COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

The Committee on the Census will hold a hearing at 10 o'clock a. m. on Thursday, December 6, 1945, on H. R. 4781, in room 1414, New House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will have an executive meeting on Thursday, December 6, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., in room 446, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled a hearing to begin at 10 a. m. on Friday, December 7, 1945, on the bill, H. R. 4779, to enable debtor railroad corporations, whose properties during a period of 7 years have provided sufficient earnings to pay fixed charges, to effect a readjustment of their financial structure without further proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act as amended. The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

849. A letter from the national adjutant and paymaster, Marine Corps League, transmitting the annual report for the fiscal period of August 1944 to September 30, 1945, of the Marine Corps League; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

850. A letter from the chairman, the National Archives, transmitting the annual report of the National Archives Trust Fund Board for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Library.

851. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Herbert C. Rockwell; to the Committee on Claims.

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. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1329. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1330. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1331. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 3787. A bill for the relief of Natale Piavallo, also known as Natale Kiecieck, with amendment (Rept. No. 1328). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 4870. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming, to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Bear River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 4871. A bill to provide for the appointment of three additional Assistant Secretaries of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4872. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 4873. A bill to create an agricultural credit agency, to consolidate therein all Federal agricultural lending agencies, to create a public farm-appraisal system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 4874. A bill to provide gold star emblems to mothers and fathers of men who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States in World War II; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4875. A bill to provide for the investigation and mediation of labor disputes, to diminish the causes of labor disputes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

H. J. Res. 280. Joint resolution creating a joint select committee to study and recommend legislation concerning labor disputes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4876. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to John W. Jones; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4877. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to John R. Andresen; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4878. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to John Akers a patent in fee to certain lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4879. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Leslie Warrior; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 4880. A bill for the relief of J. N. Kilgore; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 4881. A bill for the relief of Alice C. Knox; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 4882. A bill for the relief of Alfred Abboud; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 4883. A bill for the relief of Eric Goffe M. Loffe; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 4884. A bill to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4885. A bill for the relief of Ernst V. Brender; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4886. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Carbone; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 4887. A bill for the relief of A. E. McCartney and O. A. Foster; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 4888. A bill for the relief of Gustav F. Doscher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 4889. A bill for the relief of Jordan B. Gross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 4890. A bill for the relief of Helen C. Coffey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILSON:

H. R. 4891. A bill granting a pension to Mary O. Shaw Lyman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 4892. A bill with respect to national service life insurance in the case of the late William E. Dennis; 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:

1365. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Monacatootha Post, No. 580, of the American Legion, Monaca, Pa., opposing S. 1203 and H. R. 3522; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1366. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the pastors and keymen of the Lutheran Center Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to aid to the occupied countries of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1367. Also, petition of Local 248, United Federal Workers of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their call for the summary abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

1368. By the SPEAKER: Petition of 150 Austrian military internees, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their scheduled surrender to Russia for forced labor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1369. By the SPEAKER: Petition of L. G. Wells and various citizens of Riverside, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement of H. R. 2229, H. R. 2230, S. 690, and S. 809; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

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

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, Thou hast given unto all of us a life of high vocation. May Thy spirit interpret for us its sacred meaning and reveal its glorious opportunities. Help us to sense the sanctity of even the most commonplace duty.

We pray that the chosen representatives of our beloved country may be in-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

spired to come to the sacrament of public service with clear minds and courageous hearts. May they be richly endowed with wisdom as they seek to mediate the blessings of the more abundant life to suffering and struggling humanity.

Grant that the unity of spirit, which was forged in the heat of battle by freedom-loving nations, may be strengthened and sustained in the continuing tasks of peace. May all the nations of the earth live and go forward as a commonwealth of free people, united by those bonds of friendship and good will which nothing can break and which shall match our common need.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, December 3, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1493) to authorize the head of the postgraduate school of the United States Navy to confer masters and doctors degrees in engineering and related fields.

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

H. R. 4571. An act to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941;

H. R. 4683. An act to authorize the Export-Import Bank of Washington to extend its operations to include the Philippine Islands; and

H. R. 4780. An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] may be excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate for a week, or possibly 10 days, while he is absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon is excused.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT] be assigned to the following committees: Commerce, Mines and Mining, and Privileges and Elections; and

That the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS] be assigned to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 117)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting additional estimates of appropriation for the Department of Commerce, amounting to $227,000, for the fiscal year 1946, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

THE HOUSING PROBLEM IN MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, Massachusetts, like every other State, has a serious housing problem, particularly as it is related to returning veterans. I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a letter I have received from Philip Nichols, former chairman of the Massachusetts State Housing Board, a gentleman who has studied this subject for a great many years and is an authority on the problems of housing.

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

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
STATE BOARD OF HOUSING,
Boston, December 1, 1945.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: I acknowledge receipt of your telegram of November 29 in regard to the housing situation in Massachusetts and the possibilities of relief through Federal action, and I have talked with Mr. McBride as requested. I find that his views as to the existing situation and to the possible remedies are much the same as mine.

The situation is one that has given me great concern in the past 2 months and on which I have devoted much time and thought in seeking a remedy. There is no doubt that there is an acute shortage of housing in many cities and towns in Massachusetts. Families of men who have remained in civilian life were already hard put to it by the middle of this year to find either single residence or apartments for rental. Vacant houses or apartments were indeed almost impossible to find. When to this population already suffering from shortage and overcrowding some 600,000 returning veterans are added, of whom from 80,000 to 100,000 are or will be seeking homes, the seriousness of the situation can well be imagined. In some cities and towns the local officials have been driven nearly frantic by the tales of distress due to inability to obtain shelter brought to them daily. This distress they have no means of alleviating under existing laws.

All of the public-housing projects are full and have waiting lists of qualified applicants longer than the entire capacity of the projects. We are told of private apartment houses with waiting lists of over a thousand families. Apparently the only way in which a homeless family can house itself is by buying a dwelling at an inflated figure and evicting the occupant. This method is beyond the means of most families, and in any event, it does not help to solve the over-all problem. What can be done to relieve this situation is a most difficult problem.

The problem is divided into two parts: (1) To provide permanent housing, (2) to provide temporary shelter while the permanent housing is being brought into existence.

The deficiency in housing was, of course, primarily due to the lack of building during the depression, and the cutting off of all private construction during the war. I feel confident that the deficiency so far as it relates to permanent housing will eventually be overcome by private enterprise and the economic law of supply and demand. Considerable time must, however, elapse before the building of private houses can even start, and it may well take 10 years before the building industry fully catches up with the deficiency.

At present there is plenty of available land, builders and contractors are anxious to get started, and the treasuries of savings banks, cooperative banks and insurance companies are overloaded with uninvested funds seeking an outlet. The only thing lacking is building materials. Almost everything required for building a dwelling house is almost impossible to obtain, and it is reported that, as to some materials at least, the production is starting very slowly.

As all restrictions and price limitations have already been removed, it is hard to see what more can be done by the Federal Government to quicken the supply of building materials. It has been suggested that priorities in favor of materials for home-building be established by the Government. If such building material is being or is likely to be diverted for other purposes not equally as essential as home building, the establishment of such priorities would tend to speed up the start of dwelling house construction. If there is any large amount of surplus war material that could be used for dwelling construction it should be released.

On the whole, however, I think that private enterprise can be counted on to make up the deficiency in permanent housing as rapidly as the supply of materials permits, at least in providing homes for families able to pay economic prices and economic rents. For the lowest income groups the need of the federally subsidized public housing is more urgent than ever. Provision for continuing these activities is of course contained in the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill.

There are of course possibilities of eventually expediting and encouraging private building suggested by some of the other provisions of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, but this does not seem to me the occasion for discussing them, as they involve new and perhaps debatable long term economic policies and what is needed now is immediate production of building materials.

With respect to temporary housing required to carry over the homeless veterans who have no relatives with whom they can double up, the situation is just as difficult. However, I do not believe that the erection of new temporary housing such as was provided near some of the manufacturing plants engaged in war industries is the solution. Such housing is very expensive—about $4,000 per dwelling unit—the materials are lacking, and if obtained would aggravate the shortage of materials for permanent housing and postpone for several years the completion of the permanent housing needed to make up the housing deficiency.

I think that we must make the best use of what we have, first by setting up home information centers, and also making surveys of all available housing in each city or town, remodelling or rehabilitating existing residential property and if necessary large, vacant buildings of other types; also providing locations for or supplying portable and prefabricated houses, huts, cabins and trailers. Even vessels may have to be used in some cases.

At the last session of the legislature a resolve was adopted requiring the State board of housing to submit recommendations in regard to providing housing for veterans, with a draft of proposed legislation. This report has to be filed not later than December 6 and I have nearly completed a report, and a bill containing a grant of authority to cities and towns to act as outlined in the previous paragraph. With this effort under State authority the Federal Government might cooperate in one or more of the following forms:

(1) By releasing to all public bodies needing them such temporary war housing as is no longer required for its original use, at a nominal charge. This help is now being given

some extent, but some of the temporary war housing is being destroyed or sold for private purposes.

(2) By devoting all of the permanent war housing to housing for veterans and converting it when no longer needed by the veterans to low-rent housing for low-income families generally.

(3) By cooperating as far as possible with local officials in the use of all available locations, buildings and materials, owned or controlled by the Federal Government, including surplus war material, for providing shelter for veterans and their families.

(4) By using all suitable shipping when no longer needed, to provide shelter for veterans in cities bordering on the sea and on navigable waters. If the crisis becomes more acute, the Liberty ships now unused and tied up and other freighters might be converted so as to house many veterans and their families.

I feel that the consequences of allowing the soldiers and sailors to return to their own home cities and towns, to be received as heroes and then to find no place to live will be serious and that everything that can be done should be done to avoid such a situation, even if we temporarily have to swallow some of our ideas about the expenditure of public funds for private use, city planning, and zoning and other conceptions of public policy which must be lived up to in normal times.

I am very glad if I can be of any use in this difficult situation.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP NICHOLS.

PERMANENT FAIR-EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE LEGISLATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a telegram I have received from the Kansas District Woman's Missionary Society, in which they favor immediate action on permanent fair-employment practice legislation.

There being no objection, the telegram was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUTCHINSON, KANS., *November 30, 1945.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We urge immediate and effective permanent fair-employment legislation to protect rights of all men to gainful employment and willing to work without regard to color, race, creed, or previous condition of servitude. Please exert your every effort to this end and know that we pray a just and loving God of us all will lead your steps aright.

KANSAS DISTRICT WOMAN'S MISSIONARY SOCIETY,
MRS. GEORGIA WALKER, *Chairman.*
MRS. ORA CARTER, *Member.*
REV. R. C. D. TEUEL, Jr.
MRS. ROSA BASS.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL HOUSING POLICY—RESOLUTION OF KANSAS SAVINGS AND LOAN LEAGUE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a resolution recently adopted by the Kansas Savings and Loan League, protesting against the enactment of the so-called Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill, S. 1592, to establish a national housing policy and provide for its execution. I ask unanimous consent to present the resolution and that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

Whereas the Kansas Savings and Loan League, acknowledging that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and realizing that there are abroad in the land today certain influences and destructive philosophies which, if allowed to spread unrestrained, would undermine and damage, if not entirely destroy, those traditional ideals of individual thrift and private home ownership to which we have been so long committed, do hereby

Resolve, That we voice our disapproval and opposition to the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill (S. 1592) providing for an all-powerful permanent National Housing Administration, with extensive and permanent powers over the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration which will include influence and appointments, control of appropriations, reports, regulations, and authority for mingling and further consolidation. That the provisions of the bill will give the public housing group a dominance in the Federal Government that is illogical, unfair, and unnecessary, if this country is basically and honestly interested in private enterprise and home ownership.

That we, as thoughtful citizens of the State of Kansas and of the United States of America, publicly proclaim and restate our sincere belief in the fundamental social, patriotic, and economic values of private financing, private building, and private ownership of homes as opposed to the publicly sponsored or socialized housing concept.

That the leaders of our Government and Members of Congress should realize that the public housers are using the housing shortage that has resulted from the war as an excuse to stifle private enterprise by introducing legislation that is public housing done up in the impressive wrappings of a "private enterprise program."

That we, closely associated with the individual home owner and taxpayer, and conscious of his problems and requirements, are fully convinced that private enterprise has been, now is, and will be, ready, willing, and able to adequately meet the housing needs of our citizens—that Federal encroachment in the housing field is unreasonable and unnecessary and can lead only to paternalistic tendencies in the individual citizen's character and independence of thought that we, as Americans, must certainly deplore and discourage.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 3603. A bill to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 807).

