, I feel it my duty to from time to time keep the people advised. I further feel that it is the duty of every Member of this House to have the facts actually existing with this committee when it has no standing other than a temporary organization set up by Executive order.

When the operation of this committee with its shameful, disgraceful, and undemocratic set-up is considered, when it is existing only as a temporary organization, it is impossible to conceive of the abuses that the people may expect from it when it once gets itself permanently established in this democracy.

To begin with, this committee or any such organization has no right of existence in a democracy where people are presumed to have some rights and privileges over themselves and their own business, but looking behind the curtain, let us see whether its status has been improved since my report of April 1944, or whether the misuse of power has been expanded and the privileges granted this organization more grossly abused.

I have recently obtained from the chairman's office a statement of the names, positions, salaries, and color of all employees connected with this committee throughout its entirety. It is at this time composed of 43 whites, 65 Negroes, and 2 Japs.

In other words, around 63 percent of its personnel is Negro, and nearly 2 percent Japanese. There being only 43 whites, I will give the names of them, as follows:

Malcolm Ross, Emanuel Blotch, Evelyn Cooper, Myra Bunting, Will Maslow, Hayes W. Beall, Inez Mercer, Celio Hoffman, Daniel R. Donovan, Olcott R. Abbott, Harold James, Witherspoon Dodge, George D. McKay, Sally Chubb, Don W. Ellinger, Evelyn Ronning, Harry L. Kingman, Edward Rutledge, Bernard Ross, Virginia Seymour, Jewell Mazen, Bruce A. Hunt, Max Berking, Coral Coan, Simon Stickgold, Tillie Asepha, Sonia Schwartz, Mildred Greenbelt, Samuel Risk, Karyl Klinger, Alice Kahn, Edna Wasem, Joy Schultz, Penny Zeidman, Roy A. Hoglund, Eugene Ormsbee, Helen G. Schlien, Morris Levine, Carlos Castenada, Willetta Gutleben, Ignacio Lopez, Vera G. Vetter, Marie Lerma.

I want the people of the United States to bear in mind that this committee is vested with powers to destroy this democracy. I recited the powers granted this committee in my other report to the Congress, but I desire to quote said powers as follows:

First. All agencies of the Government of the United States shall include in all contracts a provision obligating the contractor not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

Second. All Federal agencies concerned with vocational and training programs for war production shall take all measures appropriate to assure that such pro-

grams are administered without discrimination.

Third. The committee shall formulate policies to achieve the purposes of this order and shall make recommendations to the various Federal departments and agencies. It shall also recommend to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission appropriate measures for bringing about the full utilization and training of manpower in and for war production without discrimination.

Fourth. The committee shall receive and investigate complaints of discrimination. It may conduct hearings, make findings of facts, and take appropriate steps to obtain elimination of such discrimination.

Fifth. The committee shall assume jurisdiction over all complaints and matters pending before the old committee.

Sixth. The committee shall have the power to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be appropriate or necessary to carry out the provisions of the order.

I feel in my heart such a spirit of indignation to any such condition being permitted to exist in this democracy until I am not in position to command words sufficient to express my contempt for this organization and the spirit that prompts its sponsorship.

There is quite a block of the membership of this House today sponsoring, and sponsoring with all their force, legislation to give this committee permanent status. They realize that if such legislation becomes law that this committee will have power to make them work in their offices a Negro, Japanese, or anyone else of their choice. Now let me get this straight in the beginning: this is not a Negro row—he is not to blame for this condition. He is being used as a tool, if you please, a means to an end, which end will bring to him nothing but suffering. If the Negroes in this country were let alone they would cause no one any trouble. It is the meddlers who are not interested in the Negro nor his well-being, but who are cheap enough to use him and his status as a means to destroy the liberties and freedom that have been the fruit of this democracy. If you Members of Congress are sincere in your efforts to establish this committee as a permanent branch of the Government, why don't you practice what you preach? I would like to say to the Negro people, if you want to test the sincerity of the membership who are sponsoring this legislation, call at the office of each one of them and see how many Negro secretaries they have. This one fact should convince you that they are not sincere and not willing to do voluntarily what they seek to force others to do by laws passed at their hands.

It is beyond me to understand why there is so much effort being put out to tear down and destroy all the fundamentals of the democracy our fighting forces are dying to preserve while they are absent on the many battle fields of the world today, and are precluded from even expressing themselves on these radical changes and this great progress of regimentation of man and property.