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

S. 1590. A bill to authorize the President to appoint Graves Blanchard Erskine, major general, United States Marine Corps, to the office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, without affecting his service status and perquisites; without amendment (Rept. No. 809);

S. 1605. A bill to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires which occurred at various Navy and Marine Corps shore activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 810);

S. 1631. A bill to provide for the payment on a commuted basis of the costs of transportation of dependents of certain persons entitled to such transportation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 811);

H. R. 2553. A bill to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's tailor shop at the United States Naval Academy; without amendment (Rept. No. 812); and

H. R. 2556. A bill to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's cobbler and barber shops at the United States Naval Academy; without amendment (Rept. No. 813).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation three lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1653. A bill to amend section 3 of the Social Security Act so as to provide for computation of amounts of grants to States for old-age assistance on the basis of the financial resources of the several States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 1654. A bill to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. CARVILLE:

S. 1655. A bill to amend section 2288 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

(Mr. O'DANIEL introduced Senate bill 1656, prohibiting labor organizations from making contracts or engaging in combinations or conspiracies in restraint of commerce, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 1657. A bill to amend Public Law 779 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, entitled "An act to provide for furnishing transportation for certain Government and other personnel necessary for the effective prosecution of the war, and for other purposes," approved December 1, 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1658. A bill to provide for payment of travel allowances and transportation, and for transportation of dependents and shipment of household effects, of members of the naval forces upon separation from active service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1659. A bill relating to appointments in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H. R. 4571. An act to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941; and

H. R. 4780. An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4683. An act to authorize the Export-Import Bank of Washington to extend its operations to include the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SEATS FOR DISABLED VETERANS AT THE ARMY-NAVY GAME

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I had intended to say something today about a resolution which I shall offer. I know of the important business now before the Senate, and I do not wish to interrupt its consideration for more than a moment. So I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution, which reads as follows:

Whereas there is conducted an annual contest in football between the respective teams representing the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, commonly known as the Army-Navy game; and

Whereas such contest typifies and expresses the spirit of friendly rivalry between the two services and all members of these services regardless of rank or commission; and

Whereas the athletic associations of both Academies have the authority to allocate and block out seats for such contest and make suitable provisions for members of the armed forces, disabled, and otherwise, to obtain seats for such game before general sale; and

Whereas at the recent contest played in Philadelphia December 1, 1945, no apparent effort was made by such associations to allocate seats for disabled veterans able to attend such contests, although other groups of citizens were allocated seats: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate direct its standing Committee on Military Affairs to ascertain the methods used by the associations in allocating seats to disabled veterans and in giving such veterans opportunity to obtain such seats to the end that in future Army-Navy contests proper allocation and opportunity be given to all disabled veterans to attend the contest.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Washington will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 198) submitted by Mr. MAGNUSON was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

NEW ENGLAND AND THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT — ADDRESS BY SENATOR AIKEN

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject New England and the St. Lawrence Project, delivered by Senator AIKEN before the Boston City Club, November 14, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TUNNELL BEFORE AMERICAN SLAV CONGRESS, DETROIT, MICH.

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the annual convention of the American Slav Congress at Detroit, Mich., December 2, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

HIROHITO'S STATUS — EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hirohito's Status," published in the Washington Star of December 4, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

DELAWARE DAY (1944) ADDRESS BY SENATOR TUNNELL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator TUNNELL at a joint meeting of the Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs of Dover, Del., on December 7, 1944, in celebration of the ratification of the Federal Constitution by the State of Delaware, which appears in the Appendix.]

ENGLAND—ENEMY OF LIBERTY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LANGER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "England—Enemy of Liberty," delivered by him at the Academy of Music in Brooklyn, N. Y., on November 29, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. EASTLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Austin	Hart	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hawkes	Overton
Bankhead	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bilbo	Hill	Revercomb
Briggs	Hoey	Russell
Brooks	Huffman	Saltonstall
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Butler	Kilgore	Stanfill
Byrd	Knowland	Stewart
Capehart	La Follette	Taft
Capper	Langer	Taylor
Carville	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McCarran	Tobey
Connally	McClellan	Tunnell
Donnell	McKellar	Tydings
Downey	McMahon	Vandenberg
Eastland	Magnuson	Wagner
Ellender	Maybank	Walsh
Ferguson	Mead	Wheeler
Fulbright	Millikin	Wherry
George	Mitchell	White
Gerry	Moore	Wiley
Gossett	Murdock	Willis
Green	Murray	Wilson
Guffey	Myers	Young
Gurney	O'Daniel	

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

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

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

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business as heretofore stated.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business. They have been excused.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD EUROPE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Postwar Economic Policy and Planning Committee of the House of Representatives recently spent a number of weeks on the European Continent in an investigation and examination at first hand of conditions there, and in a study of our permanent policies toward the defeated German nation. The committee several days ago filed a report on conditions in Europe, and made certain recommendations. This report was very critical of our policies toward Germany, and made recommendations for a sane economic reconstruction of that unhappy nation.

I recently read in a communistic newspaper that the American people are the least informed about current world conditions of the people of any civilized nation. I agree entirely with this conclusion. There appears to be a conspiracy of silence to conceal from our people the true picture of conditions in Europe, to secrete from us the facts regarding conditions on the Continent and information as to our policies toward the German people. In spite of this suppression the American people are becoming suspicious of conditions across the Rhine, and suspect the motives behind every source of information or alleged information that sees the light through the barrage of propaganda which is being used to blind us. Are the real facts witheld because our policies are so cruel that the American people would not endorse them?

A number of weeks ago Mr. Hoover and a committee of experts appointed for the purpose submitted to General Clay a report on German industry, in which were given figures on the industrial production necessary to leave to that country an industrial output sufficient to feed and clothe its population. This report was at wide variance with the policies and plans of our own Government. In fact, I am informed it took issue with the proposals of our Government, and showed that our policies would cause grave hardship, starvation, and human suffering abroad. The report was immediately marked "Secret," and was not released and has not been released to the American people.

Mr. President, at first the State Department refused to furnish me a copy of the report, stating that the Members of the American Congress had no right to the information therein contained, but on yesterday, through the intercession of a high official of the State Department, the report was given to me, with the understanding and the promise received from me first, that the information therein would not be made available to the people of this country.

At a time when the war is over, why there should be secrets from the American people is more than I can comprehend. If our policies could withstand the sunlight of publicity, if they were just and humane, I am confident that the Government would desire that the full facts be given to our people.

On last Thursday it was announced that certain German industries were available for reparations and that they would be shipped out of Germany. The particular industries included were not announced. This information is also evidently marked "Secret."

What have we to hide, Mr. President? Why should these facts be withheld from the people of the United States? There cannot possibly be any valid reason for secrecy. Are we following a policy of vindictive hatred, a policy which would not be endorsed by the American people as a whole if they knew true conditions?

Mr. President, I should be less than honest if I did not state frankly that the picture is so much worse, so much more confused, than the American people suspect, that I do not know of any source that is capable of producing the complete factual account of the true situation into which our policies have taken the American people. The truth is that the nations of central, southern, and eastern Europe are adrift on a flood of anarchy and chaos.

Mr. President, the whole American people are responsible for the policies of our Government. Eventually, we will reap the reward or pay the price for these policies. Our policies, therefore, should certainly be subject to the most searching scrutiny. Our people are most certainly entitled to know fully what their Government is doing abroad.

Mr. President, last summer, with a group of my colleagues of the Senate, I visited Europe and at first-hand saw conditions in western, central, and southern Germany.

We discovered that in the Reich most of the houses in all of the cities have been destroyed. Millions are homeless. Millions more are dead. Most of the factories are in ruins. Practically all the bridges are blown up. The railroads and transportation system are wrecked. The misery and human suffering are terrible to contemplate. No nation in modern history has suffered such catastrophe as Germany endures today.

We were unable to go into eastern Germany because of the policies of the Russian Government, but from authentic reports received, both in person and through the press, conditions there, due to the policies of the Soviet Government and the conduct of the Soviet armies, are horrible beyond human comprehension. In fact, by eyewitness accounts, loot, pillage, pestilence, rape, wholesale murder, and human suffering form one of the most terrible chapters in human history. Words are incapable of adequately picturing conditions there. The virtue of womanhood and the value of human life are civilized man's most sacred possessions, yet they are the very cheapest thing in Russian-occupied Germany today.

Mr. President, I agree entirely with the recommendations in the Colmer report. There is more intelligence in the conclusions of this committee than in anything I have read regarding our policies toward this late enemy state. I commend it to my colleagues in the Senate. In the name of decency, in the name of civilization, for the sake of our own future welfare, and for the future of world peace there must be a complete review and revision of our policies for the reconstruction of the German Nation and the rehabilitation of the German people.

Mr. President, there is a minority school of thought in this country headed by Mr. Morgenthau and Mr. Bernard Bernstein and by certain high officials of this Government which has held and still holds that Germany should be deindustrialized, her heavy industry for peace as well as war destroyed or removed, and that she be reduced to an agricultural state with a population consisting largely of subsistence farmers. The proponents of this plan advocate allowing her only enough industry to serve her most limited, essential consumer needs. She would not be permitted an industrial production large enough to enable her to export large amounts of peacetime industrial products which would enable her in return to buy foods, agricultural raw materials, and industrial imports necessary if Germany is to have a standard of living comparable with other civilized nations. In fact, under this program it would even be necessary, as advocated and admitted by Mr. Morgenthau, for the German people even to export food to pay for the fertilizer which is so essential to the productivity of the soils of Germany. It is admitted that under the Morgenthau dispensation the standard of living of the German people would thus be very low, and that Germany as an industrial nation would be a thing of the past.

Mr. President, in support of his plan, Mr. Morgenthau has written a book attempting to prove that Germany, stripped of her best agricultural lands in the east, stripped of Austria, the Sudeten and the Saar—and that program today has largely been carried out—and in addition stripped of her industry, can still survive as an agricultural nation. This program, as I shall show in a few moments, represents the policy adopted by the American Government.

What are the facts?

Prewar Germany had 79,000,000 people and 225,000 square miles of land, including Austria and the Sudeten area. Stripped of East Prussia, Silesia, the Sudeten, Austria, and the Saar, Germany's area is reduced about one-third, or to about 150,000 square miles. The area of Texas is 267,000 square miles. Mr. Morgenthau, therefore, wants what remains of Germany's 79,000,000 people to subsist on an area 40 percent smaller than the State of Texas.

In 1940 the United States census revealed that the size of the average American farm was 174 acres. Under Mr. Morgenthau's plan the average German farm would be 6 acres. Yet, Mr. Morgenthau says on page 54 of his book that Germany could even export enough food crops to pay for her fertilizer requirements.

I notice from the newspapers that Mr. Morgenthau states that the recent Potsdam agreements, which promulgated our permanent German policies are based upon his proposals.

The New York Times, on October 18, in commenting on this fact states:

> This means that the policy toward Germany determined upon at that conference was in the main an American plan and must, therefore, also be primarily an American responsibility.

How is it that the Morgenthau plan manages to find its way into an official declaration of America's intentions toward the German people? The fact is, I am informed, that the directive issued to General Eisenhower, which Mr. Morgenthau demanded be released after having been kept secret for months, was Mr. Morgenthau's brain child, and that it did not represent the views of the Central European Division of the State Department, and further that the directive did not represent either the Department's long months of preparation or its own convictions in the matter. I am informed further that this plan was fathered and born in the Treasury Department, and the responsibility for its consequences must be laid at that door.

Mr. President, the American people have not the slightest idea of what Mr. Morgenthau's proposal and our policies for Germany mean in terms of its economic or social or religious implications. It is not to the interest of America that oriental, atheistic philosophies prevail in the heart of Europe, the cradle of western civilization; and yet, if these policies are pursued this will be the result, to the grave detriment of America.

Under our policies the exports of Germany are to be limited to merely 2,000,000,000 reichsmarks per year against 12,000,000,000 reichsmarks in normal times, and even this amount did not afford prosperous conditions to the German people. In other words, German exports are to be reduced to one-sixth of normal. Much of the industry of Germany was destroyed in the war. Sixty percent of the remaining heavy industry is to be removed. The plan is to deindustrialize Germany and destroy most of her peacetime industry as well as all war industry.

Of course, there is no argument regarding the elimination of Germany's war industry. We are all agreed on that. We are all agreed, too, that she must be kept disarmed. But why blur the easily defined distinction between peacetime industry and war industry? By eliminating specific war industries, preventing the stock-piling of certain raw materials, and by supervising German industry, there will be no possibility whatever of Germany rearming. The basic issues here have nothing whatever to do with German rearmament. To deindustrialize Germany is not necessary to render Germany powerless again to wage war.

We are concerned, instead, with the great issue of humanitarianism, of our responsibility as a civilized, Christian people in the face of profound misery, suffering, and impending starvation abroad. We are concerned with the great question of the effect present policies will have upon our own economy and on the future peace of the world.

Mr. President, western Germany, the part now occupied by the United States, Britain, and France, is the industrial heart of Europe. In the prewar years the whole of Germany produced only 80 percent of its food supply, and western Germany, the large industrial area, produced nothing like its essential food requirements. Normally the American area produced 75 percent of the food required to give each person 1,500 calories per day. Mr. President, 1,500 calories a

day is a starvation diet, which will do irreparable damage to the human body. The French area produced 45 percent, and the British area less than that. Of course, production today, due to war dislocations and lack of fertilizer, is only a fraction of that.

For centuries the lands in Germany east of the Oder-Neisse Rivers have been inhabited by 9,000,000 people of German culture, tongue, and blood. In Czechoslovakia, two to three million more reside in the Sudeten areas. In the Potsdam agreement these areas were given to Poland and Czechoslovakia, with the understanding that their populations would be uprooted from their homes by the Russians, Poles, and Czechs. As a result, their lands, implements, tools, food, and even most of their clothing, were confiscated, and the men have been enslaved and taken off to Russia. By the way, Mr. President, this is the first time in the Christian era that the doctrine of slavery has been adopted as applied to the white race. The women and little children, defenseless and helpless, were driven, starving, at the beginning of winter, into the other zones of Germany. Many of them died of starvation and pestilence. Many were cruelly murdered by their oppressors, made to wander aimlessly, stripped of everything they owned, while their children died like flies, without food or medicine. The suffering of these people forms one of the most cruel chapters in history. We agreed to this. We did it, as was said—and I quote from the Potsdam agreement—"to restore true justice and peace." This agreement was made to settle the disputes which were dividing the United Nations. It was made to compensate Poland for her territory which was forcibly seized by Russia. We agreed to this transfer of populations, we are a party to and must assume part of the responsibility for the destitution and suffering of these people, and there is certainly a moral and legal obligation upon us to prevent those who now live from starving. There is an obligation upon us to assist them in starting anew.

The only surplus food-producing areas in Germany were in the east, areas which because of our agreements have been taken from her. Today she is left with a production of less than 50 percent of her necessary food requirements. Even with a very low diet she must import a vast amount of food. Today the Russians refuse to make food grown in the east available to the people of Germany outside the Russian zone, and very little, if any, to the people who remain in that zone—a fact which greatly increases the relief load which American taxpayers must bear and which we will be willing to bear because we are a civilized and Christian people.

The Russian area, in addition to containing the most fertile and productive agricultural area in the country, contained the second largest industrial area. This eastern industrial region has been looted by the Russian armies. Factories and industrial equipment of all kinds have been removed to Russia. Food, grain, herds, livestock, and farm machinery have been seized and shipped off to the Soviet Union. The country has been devastated. Thousands of people have been murdered, thousands of women violated, and conditions horrible beyond civilized human comprehension prevail.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks sundry newspaper clippings which deal with conditions in the areas of Germany occupied by the Russian Army.

There being no objection, the clippings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From PM, New York, N. Y., of October 3, 1945]

UNITED STATES DOCTORS IN BERLIN FEAR DEADLY WINTER—SAY MOST GERMANS UNDER 10 AND OVER 60 WILL BE KILLED OFF

(By Edd Johnson)

BERLIN, October 3.—Germans are going to die like flies this winter—so say the United States public-health officers here.

The Germans are undernourished and flea bitten. A typhus epidemic is inevitable, they say. They predict that German children under 10 years of age will virtually be eliminated by diphtheria and that tuberculosis will kill thousands under 10. Diarrhea now afflicts almost all new-born German children.

The infant mortality rate in Berlin is 16 times as high today as it was in 1943. A German Red Cross official predicts an infant mortality rate of 80 to 90 percent during the coming winter.

There is going to be a definite age-group elimination of the German population. Most children under 10 and people over 60 cannot be expected to survive the coming winter, they say.

The inevitable influenza epidemic will fill the gutters with German dead—and I am still quoting the public-health officers with whom I have had rather close associations in the past few days.

These public-health officers have no statistics with which to back their predictions. The AMG denazification program has made it impossible to obtain hard facts. All efficient medical-statistical personnel have been denazified and fired.

Nonetheless the public-health officers are talking as reported above. If they are correct in those predictions, then those predictions are the most important news that could come out of Germany today.

For it would again mean that our occupation has brought depopulation to the groups who are the principal hope of a new democratic Germany—the very young and the very old.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of October 16, 1945]

GIRL DESRCIBES RAPE OF DANZIG BY RED SOLDIERS

(By Hal Foust)

STOCKHOLM, October 15.—The rape of Danzig—literally the violation of its women and young girls by the Russians—was described here tonight by two sisters, 15 and 17 years old, with their 20-year-old brother, their parents, and their uncle contributing details of barbarism they said was not ended. They were a Swiss family which recently escaped from the Polish Corridor and are en route to their homeland.

The younger girl, with the nonchalance of a high-school student reporting a football game, told of brutal sex attacks upon her classmates, of sex murders by Soviet soldiers in an air-raid shelter, and of the almost flippant attitude toward such crimes under Russian rule.

ASSERT ASSAULTS COMMON

"It is so commonplace in Danzig now that a girl's screams attract little attention," the mother added as if to explain her daughter's failure to blush.

"There were a couple of hundred of us, mostly women and children, in a shelter when Russian soldiers came in," the child related. "They took my 14-year-old chum because she was blond and pretty. She cried and shrieked. The mothers protested and the Russians pointed their guns at the crowd and told them to shut up.

"Her father, a German, interceded. 'Better go with them, darling,' he said, 'before they kill all of us.'

"She went. About 4 hours later she came back. She walked into the shelter and fainted in front of all of us. She was dead.

CHOSE ONE AT A TIME

"We spent much time in the shelters in those first weeks of Russian occupation because they were about the only roofs left in Danzig. Soldiers finding us there barred the exit and used the shelter office for vergewaltigungen (translated 'forced down').

"We could hear screams as the soldiers took turns with the victim. They would come in and take out one girl at a time. One day another school chum, a 15-year-old, was taken into the office about a dozen times and I could hear her crying. The last time she was thrown into the shelter unconscious."

The mother told us of an 18-year-old girl living with them who was repeatedly ravaged by the Russians who forced their way into their house in the daytime as well as at night.

HID IN FEATHER BEDS

The father made haste to add that his own daughters, after early narrow escapes, were confined to their home and were successfully hidden in feather beds during repeated searches by soldiers hunting women, liquor, and incidental loot.

Another rape story involved the wife of an American engineer who had been employed in Stettin at the outbreak of the war. She was assaulted in her home which flew the Stars and Stripes over the front door. They said she recently left for America via Berlin, an invalid.

[From the New York Daily News of October 8, 1945]

GERMAN REFUGEES BARE HORRORS OF DEATH FLIGHT

(By Donald Mackenzie)

BERLIN, October 7.—In the windswept courtyard of the Stettiner Bahnhof, a cohort of German refugees, part of 12,000,000 to 19,000,000 dispossessed in East Prussia and Silesia, sat huddled in groups under a driving rain and told the story of their miserable pilgrimage, during which more than 25 percent died by the roadside and the remainder were so starved they scarcely had strength to walk.

Filthy, emaciated, and carrying their few remaining possessions wrapped in bits of cloth, they shrank away crouching when one approached them in the railway terminal, expecting to be beaten or robbed or worse. That is what they have become accustomed to expect.

RED ATROCITIES CHARGED

A nurse from Stettin, a young, good-looking blond, told how her father had been stabbed to death by Russian soldiers who, after raping her mother and sister, tried to break into her own room. She escaped and hid under a haystack with four other women for 4 days, she said, then remained on in the city working for the Poles who had taken over a portion of the city, until she had bartered everything she owned for food.

She said that in Stettin and all other cities in East Prussia food rations for the remaining Germans were a twentieth of the rations in Berlin.

On the train to Berlin she was pillaged once by Russian troops and twice by Poles who, she said, were far more savage than

the Russians. Women who resisted were shot dead, she said, and on one occasion she saw a Polish guard take an infant by the legs and crush its skull against a post because the child cried while the guard was raping its mother.

The nurse said it was pathetic to see in the midst of starvation ripened crops standing in the field with nobody to harvest them.

An old peasant from Silesia said shooting and fights between Russians and Poles were daily events, with officers smacking each other's faces and having duels with hand grenades. An old man said that when his party reached Kustrin a typhoid epidemic broke out in the train and all who were sick were pushed out on the platform, where they lay day and night until they died.

GANTLET OF ROBBERY

But first these victims were robbed of everything they had, even their shoes. Infants were robbed of their swaddling clothes so that they froze to death. All the healthy girls and women, even those 65 years of age, were raped in the train and then robbed, the peasant said.

Another woman with whiplash bruises across her face said that as the party with which she marched to the railroad from Upper Silesia was passing through Sagan, Polish civilians lined both sides of the road and the refugees were systematically robbed and beaten as they walked by.

They were stripped naked in streets and their bodies were gone over by jeering Poles. Many men and women continued to march barefoot in shirts and pants.

By the time they reached Cottbus, 90 percent of them had died.

This informant said one of the most galling things to the starving pilgrims to see was Polish stores and delicatessens crammed with luxury foods which the Poles bought freely at exorbitant prices with money obtained by looting German homes of furniture and selling it.

She concluded that she thought she was pregnant. She had been raped 30 times on the journey to Berlin.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of October 2, 1945]

STARVING BERLIN'S DAY OF RECKONING IS TERRIBLE ONE

(By Donald MacKenzie)

BERLIN, October 1.—Children of this city are dying like flies from undernourishment. Typhoid is rampant and the shadow of approaching death is plain on the gaunt faces of adults who are slowly starving because most of them are living on a ration that supplies scarcely half the minimum necessary to support life.

MORE SUFFERING AHEAD

But worse is still to come. Winter, it is universally admitted here, will intensify hardships a hundredfold. There will be no coal nor any other heating fuels for city dwellers in Germany this winter. Even if the mines were producing there is no transportation to distribute coal. Tens of thousands will freeze to death before Christmas.

Today we drove through the rubble that once was Berlin. Over an area bigger than Manhattan and the Bronx, including the Tiergarten, Unter den Linden and the whole of what formerly was select west Berlin, there is not one habitable building. Of the 15 percent of the city not wholly destroyed, most of the still habitable buildings have been taken over by American, British, and Russian occupation missions.

More than 3,000,000 Berlin residents, most of them women, live in the remainder.

CITY WAS LOOTED

The city was systematically looted in May, and blankets, pillows, bed linen, cooking utensils, and all food was carried off.

Shoes are so scarce and shabby that tens of thousands will go barefooted within a few weeks. In their present underfed condition, following years of undernourishment and privation, their mass extermination is as certain as though they were in the infamous Auschwitz or Belsen concentration camps.

American, British, and Russian evictions were governed strictly by military dictates. We took the best homes left standing and gave the German occupants a few minutes to pack one suitcase and get out to find what accommodations they could.

SEARCH GARBAGE CANS

Great streams of discharged German soldiers and displaced persons gush into Berlin every day but they are not permitted to remain, even though their families are here. The authorities refuse to issue them ration cards so that they are compelled to carry their miseries elsewhere.

Today we saw long lines of women with bags ransacking garbage cans in search of scraps of food, cigarette butts or bits of rag. It is impossible adequately to convey the scene in words. It was pouring with a rain that has been steady for 16 hours. The women all were drenched.

Every so often we passed funeral processions. The coffins were bundled along on wheelbarrows. They had no lids and the rain beat in on the corpses. Coffins are scarce in Berlin, so they are used only to convey the bodies to the burial plots. The dead are then tipped into the graves and the coffins resold.

COMMON GRAVE USED

The poor who can't afford coffins carry their dead to the crematorium and dump them before the gates. The overworked crematorium cannot handle all of the bodies, so some of those that are unidentified are carted off to a common grave outside the city.

As a final touch to the picture of Berlin's plight, the sewers are seeping into the drinking-water supplies so that it is dangerous to drink unchlorinated water. That is well enough for the victors who have plenty of drugs. The Germans have none and do not even ask for drugs for hospitals.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 5, 1945]

REDS TERRORIZE CONQUERED WITH RAPE AND DEATH

(By B. J. Kospoth)

LONDON, August 4.—As our long line of British Army lorries (trucks) carrying American, British, and French liberated prisoners of war from the Russian to the main Anglo-American zone of Germany rolled through the main street of Brahlstorf, the last Russian-occupied town, a pretty blond girl darted from the crowd of Germans watching us and made a dash for our truck.