I want to say to the membership of this House, in no uncertain terms, that you will have to answer to those boys who,

while prisoners of Japan, were mutilated, burned, and abused, and forced to eat rats, cats, and stray dogs, while you have lived normal, full lives, for voting to put in charge of their homes, their families, and their businesses, Japanese, while they have had no right to express themselves. When you go to cast your ballot for this legislation, I want you to know that you will not be able to say in your next campaign that you did not know that you were voting to establish a dictatorial agency to control the destiny of the lives of the families of those who suffered at Bataan and Corregidor, who had in its employ at the time one Doris K. Sese, a Japanese, and one Otome Saito, a Japanese. You will not be able to say that you did not know that the office of the chairman of this committee was staffed by five whites and five Negroes; that the Field Operations was staffed by three whites and five negroes and one Japanese; that the office of Review and Analysis was staffed by two whites and six Negroes; that the Legal Division was staffed by one white by the name of Simon Stickgold, and two Negroes; that the Information Division was staffed by two Negroes only; that the Office of Budget and Administration was staffed by eleven Negroes only; and the office of Mail and Files was staffed by six Negroes only. I say you will not be able to tell them that you did not know this because I am now telling you, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will disclose these facts to you. I have been told that those who would not hear must feel, and those of you who cannot wait to set up this infernal machine of destruction until the boys do return and are given the privilege of at least expressing themselves, I hope will at least be able to feel.

I want to further remind you that the taxpayers are spending annually \$351,380 base pay to maintain this stigma on the decency of America. I have no definite figures further than the base pay, but when the increased percentage employees draw and overtime is figured, I have every reason to know that the amount drawn from the tax funds of the Nation will run more than \$400,000 per year.

I hold no prejudice, ill will, or malice against any individual on account of race, creed, or color. I measure people by their own conduct, but let me say to you that in my opinion if there is any such thing as a decent Japanese the percentage would be less than one-hundredth part of one percent. For the sake of argument, let us presume that there are some individual Japanese who could be considered loyal to this Government, and who could be considered trustworthy, then could it not be said that that individual who is privileged to live under our flag could safely trust native-born white Americans for a square deal. If you people think that the native-born Americans have deteriorated to such a low degree of responsibility, of decency, and of national honor that you have got to set up a board with no one but Negroes in charge of its administration and a bunch of Japanese to go out and control the business of this Nation, then you should be ashamed of your citizenship.

I wonder if you people really know just what your works are going to pro-

duce. I wonder if you have forgotten that, "by their works ye shall know them." I wonder if you think that the American people, the people who built this great commonwealth, are going to submit to a bunch of Negroes and Japs going about over the country telling them who they shall employ and how they shall run their businesses. I can tell you, you are fixing to produce a condition in this country that will cause your own children to look back on your record with scorn and disdain. Do you realize that you are sowing the seeds of revolution? Do you realize that you are meddling where you have no business; that you are nourishing national disorder and trouble that can only serve to destroy a land of freedom, liberty, and justice?

I hope that through the press and otherwise the inside story of this organization can go to the entire citizenry of this Nation, and irrespective of persons, I hope those who so far forget the spirit of those who perished at Corregidor and Bataan and those who lived through the horrors to return will not be forgotten by the voters who love America and American institutions.

I was criticized by some few individuals for bringing those facts to the people last April, and may again be criticized for exposing these facts. But let me say that I have them over the signature of the office of the Chairman if anyone wants to question the veracity of the statements of fact contained herein. I want to advise the House and this Nation that irrespective of any criticism I shall continue to keep the people advised on the work of this un-American set-up.

Let me say again that you may accuse me of striking at the Negro people, but I want to tell you that the Negroes through my district and in my home town are my friends and I do not believe that they would want such organization to exist in this country. I know that they would not want to be dictated to by a Jap, and if this committee ever obtains permanent status you have no assurance that it will not be dominated by Japs and every other un-American force that can be obtained. Let me tell you, and I speak with all the truth within my being, if an attempt was made here to set up a committee composed wholly of white native-born Americans to go out and meddle and dictate and interfere with the business of the Negro people of this Nation only, then I would stand on this floor and fight such a move as un-American and not worthy to be perpetuated under the American flag.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. CHAPMAN, for 2 days, on account of illness.

To Mr. PATRICK, for 3 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. HOBBS (at the request of Mr. SPARKMAN), for 1 week, on account of official business.

To Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON (at the request of Mr. THOMASON), for the balance of this week, on account of serious illness in his family.