Clinging with both hands to the tailboard, she made a desperate effort to climb in. But we were driving too fast and the board was too high. After being dragged several hundred yards she had to let go and fell on the cobblestone street.

IN STATE OF TERROR

That scene was a dramatic illustration of the state of terror in which women in Russian-occupied eastern Germany were living. All these women, Germans, Polish, Jewish, and even Russian girls "freed" from Nazi slave camps were dominated by one desperate desire—to escape from the Red zone.

Before I describe what happened to the women of Pomerania when the Russians came I want to put it on record that I have no wish to vilify the Red army, whose brilliant military exploits already are a matter of history. I shall relate only facts which came within range of my personal observation.

I know the Russian high command issued orders to restrain Red soldiers and I have seen local Russian commanders run considerable personal risk trying to protect women against the lust of undisciplined drunken troops.

ORDERS RARELY ENFORCED

But I also know that the high command's orders frequently were not enforced and rarely obeyed.

In the district around our internment camp—the territory comprising the towns of Schlawe, Lauenburg, and Buckow and hundreds of larger villages—Red soldiers during the first weeks of their occupation raped every woman and girl between the ages of 12 and 60. That sounds exaggerated but it is the simple truth.

The only exceptions were girls who managed to remain in hiding in the woods or who had the presence of mind to feign illness—typhoid, diphtheria, or some other infectious disease. Flushed with victory—and often with wine found in the cellars of rich Pomeranian land owners—the Reds searched every house for women, cowing them with pistols or tommy guns, and carried them into their tanks or trucks.

PROTECTORS MURDERED

Husbands and fathers who attempted to protect their womenfolk were shot down and girls offering extreme resistance were murdered.

Some weeks after the invasion, Red "political commissions" began a tour of the countryside ostensibly in search of members of the Nazi Party. In every village the women were told to report for examination of papers to these commissions which looked them over and detained those with sex appeal. The youngest and prettiest were taken by the officers and the rest left to the mercy of the privates.

This reign of terror lasted as long as I was with the Reds in Pomerania. Several girls whom I had known during my captivity committed suicide. Others died after having been raped by 10 soldiers in succession.

HIDING FROM REDS

In an isolated farmhouse where my French comrade and myself spent 3 months after joining the Reds, there were eight young girls from neighboring villages hiding from the Reds. One was always on watch and whenever the Russians were seen approaching they scampered off into a nearby woods and hid in the dense underbrush. This sometimes happened several times daily and the girls never had a quiet moment but while we were there the Reds never discovered them.

All of these girls already had been raped and three of them—one a little girl of 13—were pregnant.

Inevitably the Red occupation is having a disastrous effect on the morality of the inhabitants and the existing conditions of anarchy will exert an evil influence for years. Many women have been infected with venereal diseases and now a very few youthful girls have joined the Reds for pleasure and food and are helping them spot their compatriots.

QUEER CODE OF HONOR

Whenever possible, girls attach themselves to liberated Anglo-American or French prisoners of war for protection against the Russians. Curiously, the Reds seemed to have a special code of honor in this respect—they will take an Allied prisoner's watch but won't touch his girl.

On the road to the Prenzlau crossing of the Oder River we met three young Pomeranian Jewish girls who begged us to take them with us. They were highly respectable and had succeeded in escaping the Russians, but they were in mortal fear of them. Every night when we were sleeping in ruined houses or haylofts Red soldiers would awaken us while making their customary rounds in search of women but when they saw our uniforms they would merely grunt "harasho"

(all right) and go away without molesting the girls.

GOT GIRLS TO SAFETY

We eventually got the girls safely across the line of demarkation to Lueneburg.

When the Red army starts a big offensive its commanders hold out prospects of unrestricted rape and pillage as encouragement to the troops, but later they try to stem the tide of lust—not on grounds of humanity but because it threatens to undermine discipline.

Squadrons of Cossacks, used by the Reds, as they were by the czar, as mounted police, periodically surrounded villages in Pomerania and searched all the houses for deserters and stragglers who had remained behind with women. The Cossacks mercilessly drove the soldiers off to jail with their "nagaikas"—Cossack whips—but they kept the women for their own pleasure.

Mr. EASTLAND. From an area recognized as possessing one of the high points of world civilization in the twentieth century, most of the male population has been enslaved and shipped off to work camps in the Soviet Union. Today this area needs our help even more than western Germany.

Mr. President, we are face to face with stark reality. When we adopt the program which is cut out for Germany, we sentence millions of people to starvation and death. We limit them to land which will not grow the food to feed their populations. We strip their industry, prevent them from manufacturing, and thus deprive them of the ability to earn a livelihood. We attempt to keep them permanently at starvation levels. We are not punishing the guilty. Innocent, helpless little children and defenseless women are doomed to die by the policies of the American Government—people who have violated neither the laws of God nor man. The American people are not bloodthirsty. Our people, if they know the facts, would not be guilty of cruel, inhuman injustice. Under what theory should we make the children pay for the sins of their elders? Yet we are doing so. There is a 50-percent infant mortality in Berlin today. I am informed the infant mortality in Russian-occupied Austria is 100 percent. Throughout this winter the rate in Berlin and the rest of Germany will greatly increase.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to make a brief comment. The Senator says that we are not punishing the children of the fathers who are guilty, but that we are punishing the children of the fathers and mothers who are not guilty at all.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. HAWKES. I agree with the Senator 100 percent. Recently I heard a very distinguished man answer this question. The question was put to one of the greatest men in the United States, "Do you think the German people as a whole should be exterminated in order to make peace in the world?" His answer was a wonderful one. He said: "I do not believe that any people as a whole should be exterminated, because there are good and bad people in every nation." He called attention to the fact that in Germany 1,800,000 non-Jews had resisted Hitler to the point where they had been executed, or put into prison camps, and enslaved. He said: "I wish to God that I felt there were 4,000,000 people in the United States whose population is twice Germany's who would resist dictatorship to the point where they might be executed or be put into prison camps."

The Senator is speaking on a subject which is very interesting to me. Unless we cure the difficulty there will be a historical record which we shall always be ashamed to look at.

Mr. EASTLAND. I believe that future generations will condemn the American people if our present policies are not changed. I thank the Senator from New Jersey. As I shall show in a moment, those policies, if pursued, will also gravely damage the American economy and curtail the future prosperity of this country.

Mr. HAWKES. And damage, as well, our character.

Mr. EASTLAND. Even communistic periodicals are admitting that from ten to fifteen million Germans will die of starvation this winter. Mr. President, the Morgenthau plan for these unhappy people, on which our present policies are based, is sadistic. We are abandoning the principles of Christian civilization, for not since the days of Nero have Christians been treated so cruelly. This plan promises a prolonged era of pitiless hunger, a program of central European chaos and disorder, to be ultimately presided over by the ghouls of revolution, starvation, and atheism, and resulting in the cremation of Christianity in Europe.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What does the Senator think about the children and the people of Greece, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia?

Mr. EASTLAND. I believe that the children of Greece, Czechoslovakia, and other areas should be fed. We are feeding them and preventing starvation in those areas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. According to reports which I have seen recently, we are not doing a thorough job in those areas. It is estimated that enormous numbers of deaths are occurring in those countries.

Mr. EASTLAND. The American Congress should by all means appropriate the money to prevent starvation in those areas. We have set up the organization. We put up 85 percent of the money, and we have given the organization every dime it said was necessary to prevent starvation in those countries.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On the floor of the Senate yesterday the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and I believe one other Senator, made the statement that the pipe line is empty, and that we are very far behind today.

Mr. EASTLAND. The bill has passed the House of Representatives; it has been approved by the Senate committee, and it is next on the calendar. It will be passed by the Senate as soon as the bill presently under consideration is out of the way.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is one trouble in the practical situation. Winter is upon us and the bill has not as yet been passed. But I understand UNRRA has purchased the goods.

Mr. EASTLAND. It has the money and it has purchased the goods, and it will continue to buy them so long as the money is available.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If we assume that ample supplies are available, then I join the Senator in his feeling about the children of Germany. But does not the Senator think that a slight difference exists between our attitude toward the people of Germany and our attitude toward the people of Greece and other countries?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not see the point in that question, because we have ample supplies of food with which to feed the people in all such areas. So there is no use quibbling about who are the people to whom we owe the greatest duty. We owe a duty to our allies, of course; but we should prevent starvation in all those areas if we can do so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator will yield, let me say that it seems to me it is rather a harsh condemnation to say that the United States has brought this condition upon Germany. I think there is some duty which we owe to humanity, of course; but we did not create those conditions.

Mr. EASTLAND. I said before, and I repeat, that the permanent policies which we have adopted for the control of Germany after this war will cause the starvation of millions of Germans, because Germany is the most densely populated country in Europe, and she is not organized on the basis of an agricultural economy. The Germans do not have sufficient agricultural resources to feed all their people, but the functioning of Germany on the basis of an agricultural economy is exactly what we are attempting to enforce.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My only point is that the conditions in Germany were not created by us.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, they were not. Everyone knows who created the conditions. Of course, the Germans started the war.

But the question is whether we are civilized people and whether we are going to relieve conditions there. I understand that the Senator agreed with me on that ground.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agreed on that ground, but I question the availability of sufficient food to feed everyone.

Mr. EASTLAND. Our own Secretary of Agriculture states that we have sufficient food to do that. Our diet has increased during the war, but we are the only people of whom that may be said.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is true. But the question is whether we have sufficient food with which to feed all those people.

Mr. EASTLAND. We have appropriated every dime that UNRRA has said was necessary.

Mr. FULBRICHT. Then I have been misinformed about that.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. We still owe a balance of $550,000,000 on the commitment we made last year.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator even mean to infer that there is the least doubt that that appropriation will be made?

Mr. MEAD. That is not the question. The Senator said we have given UNRRA every cent they have asked for.

Mr. EASTLAND. We have given them every cent they have asked for.

Mr. MEAD. They have asked for $550,000,000 more, but we have not as yet given it to them.

Mr. EASTLAND. But as they have requested $550,000,000 more, a bill appropriating that sum of money has passed the House of Representatives, has been approved by the Senate committee, and will be passed by the Senate within the next few days.

Mr. MEAD. We pledged $550,000,000 nearly a year ago. We are the only country which has not furnished the full amount of its pledge. The UNRRA needs that money now. The pipe line is empty.

Mr. EASTLAND. Are they not getting it now? Is there any opposition to that bill? As I understand the Senator, he is talking about a measure which is about to be passed by the Congress. Is it the Senator's point that we should have passed the bill sooner? Is that it?

Mr. MEAD. The point is that the Senator from Mississippi said we have given UNRRA every cent they have asked for, whereas so far as I am concerned we have not given them $550,000,000 which they asked for months ago. That amount is still pending.

Mr. EASTLAND. They came before the Senate committee 2 weeks ago. Mr. Lehman appeared there and I was present when he testified. The bill has already passed the House of Representatives and has been favorably reported by the Senate committee, and, in my judgment, it will be passed by the Senate this week.

Mr. MEAD. As I understand the matter, Governor Lehman has made a statement, which, I think, appeared in the New York Times of today, to the effect that the situation in Europe is serious and the pipe line is running low.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, that is true.

Mr. MEAD. We have pledged the money.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; and we will give it to them in the next few days.

Mr. MEAD. I certainly hope so.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I certainly think the Senator from New York has misstated the situation when he has inferred that any pipe lines are empty because the Congress of the United States has not made the appropriation effective. Of course, that is entirely contrary to the facts. As the Senator from Mississippi has said, the appropriation will be made this week. There is no empty pipe line because of failure on our part to pass the appropriation bill 2 or 3 days ago.

Mr. MEAD. The information I received, let me say, if my colleague from Mississippi will yield further to me, is that the pipe line is running low; that unless they receive this appropriation, they cannot contract for goods for which they do not have the money; and that if the goods are not applied for now, there will be a time when the pipe line will run low.

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator has just said is exactly true. They asked that the money be made available by the 31st day of this month.

Mr. MEAD. They have been trying to obtain the money for some time.

Mr. EASTLAND. They have been eager to have us pass the bill. But they have asked that the money be made available by the 31st of this month.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President——

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator.

Let me inquire whether I correctly understand that when Governor Lehman appeared before the Senator's committee he said that the failure to appropriate the money sooner had interfered in any way with obtaining the supplies or placing them in the hands of the people who need them; or did he say that the appropriation should be made this year?

Mr. EASTLAND. As I remember his statement, he said that the appropriation should be made available by December 31.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator another question, if he will further yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Before I ask this question, let me say that my understanding of the statement which Governor Lehman made at a meeting which I attended with him is that if the money was appropriated by December 31, the supplies would keep right on flowing.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is my understanding.

Mr. HAWKES. I wish to ask this question, because apparently there is some misunderstanding on the subject: Does the Senator know what people UNRRA will feed in Germany? Will UNRRA feed displaced persons only, or will it feed the German people about whom the Senator from Mississippi has been talking?

Mr. EASTLAND. UNRRA will feed the displaced persons. Under UNRRA's charter, it cannot feed German nationals.

Mr. HAWKES. Then I understand that the continuation of UNRRA will not solve the problem which the Senator from Mississippi has been discussing in his speech; is that true?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is absolutely true.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to ask a question in order to obtain information. Does the Senator know whether UNRRA will acquire some of the property which is surplus?

Mr. EASTLAND. I know nothing about that. UNRRA is beyond the purview of the speech I am now making. UNRRA does not feed all the people who I think should be fed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought perhaps the Senator knew that as a matter of information. I notice there are very large surpluses, and no doubt they would help in the very situation which the Senator has been discussing.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am sorry that I cannot tell the Senator about that.

Mr. President, as Mr. Michael Foot so aptly quoted in the British Parliament:

> We speak of the Potsdam agreement. For the women and little children, the principal sufferers from our policy, there is for their protection an older law than any ever promulgated at Potsdam: "But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in Me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea." Thank God that law protects the children of Germany as it does the children of all mankind.

Mr. President, surely there cannot now be any question in the minds of the American people that terrible conditions exist in Germany, that a great tragedy is in the making, and that a catastrophe which threatens western civilization itself has been set in motion by these proposals. An overwhelming support of this charge is to be found in the recent warnings given by General Eisenhower, the Colmer Committee of the House, the Byron Price report, the economic advisers to Gen. Lucius Clay, by Mr. Churchill, Mr. Bevin, Gen. Sir Henry Maitland Wilson, General Montgomery, and a host of others who are compiling, without any relation to each other, a list of terrible indictments of the consequences of these policies. To be more specific, Mr. President, there is involved in the present predicament of Germany the whole question of the relation between the eastern and western civilizations. Germany has served both as a neutralizing agent and as a barrier between the Oriental hordes and a western civilization 2,000 years old, and for the first time in history we find in Czechoslovakia savage, barbarian Mongolian hordes stalking the streets of western civilization as its conquerors, and threatening not to stop at Vienna and Berlin but to push on to engulf the very civilization from which we ourselves have stemmed. Our treatment of Germany will decide this question of whether Germany is going to clamor for an anschluss to Moscow, or is to be reincorporated into our own civilization and culture, and the time has come for the American people to be told what it would mean if Germany, the most highly industrialized country in Europe, were to be incorporated into a totalitarian tyranny, masked under the guise of a modern democracy but manipulated by a vicious and sadistic minority of totalitarian Communists who for 30 years or more have preached openly throughout the world the doctrine that there is nothing left in western civilization worth preserving, and who have been and are the greatest persecutors of the Christian church since the Mohammedan invasion of Spain. Is it not significant, Mr. President, that there is not the slightest mention of this prospect in any of the writings of Mr. Morgenthau in any information which comes to the American people from the stricken continent?

Communism is the only beneficiary of starvation and vast human suffering. If

we permit wide starvation in Germany, if we attempt to destroy the German people, hold down their standard of living to low subsistence levels, and destroy their culture and self-respect as a people, Germany will be driven into the arms of communism. Mr. President, the western powers cannot permit the German Reich to become a satellite of Russia. The Communists know that a hungry, chaotic Germany will and must embrace communism, and that a Soviet Germany will lead to the Sovietizing of the smaller nations of western Europe and the collapse of democracy outside Britain and the United States. Whether we like it or not, Germany is the keystone of the structure, and Germany and western Europe must, by all means, be kept within the folds of democratic, freedom-loving Christian society which follow the private-enterprise system. No matter whether we have atomic bombs or not, we are not strong enough to stand against a world organized against us. I shudder to think what a union of Russia and Germany under the banner of communism would mean to the peace of the world. Why, Mr. President, that would be the most powerful combination in the world, a combination fraught with grave danger to world peace. The American people must realize that Russia is a predatory, aggressor nation, and that today she follows the same fateful road of conquest and aggression with which Adolf Hitler set the world on fire.

What the people of America want more than anything else is a just and permanent peace. This is the only kind of peace, Mr. President, that America will give her blood and treasure to defend and preserve. We desire a world system based upon freedom from want and freedom from fear. We want equality of opportunity and justice. We want a world in which nations and peoples shall be independent, and in which mankind shall be free from control and aggression at the hands of larger states. We made war upon tyranny. We destroyed the tyranny of the Nazis and the Fascists. We cannot permit American or Russian tyranny to take its place. The abolition of tyranny has been the great ideal under which America has labored, fought, and poured out her precious blood and treasure in order to win the victory. It is the inalienable right of every nation and of every people, Mr. President, whether friend or foe, to follow the pursuit of happiness and to build commerce and prosperity in the paths of peace. Shall the blood, the labor, the treasure, and the sacrifices of the American people all have been in vain? By holding down the standard of living of the German people to starvation levels, by depriving them at bayonet point of the opportunity to prosper, rebuild their economy, and reconstruct their civilization, we build up reservoirs of hate and create a festering sore in the very heart of Europe, a sore which once again can and, in my judgment, will poison the world with the scourge of war.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I think that perhaps when we were previously discussing this matter we had two separate bills in mind. I had in mind the emergency appropriation bill which is on the calendar.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is the bill which I had in mind.

Mr. MEAD. Very well. If the Senator will allow me, I should like to read into the RECORD a portion of an article appearing in the New York Times.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I may say that I favor the appropriation for UNRRA. However, that subject is not germane to what I am now discussing. The appropriation for UNRRA will undoubtedly be made. I may say frankly, however, that I do not wish to go into that subject at this time. I am just as strongly in favor of the appropriation for UNRRA as is the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. If the Senator will allow me to do so, I should like to say that Governor Lehman has said:

> Congressional sanction for the additional American contribution must be had before the end of the year so that supplies can be ordered for shipments beginning in February.

The bill which covers that matter is not even in the Senate at this time. It is still in the House of Representatives, and unless we act upon it before Christmas the authorizations which will be necessary in order to keep the pipe line in operation will not be made.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I will join with the distinguished Senator from New York in anything which he may wish to do to expedite consideration of the bill.

Mr. MEAD. I appreciate the cooperation of my distinguished colleague. I merely wanted to emphasize the fact that we not only should pass the appropriation bill which is now on the calendar but we should expedite the passage of the authorization bill and see to it that it is passed before the holidays have arrived. As I understand, that bill is now pending in the House of Representatives and has not as yet reached the Senate. I believe, of course, that a separate bill could be introduced in the Senate and referred to our Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. EASTLAND. The money about which I am talking would be used to feed more than displaced persons. I want people all over the continent of Europe to be protected and saved from starvation. I think that the appropriation of the necessary funds would be very good business and a very good investment for the American people.

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think it should be made plain in connection with the suggestions of the Senator from New York that this Congress is not guilty of withholding funds from UNRRA which in any way has had the effect of diminishing or reducing supplies in the pipe line to which the Senator has referred. This Congress does not deserve that kind of an indictment, and it is for that reason that I object to the implication contained in the remarks of the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I do not believe that there has been any trial, indictment, or decision of guilt made in accordance with the statement of the Senator from Colorado. I merely say that Governor Lehman said that he is in charge of this responsibility, and that unless we expedite the appropriation which has been requested, UNRRA will break down. That is the purport of the article to which I have referred as it appears in the New York Times. What I read was a statement made by Mr. Lehman at the White House.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, if the history of this world shows any one thing, it is that no peace which is founded upon injustice and vengeance is an enduring peace.

As the British Prime Minister, Hon. Clement Attlee, told the Congress a few days ago, "We cannot have prosperity at home with hell abroad." The United States cannot alone be prosperous when the people in great areas of the earth are unemployed and in poverty. As I have said, Germany is the industrial heart of Europe. European countries are dependent upon German industry. European industry is dependent upon German machine tools for repairs and replacements. Destroy Germany as an industrial nation and we retard the whole European recovery. In fact, there can be no permanent European recovery without German recovery. With Germany deindustrialized so that she produces only a limited domestic consumer supply of peacetime industrial products, the producers of the United States are deprived of one of their greatest foreign markets. In fact, there can be no sound, permanent peacetime prosperity in the United States until the economy of Europe is put upon a sound permanent basis.

Mr. President, what will be the effect of our present policies toward Germany upon the economy and future prosperity of the United States? If these policies prevail and the producers of the United States lose their German market, what will be the result upon our own economy? I think, Mr. President, no one will deny that the present program is aimed at depriving us in the United States of that market.

Next to the United Kingdom, Germany and our other defeated enemy, Japan, have traditionally been the most important export markets for the farmers of the United States. Next to the United Kingdom and Canada, they are the greatest export markets for both American farmers and American industry. As agricultural export markets they have ranked second and third; as general export markets for all American products they have ranked third and fourth. These two former enemy states normally take huge quantities of cotton, wheat, tobacco, lard, pork, corn, flour, fruits and other products.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at

this point a table giving the statistics of our exports in former years to Germany.

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

United States: Exports to Germany, specified commodities, 1920–39

Calendar year	Cotton, excluding linters		Tobacco, unmanufactured, value	Lard, including neutral, value	Total pork,[1] value	Corn, including meal, value
	Quantity	Value				
	500-lb. bales	*Thous. of dol.*	*Thous. of dol.*	*Thous. of dol.*	*Thous. of dol.*	*Thous. of dol.*
1920	742,718	110,308	4,806	28,823	18,736	1,667
1921	1,505,686	110,153	5,589	35,790	9,502	10,405
1922	1,231,008	128,272	4,611	26,356	6,670	21,954
1923	1,014,818	148,311	5,836	46,590	12,211	4,765
1924	1,578,844	220,050	7,487	41,667	6,211	683
1925	1,989,557	245,885	8,176	33,916	2,505	213
1926	2,090,802	173,251	5,498	31,712	1,531	477
1927	2,528,110	226,048	5,949	25,232	1,109	277
1928	2,141,660	217,891	5,551	24,169	922	2,823
1929	1,738,583	169,457	3,493	27,264	1,299	3,704
1930	1,736,751	123,077	4,063	12,945	548	3
1931	1,435,149	64,380	2,777	11,982	198	70
1932	1,846,812	67,624	2,061	9,482	41	113
1933	1,746,814	77,107	1,720	7,223	157	7
1934	782,112	44,948	1,986	1,550	80	49
1935	624,706	38,453	2,357	183	5	0
1936	722,763	45,306	1,357	1,066	6	0
1937	854,143	50,243	1,435	264	3	103
1938	343,119	16,875	1,365	140	71	9,581
1939	183,409	9,046	1,211	28	15	0

[1] Includes bacon, sides, hams and shoulders, pork, canned, fresh, pickled and salted.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Division of Statistical and Historical Research. Compiled from Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States.

Wheat and flour: United States exports to Germany, quantity and value, 1920–39

Calendar year	Wheat		Wheat flour		Wheat including flour, in terms of grain	
	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
	Thous. of bu.	*Thous. of dol.*	*Thous. of bbl.*	*Thous. of dol.*	*Thous. of bu.*	*Thous. of dol.*
1920	8,246	22,511	1,078	11,856	13,311	34,367
1921	36,931	61,193	1,726	11,859	45,043	73,052
1922	10,084	12,656	1,497	7,909	17,121	20,565
1923	2,386	2,781	1,247	6,288	8,246	9,069
1924	7,150	10,218	1,861	10,750	15,899	20,968
1925	2,504	4,302	1,085	8,574	7,606	12,876
1926	6,877	10,473	657	4,554	9,967	15,027
1927	5,472	7,843	656	4,369	8,554	12,212
1928	2,117	2,775	341	2,060	3,718	4,835
1929	3,754	4,778	409	2,360	5,678	7,138
1930	2,431	2,722	368	2,060	4,163	4,782
1931	2,821	1,659	173	533	3,633	2,192
1932	1,743	982	58	164	2,017	1,146
1933	0	0	23	70	107	70
1934	19	19	18	72	104	91
1935	11	10	19	78	99	88
1936	0	0	17	80	82	80
1937	669	751	17	98	747	849
1938 [1]	3,215	2,635	4	14	3,232	2,649
1939	378	154	1	3	382	157

[1] Trade data for Germany include Austria beginning May 6, 1938; Sudeten area as far as ascertainable beginning Nov. 10 1938; Czechoslovak Provinces occupied by Germany, beginning Mar. 18 or 19, 1939; and Memel beginning Mar. 25, 1939.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Division of Statistical and Historical Research. Compiled from Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, during the 1920's Germany took more than two million bales of American cotton per annum. If the American farmer is permanently to lose this market, as he most surely will if the present plans are carried out, then American agriculture will not and cannot be prosperous. Surpluses will pile up. The purchasing power of the American farmer will be cut, and through his reduced purchasing power our entire economy will suffer. It will simply mean a continuance of acreage reductions, subsidies from the Treasury and regimentation for American agriculture. This is a terrible price, Mr. President, which the American farmer must pay if we continue the policies generated by Mr. Morgenthau's hatred of the German people. I do not desire to see the American people punished and impoverished, as they certainly will be if the present course is continued.