To Mr. IZAC, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MOTT, Mr. BATES of Massachusetts, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr. FARRINGTON (at the request of Mr. VINSON), for 2 weeks, on account of official business to investigate the housing situation as it pertains to the Navy in the Hawaiian area.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 13, 1945, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Brand Names and Newsprint Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m. Tuesday, March 13, 1945, to resume public hearings on newsprint.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m. Tuesday, March 13, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

##### COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold a hearing on Tuesday, March 13, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 173.

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold a hearing on Wednesday, March 14, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 1624 and H. R. 1746.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Thursday, March 15, 1945, at 10 a. m., to continue hearings on parcel-post rates.

##### COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in executive session at 10:30 a. m., on Thursday, March 15, 1945, in the committee room, 356 House Office Building.

##### COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold hearings on Tuesday, March 20, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., in room 247, House Office Building, on H. R. 128, a bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913.

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will continue hearings on Wednesday, March 21, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on H. R. 128, a bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection for pensionable purposes for service rendered between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

285. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, reported by the Governor of the Virgin Islands to the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

286. A letter from the Administrator of War Food Administration, transmitting a report with respect to the progress of the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects; to the Committee on Agriculture.

287. A letter from the Administrative Officer of the White House, transmitting the estimated personnel requirements for the White House Office for the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

288. A letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting an estimate of personnel requirements of the United States Tariff Commission for the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

289. A letter from the Chairman of War Production Board, transmitting a copy of the personnel requirements of the War Production Board for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

290. A letter from the Executive Director of the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, transmitting a copy of the estimates of the number of employees required for this Office during the period ending June 30, 1945, as submitted to the Bureau of the Budget; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

291. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting estimates of personnel requirements for the Post Office Department, for the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

292. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of \$59,169,040 for the Federal Security Agency, in the form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 111); to the Committee on Appropriation and ordered to be printed.

293. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1946, in the amount of \$20,550, for the legislative branch, House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 112); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

294. A letter from the Executive Secretary of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, transmitting a copy of the estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of Scientific Research and Development during the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

295. A letter from the Alien Property Custodian, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the period ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

296. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the organic act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936, a copy of various legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

297. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting estimates of requirements of personnel subject to Public Law 49 for the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard (departmental and field) for the fourth quarter, fiscal year 1945, together with a request that a new ceiling be established for the Navy Department in each classification for

the fourth quarter, fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

298. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the fiscal year 1946 for development of landing areas for national defense, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, Department of Commerce, in the form of a draft of a proposed provision extending the availability of the existing appropriation under that head to June 30, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 113); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

299. A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, transmitting the information for the purpose of making a determination of the number of employees necessary for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the Federal Works Agency for the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

300. A letter from the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements of the National Labor Relations Board for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BATES of Kentucky: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 178. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 2013, a bill to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 308). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 115. Joint resolution relative to determination and payment of certain claims against the Government of Mexico; without amendment (Rept. No. 309). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2531) for the relief of Norman C. Albrethsen, and the same was referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 2580. A bill to give credit to veterans, for purposes of title II of the Social Security Act, for certain service in the armed forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2581. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the issuance of devices in recognition of the services of merchant sailors," approved May 10, 1943 (57 Stat. 81), and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BUNKER:

H. R. 2582. A bill to provide for disregarding small amounts of compensation for casual labor in determining need for the old-age assistance provided for pursuant to title I of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2583. A bill to provide 30 days' leave to enlisted men before honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 2584. A bill to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 2585. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Code; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 2586. A bill to authorize the leasing of Indian lands for business, and other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2587. A bill to dispense with the requirement of an oath in connection with applications for benefits under certain laws granting benefits to veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 2588. A bill to provide for the establishment of a bee-culture laboratory at Corvallis, Oreg.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 2589. A bill authorizing payment to the San Carlos Apache Indians for the lands ceded by them in the agreement of February 25, 1896, ratified by the act of June 10, 1896, and reopening such lands to mineral entry; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. TRAYNOR:

H. R. 2590. A bill to provide for the bonding of Federal officials and employees; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 2591. A bill to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments and certain purchase and sale operations by corporations created pursuant to section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 2592. A bill to establish the United States Naval Aviation Academy in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 2593. A bill relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2594. A bill to provide for compensation to blind persons for loss of earning power due to blindness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution designating period from Thanksgiving Day to Christmas of each year for Nation-wide Bible reading; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H. J. Res. 118. Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States and others to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 179. Resolution requesting certain information from the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. Res. 180. Resolution to authorize the House Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take appropriate measures to open Palestine to free immigration and col-

onization by the Jewish people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation relative to employers' sinking funds and reserves, and taxability thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that all presently proposed Federal irrigation projects and all such which are proposed in the future for construction in the State of Wyoming, be continued in all stages under the direct supervision of the United States Bureau of Reclamation; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to public lands in, and funds and other relief for, the State of Wyoming from the United States of America; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider and pass legislation to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to accept the principles of the federation of the world and requesting the President of the United States to call an industrial convention to formulate a constitution for the federation of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to have representatives of veterans of World War No. 1 and No. 2 at the Conference for World Peace at San Francisco; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for legislation providing that the military installations now located on the Indianola anti-aircraft gunnery range be transferred to the county of Calhoun, State of Texas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GRANAHAH:

H. R. 2595. A bill for the relief of Patrick A. Kelly; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 2596. A bill for the relief of M. F. Diller; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 2597. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Arizona to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the estate of Earl W. Nepple, and for the relief of Marie Nepple; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2598. A bill for the relief of J. H. Atkins; 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:

166. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Edith M. Dennis and 23 other citizens of Lakewood, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve

manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

167. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Robert C. Hayes, Deadwood, S. Dak., urging that Congress refrain from passing legislation conscripting American labor or fixing hours, compensation, or places of employment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

168. Also, petition of Robert C. Hayes, Deadwood, S. Dak., that legislation be enacted to reduce the civil employees of governmental agencies by one-third; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

169. Also, petition of Robert C. Hayes, Deadwood, S. Dak., urging that the Congress refrain from enacting any law involving the United States in any obligation to furnish men or means for foreign wars other than those for the safety of America and consistent with the national honor and rectitude; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

170. Also, petition of Robert C. Hayes, Deadwood, S. Dak., urging that Congress enact legislation to reduce compensation and salaries of all civil employees of the Federal Government by 35 percent; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

171. Also, petition of Robert C. Hayes, Deadwood, S. Dak., urging that the Constitution of the United States be amended limiting the term of the President of the United States to one term of 6 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

172. By Mr. MUNDT: Petition of the South Dakota State Legislature, commending the removal of limitations on the number of soldiers who may receive 30-day furloughs, leaving authority with theater commanders to determine which men deserve and need such relief, and urging that this practice be extended to all the armed services, if such action has not already been taken; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

173. Also, petition of the State Legislature of South Dakota asking that the Federal Government recognize and accept the obligation and responsibility to the Indians of South Dakota and to make payment to them for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children on the basis of 100 percent and without participation by the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

174. By Mr. MURDOCK: Memorial of the Senate of the Arizona Legislature, Senate Memorial No. 2, praying for the relief of certain property owners of Santa Cruz County; to the Committee on Claims.

175. Also, memorial of Arizona State Legislature, Senate Concurrent Memorial No. 3, requesting the Congress to pass Senate bill 114, to pay for land of the San Carlos strip ceded by the Apache Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

176. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, the Association of Provision Retailers of Mayaguez, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to asking from the Government of the United States the immediate determination of the political status of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

177. Also, petition of Mrs. Harry Campbell and various citizens of Tennessee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their request for support of House bills 709 and 2082 and Senate bills 569 and 682; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

178. Also, petition of Dorsey W. McMahan, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to immediate deportation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

179. Also, petition of Local 125, International Woodworkers of America, C. I. O., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Crimean Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

180. Also, petition of Local 401, International Woodworkers of America, C. I. O., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Crimean Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

181. Also, petition of Americans of Estonian descent, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their appeal to insure the territorial sovereignty of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania based on the free will of the people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, March 12, 1945)

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

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

O Thou before whom the prayers of Thy children go up as incense, speak to our burdened and longing hearts as we lift our lives to Thy searching gaze. In these holy days of the Passion we would test our thoughts and deeds and words, not against the faulty background of our fellows but with our eyes upon the transparent glory of the Crystal Christ. In these hard, bestead, and dangerous days we would find peace in the midst of the storm and cleansing for the baseness of our own hearts. Sober us with a solemn sense of personal responsibility, with the realization that Thy call to every man is to contribute to the world's good his own life, strong, clean, honest, trustworthy, and serviceable. In the light of this truth we pray for ourselves, that we may not fail our own generation and Thee, that the paganism that afflicts the world may be redeemed into decency, justice, and mercy and into the brotherhood of that One who went to the cross that He might be the servant of all. We ask it in His name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, March 12, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 10, 1945, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 211. An act for the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthew McCord, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 212. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act