We hear a great deal about the importance of our trade with the 10 South American nations. South American trade is important, yet our trade with Germany—one nation—is traditionally greater than our trade with the whole continent of South America.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a table showing our exports to Germany and to South American countries for a number of years. The table shows that in the 1920's we exported approximately 20 percent more to Germany alone than to all the South American countries combined.

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

United States exports to Germany and South America compared

[In thousands of dollars]

	To Germany	To all South America
1921	372,380	273,325
1922	316,114	226,075
1923	316,837	269,318
1924	440,418	314,252
1925	470,344	402,606
1926	364,162	443,507
1927	481,681	438,159
1928	467,260	480,815
1929	410,449	539,310
1930	278,269	337,509
1931	166,050	158,691
1932	133,417	96,589
1933	140,024	114,048
1934	108,738	161,701
1935	91,981	174,341
1936	101,956	204,222
1937	126,343	318,354
1938	107,130	299,714
1939	46,475	329,127
1940	156	435,584
Total for 13 years (1921–33)	4,362,656	4,094,203

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, as an illustration of the impractical policies of our Government toward the German people, permit me to give an illustration. We have in America a great surplus of cotton. A surplus which is large enough to affect the whole economy of America, both in industry and agriculture. Germany, on the other hand, has a textile output which is far from adequate, but a textile industry which was largely undamaged during the war. There are millions of destitute, ragged people on the European Continent, millions whom America's own textile industry cannot clothe.

What happened? The cotton interests of the United States and the German textile industry reached an agreement whereby cotton would be consigned to the Port of Bremen, spun in German mills and enough of the product sold in central and southeastern Europe to pay us for the cotton. From 25 to 30 percent of the proceeds thus derived would be used to pay us for the cotton, and the remainder of the goods would be distributed or sold as our own military government desired. I am informed that that agreement was approved by our military government, but the State Department refused to make the cotton available. The reason which was assigned was that there is a shortage of coal in Germany, and yet they permit some rayon manufacture, although it takes seven times as much coal to manufacture textiles from rayon as it does from cotton, and cellulose, which is the basis of rayon, is an explosive which can be used in rearmament. When the matter was pressed the real reason came out, and this was that the textile industry of Germany might be given to Russia as reparations. In fact there is the authority so to do.

Now Russia refuses to purchase the American product, and in eastern and southern European countries the Red Army which occupies those countries by force of arms prevents the textile mills from spinning American cotton.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article on the Russian cotton policy which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, December 2.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD. (See exhibit A.)

Mr. EASTLAND. So, Mr. President, the textile industry of Germany, not a war industry, not a part of a rearmament program, can and might be given to Russia, and 13,000,000 Americans, dependent for a livelihood on the cotton industry will be or could be deprived of what is traditionally their second largest export market.

Yesterday I was informed by the State Department that some cotton will be available to German industry and to Japan, but the point I am getting at is that under our policies the cotton textile industry among others is liable for reparations to Russia and that such a policy will hurt our country.

Mr. President, the whole procedure to make effective our German policies is wrong. The program for the deindustrialization of Germany, for the removal or destruction of peacetime German industries is not submitted as it should be to the American Congress or to the United States Senate. The agreements are made. The policies are promulgated in secret by the executive branch of the Government. They are carried out in secret by the Army and employees of the State Department; men who are responsible to no one; men who know nothing about their impact upon our country or its people. This proceeding is not legal until submitted to the United States Senate in the form of a treaty and ratified by this body.

State Department employees and Army officers can give to Russia as reparations any German industry they desire. They are responsible to no one; the matter is handled in secret; the people who are affected in the United States,

as the cotton grower is vitally affected in the matter of the German textile industry, are not permitted the opportunity to protest. They are given absolutely no chance to present their side, and show how the actions of these employees will affect the American economy and destroy the prosperity of certain segments of our population. To give this matter some vestige of legality, the program of deindustrialization should be submitted, as the terms of a treaty are, to the Senate of the United States for ratification, so that the public will of the people of this country could be expressed through their elected representatives.

The will of the American people is thus circumvented. Our people are not afforded the opportunity to protect themselves. When the Senate or the Congress has the opportunity to ratify the peace treaties or act upon these matters the destruction of German industry and of the German people will be complete. We will be faced with a fait accompli. Mr. President, these matters involve the very highest governmental policy. Their impact upon the economy of this country will be terrific. They will have very great influence upon future world peace and prosperity. This whole matter should be submitted to the American people for ratification through their chosen representatives in the legal and constitutional way.

Mr. President, under pressure from Mr. Morgenthau, Mr. Bernstein, Mr. White, and others, we are following a cold, calculated, selfish policy to destroy the German people, but in injuring them a great wrong is also being committed upon our own citizens—in other words, by following a vindictive policy of hate toward Germany we are injuring and dislocating American economy and curtailing the well-being and prosperity of our own citizens.

Mr. President, there are other reasons why our basic program toward Germany must be changed. If we hold down the standard of living of the German people as planned, if we deprive them of the right to earn a living and to prosper, as planned, if we permit starvation, want, pestilence, and sorrow, as is now planned, then we must keep in Germany a large army of occupation to control the German people at gun point for many years, and, in addition, we must certainly have compulsory military training in this country. General McNarney forecasts a 10-year occupation for Germany. The mothers and fathers of America must realize that our policies will prevent the return of their sons for a long period of time. The solution is to permit Germany to rehabilitate herself along the lines of peace and to take her place as a decent, self-respecting nation.

There is another consideration, Mr. President: Who has been more heartless or cruel than the Japanese? The death march of Bataan was one of the most cruel episodes in human history. Now, why do we force much harder peace terms upon the people of Germany than we do upon Japan? Why is there a difference? What powerful influences are there in the United States that demand the destruction of the German people? Who are they, and what are their motives? We are not deindustrializing Japan. We are not shipping out her industry to lower permanently her standard of living. We are not destroying any of Japan's peacetime industry, not permitting her male citizens to become slaves, yet she devastated large areas of the earth. Why do we give Japan a much easier peace than Germany? If our occupation of Germany and our policies toward Germany contained half as much intelligence as we have shown in the occupation of Japan, we would be rewarded with much better conditions in Europe.

There is a middle ground between a sadistic peace and a soft peace, and that is to follow an intelligent program which will reconstruct the German Nation along peaceful lines, a program which would permit them to find contentment in prosperity, and which at the same time would constitute a program that would make our own citizens happy and prosperous.

Mr. President, if we do not act immediately there will be no road left of any kind that will lead to peace. I am duty bound to reemphasize the terribly critical situation which exists in Germany at this moment, and which is getting worse by the hour. There is a desperate food shortage. Eighty-five percent of the houses in the German cities have been destroyed. There are no medicines. The hospital facilities are woefully inadequate, as are clothing, bedding, and fuel. Millions—again I say millions—of helpless innocent men, women, and children are starving to death. The authorities tell us there will be a definite age group elimination in the German population by spring unless we harness our full resources and energies to save them. That means, Mr. President, most of the children under 10 years of age and the elderly people over 60 are doomed to die by spring. In the American zone we are following a policy of supplying a starvation diet of 1,500 calories of food per person per day. We could easily supply more and save human life. This, Mr. President, is in our own zone and is our own immediate and inescapable responsibility. We permit German children to starve and at the same time we release 750,000 bushels of corn to the distillers from which to make whisky. Conditions in the British zone are better, but conditions in the French and Russian zones are much worse, if that could be possible. The Russians are refusing to feed their captured populations except for political purposes.

Mr. President, I wish to read an article written by Dorothy Thompson which appeared in the Evening Star yesterday. As everyone knows, Miss Thompson was one of the leading anti-Nazi columnists in this country, and I think everyone will admit that she has as good sources of information regarding conditions on the continent of Europe as any other columnist in the United States.

First, let us see who her authorities are. She says:

> Military officers whose positions do not permit them to come before the public communicate with journalists, and tell of frightful conditions.

Let me say, Mr. President, that I have received the same information from friends in the military services who were stationed in Germany. Listen to this:

> One reports: In 6 months large parts of Germany will be shelterless Buchenwalds of starved corpses. Trains and trucks coming from the east with refugees from the Polish and Czech territories are arriving with corpses among the barely living, many of them children. These are often tossed out of trains and trucks upon the roads.

Listen to this, Mr. President:

> In Berlin, in August, out of 2,866 children born 1,148 died—and it was summer, and food more plentiful than now. The current issue of the British Nineteenth Century and After in an article entitled "Orderly and Humane," draws the most horrifying picture since the opening of the concentration camps.
>
> From Vienna, a reliable source reports that in the Russian zone no one has had food except dried peas, bread, and a little oil, in 6 months. Infant mortality is approaching 100 percent; slight ailments result in death from lack of resistance. Tuberculosis and rickets are becoming universal.

Miss Thompson goes further—and let me say that I agree with these statements 1,000 percent:

> This war was fought by the West in the name of Christian civilization, the "four freedoms," and the dignity of man against those who were perpetrating crimes against humanity. But policies which must inevitably have resulted in the postwar extermination of tens of thousands of children are also crimes against humanity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column written by Dorothy Thompson, published in the Washington Star of December 3, 1945, be printed in the full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, our policy toward Germany that has brought this misery upon them is the direct result of the barbarous doctrine of collective guilt. The people of America can never permit such policies to be followed through to their horrible conclusion. The Christian concepts of justice are anchored to the principle of individual responsibility. The German leaders who plunged a world into war are now on trial in Nuernberg. The American people cannot demand the punishment of slow starvation. They cannot sentence to death women and children for the crimes of the leaders of the German State. Why, the principle that an entire people are responsible for the acts of their leaders has not been recognized nor permitted in the Christian era. Such a doctrine was even repudiated in the Dark Ages. We hold in our hands, Mr. President, the fate of the German children. We must feel for them in their agony. We must give to them the same treatment that we would ask for our own children.

What then must be done? The American people must demand, first, that the United States repudiate the doctrine of collective guilt.

Second, the United States Government, with the wholehearted support of the American people, must demand an increase over the starvation rations of the German people. There is not one moment to lose. I believe that President Truman should order the Army to in-

crease the daily rations in the American zone and to use its entire influence to encourage the same increase in the other zones. I want to commend the Army for opening the channels of relief in Germany to the many high-minded, humanitarian private relief agencies that have always done so much to express the basic ideals and concerns of the American people. This Government ought to do everything in its power to provide adequate shipping facilities to transport these private donations of food and clothing. But I am convinced, Mr. President, that the situation is so grave that a separate American relief machine ought to be set up in an attempt to do everything in our power to avert this threatened catastrophe.

Third, I believe the time has come to implement the provisions of the Potsdam Agreement that call for the reuniting of the four separate zones of Germany under a central, non-Nazi, civilian administration. This is the only way we can hope to enable the German people to help themselves in this hour of crisis. I believe that once this has been done and once this Government has begun to function under an inter-Allied control commission, our troops—and it would not require many of them—could be used for police purposes only and the German people could be given the opportunity to salvage something from the wrecks of their lives.

Fourth, I am absolutely convinced that we must put an end now to scorched-earth policies in times of peace which, under the slogan "Reparations in Kind," have stripped every country in Europe of the industrial equipment necessary to maintain even a minimum standard of living. I believe that wise statesmanship would demand that rather than strip Germany of what small percentage of her peacetime industrial equipment she still possesses intact we could set those industries in motion to producing the machinery and the technical equipment which could be used to meet any reparations formula that has been agreed upon.

In other words, Mr. President, instead of shipping out of Germany peacetime industry as reparations, why do we not force the Germans to manufacture the machinery and equipment as reparations for other nations, and thereby save their standard of living, give them the ability to live and prosper, and increase the industrial production of all the countries of the earth, which would be good business and which would bring about better conditions for us all?

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

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi whether he would carry that over and include the rehabilitation of Germany in the heavy-industry line.

Mr. EASTLAND. Let me see if I understand the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand the Senator's remarks, he would have Germany rehabilitated so that she could produce reparations and pay reparations out of what she could produce through her own industry.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is what I said; yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does the Senator include heavy industry in his statement?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; to the extent that heavy industry is needed to produce peacetime consumer goods.

Mr. KNOWLAND. How does the distinguished Senator then square his statement with the situation of the world having been dragged into war twice in our generation if he would permit Germany to have all the necessary requirements by which he could plunge the world into a third world war?

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from California was not present when I spoke of that matter. I went into that subject in great detail. I said it is not necessary to strip Germany of heavy industry in order to prevent her from waging war in the future. I said she should not be permitted to manufacture armament, she should not be permitted to manufacture airplanes, and what is more crucial, she should not be permitted to stock-pile strategic materials. That alone would prevent her from waging war. Furthermore, through an adequate intelligence unit, such as we already have there, we must continually supervise and control the production of German industry, and when that is done there is absolutely no danger of her going to war.

What I said, Mr. President, was that instead of shipping out her peacetime industry and giving it as reparations to other countries which have been ravaged and devastated by the Germans, let us force the Germans with their industrial equipment to construct other factories which would go to the devastated countries. Such a policy has been recommended, I understand, by some very able American citizens who are fully conversant with all the conditions.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. We have had an example in this country of a tremendous peaceful potential turned into a war potential second to none in the history of the world. But we had the foundation on which to build. In other words, we did not need a great armament industry to make this Nation the greatest armament producer the world has ever seen. I, for one, am not willing to allow Germany to have the potential to go to war a second or a third time.

Mr. EASTLAND. But regardless of whether that industry is shipped out or not, if German industry is not supervised and controlled and the Germans are not prevented from stock piling strategic materials, they can wage war. That, then, is the crux of the matter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. All I can say to the Senator from Mississippi is that I am not willing to shed tears here for German heavy industry when I have seen in other nations of Europe, such as France, Luxembourg, Belgium, and Holland, places from which the Germans have shipped factories to their own country. That material was transported to Germany, as undoubtedly much was transported from Russia. So, I think there is ample justification for taking some of that German heavy industry and returning it to the countries from which it was stolen.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, in those cases where Germany stole industry Germany should repay it. I do not conceive that the Senator would for 1 minute think that anyone would rise on the floor of the Senate of the United States and advocate the leaving of stolen property in Germany. Of course, Germany should repay it. Of course, it should be removed from Germany. But the point I am making is that instead of depriving Germany of the industrial production to replace devastation in other countries, instead of shipping out her own industry, I would force her to rebuild industries for France, Luxembourg, Russia, and other countries. When it becomes apparent that as a result of our policies they cannot feed themselves our people will demand that new industries be created both to relieve us of the relief load and to create markets for our products. In the end Germany will be reindustrialized by us and at our expense. I think that is a reasonable conclusion to draw as to what we will do in the future. This simply means that the American people as a result of the Morgenthau-Bernstein proposals will be paying the reparations of German industry which now are going to Russia.

Mr. President, nothing that I have said can or should be construed as a criticism of President Truman, Secretary Byrnes, or Mr. Dean Acheson. They inherited an impossible situation, a situation which was over 2 years in the making in the heat of war. These policies, however, have not worked out, cannot and should not work out. Relief must be given.

Mr. President, it is my earnest conviction that only by the policies which I have recommended or by similar policies can we create anything that remotely resembles the kind of a peace in Europe that the American people are going to be willing to pour out their treasure and their blood to maintain through the United Nations Organization in the years ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks excerpts from an article entitled "Common Sense About the Peace," written by William Henry Chamberlin and published in the Progressive of October 15, 1945.

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

COMMON SENSE ABOUT THE PEACE

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

If the political realities of Potsdam are a travesty on the professed war aims of the United Nations, the economic provisions of the Potsdam agreement are a complete repudiation of the fourth point of the Atlantic Charter:

"They will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity."

Such vital branches of German peacetime industry as metals, chemicals, shipbuilding, machine building are sentenced either to complete destruction or to a system of foreign control so rigid as to make normal efficient production impossible. At a time when all Europe needs all the machinery, equipment and manufactured goods it can

get from any source, the most productive industrial system in Europe, insofar as it has survived obliteration bombing, is to be very largely wiped out of existence.

The contradictions of the Potsdam economic program are so numerous and flagrant that one might well suspect a purpose not to disarm but to destroy the most productive industrial mechanism in Europe, and thereby increase and prolong the distress in that stricken continent indefinitely. American responsibility to help feed and clothe the cold and hungry peoples of Europe is often stressed. But the territorial and economic decisions of Potsdam have wrought more harm than the most generous contributions to UNRRA can repair.

One of the most glaring of these contradictions is the simultaneous declaration that "primary emphasis shall be given to the development of agriculture" in the German economy and the decision to give one-fourth of Germany's arable land to Poland. Another contradiction is the thrusting of millions of destitute refugees into the shrunken remainder of Germany and the decision to eliminate or greatly reduce the industries which might conceivably give these people employment.

Perhaps the most hopeless contradiction lies in the announcement of a desire to assist the growth of democracy in Germany while at the same time the "peacemakers" do everything in their power to make living conditions there utterly insupportable. There may be differences of opinion about the precise meaning of the word democracy. But all experience shows that no system worthy of the name has maintained itself very long when economic conditions have become not only dark but hopeless.

Some of the glib talk about transforming Germany into an agrarian country would convey the impression that there are vast open spaces waiting for new hands to till. Germany is one of the most densely populated countries in Europe and the population per square mile will be even larger because the eastern regions which have been taken away are more agricultural than the highly industrial Ruhr and Rhineland.

EXHIBIT A

[From the New York Times of December 2, 1945]

RUSSIAN MOVE SEEN FOR TEXTILE LEAD—BID SEEN IN EASTERN EUROPE AND PLAN TO CROWD UNITED STATES OUT OF MARKET AS COTTON SUPPLIER

(By Herbert Koshetz)

Although full reestablishment of the cotton textile industry in Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Poland, Greece, and Iran is hampered by scarcity of labor, there is a clearly defined trend of Russian dominance in this industrial field which eventually will eliminate the United States as a supplier of cotton staple to those markets, it was asserted last week by textile men just returned from these areas.

Russia not only will control the industry in the countries named, but she will become the world's number one grower of cotton staple in the next 5 years, they predicted, and might step ahead of the United States as the largest producer of cotton goods.

The Soviet Union's tactics in Czechoslovakia reveals the pattern which will bring textile production in eastern Europe under her dominance, textile men said. In that country Russia has discouraged the purchase of any American cotton by private manufacturers, they reported, and aside from staple supplied by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration she is supplying all the raw material for use in Czech mills.

Moreover, it was asserted, she is selling the cotton on a dollar basis at the high United States price, and taking back the major portion of production on a ruble basis.

The resulting squeeze leaves little or no profit to the individual manufacturer, and if he survives at all it will be merely as a part of the program of nationalization of industry that is gradually taking hold in that country as well as in other Balkan and eastern European countries, according to the textile men.

Although the Export-Import Bank could provide the necessary financing for Czech mills to purchase American cotton, the textile men said that the Government has discouraged the use of dollar exchange for purchase of any staple except that coming from Russia.

Russia has contracted with mills in Hungary, Poland, Yugoslavia, and other nearby countries for cotton textile production, similar to the procedure in Czechoslovakia, textile men said. In all instances, the staple to be used will be Russian and the weavers will not be allowed to cast around for customers other than Russia, it was indicated.

The mill owners' problems are complicated by inability to obtain labor and a shortage of coal for electric power. Recent reopening of two mills in Czechoslovakia normally employing several thousand workers brought less than 100 workers, it was reported.

From sources in this country, it was learned that Russia plans to expand her growing of cotton staple to perhaps three times her present harvest. For 1945, production in the central Asia republic of Uzbekistan, will total 1,000,000 metric tons. As this area supplies 68 percent of the total cotton production, it is estimated that Russia will produce a cotton crop of more than 6,000,000 bales. Reconversion of areas now devoted to grain and implementation of the latest methods for growing and picking will aid in bringing up the cotton production figure to a total well over that of the United States.

On the basis of 3,000,000 spindles destroyed in the war, estimated to be approximately one-ninth of her total, it is believed that Russia still has over 20,000,000 spindles in operation. During the war, 20 new textile mills were constructed in the east and since the end of the war 480 enterprises, including 129 clothing mills and 29 knitting mills, were restored in the Ukraine, and 112 in other parts of Russia. A substantial part of Russian cotton will go into "durable cord," for tires, it was indicated.

EXHIBIT B

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

In April I attended the enthronement of the Archbishop of Canterbury. At the climax of the impressive ritual a feminine voice rang startling through the arched nave. It came from an unassuming-looking little woman who cried, "In the name of Jesus Christ, stop this performance. While you parade in your costly robes the children of Europe are starving."

I smiled at this characteristic outburst of English nonconformist spirit. But 7 months later it is no smiling matter. The children of Europe are starving. Six years of war, indescribable destruction, and the lunatic Potsdam policies which have added to the disintegration inherited from the collapse of the Nazi regime have done their work. Germany, and with it Europe, is skidding into the abyss.

The facts are at last being revealed through what has amounted to a conspiracy of silence here. The British press has long been more outspoken and critical. Weeks ago a committee from both parties of the House of Commons issued an appeal to the long-deprived British people to cut down their rations to release food for German children.

The Economic Advisory Commission sent to Berlin to assist General Eisenhower was utterly frustrated by attempting to advise on the implementation of Potsdam in a country which had lost a quarter of its arable land by unilateral action of the Russians and Poles, who were driving the population, along with the German-speaking Czechs, into the truncated Reich. General Eisenhower now tells us that the normal population of the American zone has increased 24 percent. Eighty-five percent of the food crop in the area east of the Oder and Neisse—the normal German grain and potato source—has gone unharvested.

In the Russian zone, which together with the Polish comprises half of Germany, 50 percent of the crop is lost. The stripping of industries in the east and the demolition of others in the west and south have added to the break-down. Efforts to bring up coal have partly succeeded, but lack of transportation piles it at pit heads. Mills that should be turning out plows, rails, locomotives, machinery for all Europe are idle. Only 5 to 7 percent of industry is operating.

Mr. Byron Price points out that French opposition to a unified German economic policy is a root cause for the chaos, and that unless we find some way of instilling hope into the German people we can expect general break-down under uncontrollable conditions.

Military officers whose positions do not permit them to come before the public, communicate with journalists, and tell of frightful conditions, especially in the East. One reports: In 6 months large parts of Germany will be shelterless Buchenwalds of starved corpses. Trains and trucks coming from the east with refugees from the Polish and Czech territories are arriving with corpses among the barely living, many of them children. These are often tossed out of trains and trucks upon the roads.

In Berlin, in August, out of 2,866 children born 1,148 died—and it was summer, and food more plentiful than now. The current issue of the British "Nineteenth Century and After," in an article entitled "Orderly and Humane," draws the most horrifying picture since the opening of the concentration camps.

From Vienna, a reliable source reports that in the Russian zone no one has had food except dried peas, bread, and a little oil, in 6 months. Infant mortality is approaching 100 percent; slight ailments result in death from lack of resistance. Tuberculosis and rickets are becoming universal.

This war was fought by the West in the name of Christian civilization, the "four freedoms," and the dignity of man against those who were perpetrating crimes against humanity. But policies which must inevitably have resulted in the postwar extermination of tens of thousands of children are also "crimes against humanity."

UNRRA has no help for former enemy states. Are the children of these states enemies, too, and does anyone believe that those who survive the present egreciously compounded horrors will grow up to love democracy, or learn that war does not pay—or only that defeat does not pay? Will they believe in "Christian" civilization or grow up to despise it as a false face put upon hypocrisy and greed? Will they believe in anything except that nihilism which was the mood out of which nazism was bred?

And does any one think that chaos, famine, freezing, and disease can be confined within any frontiers in compact Europe?

America must send food for all children wherever they may be, even if we have to ration ourselves. The United States, in addition to UNRRA, must set up its own services, under men who can be trusted not to play power games with the staff of life, but give to the starving in Allied and enemy lands—children first. The world's richest country, the only one which has increased its diet during war years, will, if we do not cease our callous indifference, become the most unloved nation among the children of men.

And if ever that happens, the atomic bomb will not save us.

ADMINISTRATION AND USE OF THE PUBLIC LANDS—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, which was authorized by Senate Resolution 241 of the Seventy-sixth Congress and extended by Senate Resolution 139 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to conduct a full and complete investigation of the administration and use of the public lands, I ask unanimous consent to submit a third partial report (No. 808) thereon, which I ask may be printed with an illustration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report submitted by the Senator from Nevada will be received and printed with an illustration.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the report which I have just submitted to the Senate deals with public-land withdrawals within the State of Utah, and matters intimately related thereto. Although concerned primarily with the people in Utah, these withdrawals raise certain fundamental questions which are causing consternation in other public-land States.

The first of the withdrawal orders, which I wish to speak about, covered nearly 3 millions of acres. The order was hastily drawn, in entire secrecy, and it never had any substantial basis or justification whatever. It served no useful or legitimate purpose. It was finally vacated only because these facts were brought to light by the investigations and hearings of my subcommittee. Immediately after these facts were made known, the order was superseded by a withdrawal smaller in area, but with much more drastic terms, and correspondingly more far-reaching and objectionable effects.

This second withdrawal order, as drawn, was issued under doubtful legal authority.

The third so-called withdrawal order, covering nearly 2 millions of acres, was prepared and promulgated under an alleged authority, which, in my judgment, has not the remotest basis in law. It was based on one of the most flagrantly distorted departmental interpretations of a statute that has ever come to my attention. Yet, after 12 years, the land withdrawal still stands to plague an important industry in eastern Utah and to prevent the development of some of the richest resources in that State.

Over the years, a large number of similar withdrawals have been made in many States, under the same alleged but nonexistent authority. The distorted departmental interpretation to which I referred has therefore had the effect of nullifying three of the acts of the Congress.

Mr. President, I make mention of these three withdrawals because, although important in themselves, they are but examples of the manner in which the Department of the Interior has misused and exceeded its withdrawal powers. The citizens of the public-land States are strenuously demanding that abuses of the withdrawal authority be curbed, and so far as possible corrected by legislative action. It is high time that Congress take steps to regain at least a large part of the withdrawal power which, by acquiescence of the Congress has been acquired by the executive branch. Those powers should be drastically curtailed and redefined by legislation.

The first of these withdrawals was effected July 23, 1943, by Public Land Order 130. It withdrew from settlement, location, sale, and entry approximately 3,000,000 acres of public land in eastern Utah, without prior notice of any kind. The order aroused immediate and violent protests on the part of officials and citizens of the State of Utah, and this committee was asked to investigate the withdrawal and all of its implications. Public hearings were held in Salt Lake City in November 1943, and again in May 1945. A hearing was also held in Washington, D. C., in January 1945.

This withdrawal was considered important in Utah, not only because it involved a large area of highly mineralized public land, but also because the citizens of Utah were fearful that it would be but the forerunner of further large withdrawals of beautiful scenic lands in the southern part of the State. They were apprehensive that additional large areas would be removed from beneficial uses by placing them in national parks and monuments, thus seriously retarding the development of the irrigation and hydroelectric power resources of the State and the industries dependent thereon.

This withdrawal of July 1943 covered virtually all of the Paradox Basin, in eastern Utah, an area long known to be underlain by thick beds of saline minerals. Since 1920 many exploratory wells had been drilled in the area, most of them in a search for oil and gas. Such drillings disclosed the presence of rich deposits of the salts of potassium and magnesium, in the form of carnallite and sylvite.

In 1942, prior to the issuance of this withdrawal, the Defense Plant Corporation drilled a well in the area to explore the possibilities of magnesium ores to supply the Government magnesium plant at Las Vegas, Nev., as well as elsewhere. The drilling operations were under the supervision of the Bureau of Mines, and the report issued by that Bureau described what appeared to be fabulous findings of both magnesium and potash. The Bureau reported that: "The possibilities are tremendous." The disclosure of these findings in the Defense Plant Corporation well intensified the already widespread interest in Utah in these mineral resources and their further exploration and development. However, the findings also had much to do with the issuance of the withdrawal order.

Because of the complete secrecy with which the withdrawal order was issued, its scope and limitations were little understood in Utah until brought out in the hearings by this committee. The order was signed by an Assistant Secretary of the Interior, and was purportedly issued pursuant to authority contained in the Withdrawal Act of 1910. It, therefore, did not affect the locating or mining of metalliferous minerals. Neither did it, by its terms, affect the nonmetalliferous minerals designated in the mineral leasing laws. It is highly significant, however, that from the time the withdrawal order became effective not a single prospecting permit or lease in the area has been approved by the Department, in spite of the fact that several hundreds of applications were on file.

The withdrawal order did not affect the grazing privileges on the public lands, but it completely stopped all settlement, and exchanges, and all development for irrigation and power purposes.

This committee was told that the withdrawal order was issued because the Department had informaton that a large number of placer mining claims were being located for the so-called worthless nonmetalliferous minerals not subject to the leasing laws, as a subterfuge to obtain the valuable deposits of potash and magnesium. However, when the county records were examined, subsequent to the first hearing by this committee, it was found that only a negligible number of such locations had been made. All of these were filed many months prior to the withdrawal, and in any event, even these few mining claims would have been declared invalid by the Department in the course of its regular procedure.

It is clear, therefore, that there never was any actual serious basis in fact for the issuance of the withdrawal order. The committee emphatically condemns the habitual practice of the Department of the Interior in making ill-advised and needless public land withdrawals. The committee strenuously objects to any withdrawal which is not supportable by a preponderance of fact, and even more so to withdrawals which are predicated on rumor, as in this case. Such withdrawals seriously hamper the orderly development of resources, communities, and industries, in addition to affording constant consternation and confusion to the citizens of public land States.

On January 4, 1945, just 6 days before the committee resumed its hearings in Washington, D. C., the 3,000,000-acre withdrawal of July 1943 was lifted. In its place there was substituted an air-tight withdrawal of approximately 200,000 acres. This second withdrawal consists of seven detached areas, all within the boundaries of the preceding 3,000,000-acre withdrawal. The lines are so drawn as to include all of the public lands in the State of Utah in which there are known or suspected deposits of potash and magnesium. The terms of this withdrawal are so drafted that such essential mineral resources are successfully removed from any further exploration, or any development whatever, by any person or agency except the Department of the Interior itself, with its own personnel and appropriated funds.

This second withdrawal, unlike the first, was not issued pursuant to the general withdrawal act of 1910, nor is it based upon any other authority specifically delegated to the executive branch by the Congress. Instead, it is based upon the so-called broad powers of the President, which are derived from the

long-continued acquiescence, or silence, on the part of the Congress in the exercise of such authority assumed by the Executive. The withdrawal could not have been made under the act of 1910, for in that event the mining laws with respect to the metalliferous minerals would have applied. As a matter of fact, the only purpose specified in the order was that the public lands therein described were "withdrawn and reserved for classification." "Classification of lands" is one of the specific purposes named in the act of 1910. Moreover, the Attorney General informed the Secretary of the Interior in 1941 that "when lands are withdrawn temporarily for a purpose coming within the 1910 act these lands are subject to the terms of that act, and accordingly said mining laws apply." Furthermore, the Department officials informed this committee that the withdrawal was "prompted" by proposed legislation pending before the Congress. In other words, the withdrawal was made "in aid of legislation," and for "classification of lands," which are the terms regularly used by the Department to describe the purposes of withdrawals under the act of 1910.

The second withdrawal is therefore, at best, but a subterfuge so frequently indulged in by the Department of the Interior.

For more than 20 years, various private citizens and companies operating in Utah have prospected the public lands in question. They are the ones who have made the discoveries of the rich mineral resources therein. Many of these citizens have spent years of effort, and have made heavy expenditures, in accordance with and reliance on the mining and mineral leasing laws. For more than 2 years they have stood ready and anxious to proceed with further exploration and development of these minerals, delayed only by the necessary approval of the Department. The Department has stalled them along, while it tried to decide upon a potash policy. Now, by this withdrawal order, the Department has blithely brushed aside the efforts, the expenditures, the equities of these citizens, and has decided that only the Department itself shall proceed with future exploration and development of these resources. Such a policy has been established notwithstanding the equities and interests of Utah citizens who stand ready and willing at all times to continue exploration and development.

The Department of the Interior told the committee that the 200,000-acre withdrawal was prompted by proposed legislation pending before the Congress. The proposed legislation referred to is S. 882 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. This bill contains a most ambitious and far-reaching scheme. If enacted, S. 882 would declare, as the policy of the Congress, that the reserves of potash and phosphates in the public lands "shall be held by the Government as a public trust in perpetuity primarily for the purposes" named in the bill. It may be well to note that substantially all of the known potash reserves in this country, and a high proportion of the phosphate deposits, lie in the public lands. It may be equally well to emphasize that such lands are by the terms of S. 882 expressly reserved to the United States Government "in perpetuity."

It cannot be doubted that this bill would put the Government directly in the business of mining, processing and distributing fertilizers, on a large scale. The Department of the Interior and the Tennessee Valley Authority would be directed to construct and operate large plants for the manufacture of concentrated fertilizers and all of the chemical byproducts thereof. The Department and the Authority would acquire, by purchase, lease, condemnation, or otherwise, plant sites and additional reserves of raw materials for the mining and production of concentrated fertilizers.

The bill would set up a vast system of test-demonstration farms throughout the country, with a minimum of 75 farms per county. This would mean a minimum of about 200,000 farms. Fifty percent of the output of the Government owned and operated plants would be used to supply all of the fertilizer used on the test-demonstration farms and in other fertilizer programs provided for in the bill. The other 50 percent of the fertilizers and the chemical byproducts would be disposed of through commercial channels, preferably through farmers' cooperatives. Such fertilizers would be furnished to the farmers free of cost, or at prices to be determined by those in charge of the program.

The bill would establish a network of National, State, and county fertilizer committees, with wide powers and many enumerated functions, to carry out the numerous purposes outlined in the proposed legislation. The purposes of the bill would be further implemented by a huge additional Government personnel, by grants to the States and to cooperating agencies; all at public expense, through annual appropriations by the Congress.

My committee was told that the Department of the Interior would continue its air-tight public-land withdrawals at least until the Congress should enact or defeat this proposed legislation defining a "national fertilizer policy." In view of the Department's record with respect to the many hundreds of public-land withdrawals made "in aid of legislation," this committee has much concern and grave misgivings as to when the Department might decide that this proposed legislation had been defeated. The committee finds that it is a rare thing for the Department ever to vacate a public-land withdrawal once it is made "in aid of legislation."

There is nothing whatever in the language of this withdrawal order to indicate that the withdrawal was intended to be other than permanent. But whether this proposed legislation should be enacted or defeated, the Department of the Interior proposes to do the future exploring of these mineral resources, with its own funds and personnel, at public risk and expense. The Department has adopted this policy in complete disregard of the interests and efforts of the citizens who have patiently, at heavy expense and in good faith, carried that work forward to the present time, and who are anxiously waiting to proceed with it.

Exploratory work is both costly and hazardous. The development following exploration calls for large expenditures for plants and equipment. The same system of private enterprise that has brought about the discoveries, possessed of the technical know-how and the financial means, should be permitted to proceed in the economic development of these resources. Private enterprise would provide added and much-needed employment in the State of Utah. The public interest in these lands would be served by the royalties paid into the Government Treasury and by the conservation measures provided in the leasing laws and regulations. It is not a proper function of the Interior Department to hold these resources out of use until, under some Utopian, hair-brained scheme, it can build up, within itself, another large bureaucratic machine, with all the inefficiencies and the abuses of power necessarily entailed.

I strenuously object to any policy, on the part of the present Secretary of the Interior, of withholding natural resources in the Western States, when so great a proportion of the lands are owned by the Federal Government. I am opposed to this insatiable reaching out, grasping for bureaucratic control and power. The Interior Department is strangling the orderly and much-needed development of the resources of the public-land States, as well as the individual initiative of its citizens. In this opposition I am sure that I am joined by the other Senators representing these Western States.

The Potash Leasing Act was passed February 7, 1927. A number of prospecting permits and leases have been issued thereunder. In 1934 the further issuance of potash permits and leases was suspended by Order 914, because the new domestic industry was then facing strong foreign competition and was operating at much below its capacity. But the advent of the war years shut off imports and greatly enlarged the demand for potash. That demand is expected to continue in the postwar period. A considerable increase in the producing capacity of the industry was called for. On June 9, 1943, the suspension order was revoked by Order No. 1829, which set up four provisions under which permits and leases might be approved.

These provisions were couched in ambiguous terms, and set up conditions which could not be met by any applicants other than the four producing companies already operating in this closely held industry. Whether so intended or not, the provisions of this order were so written and have been so administered that they effectively precluded any competitors from entering the potash-producing field. During all the time that this order remained in effect, not one potash prospecting permit or lease was approved by the Department, although there were several hundreds of applications on file. The bulk of the applications were for public lands within this withdrawn area in Utah.

I now come to a special, human phase of this withdrawal episode. It reflects no credit upon the Department of the Interior. In 1919, prior to the passage of

the Mineral Leasing Act, a group of 15 citizens located oil and gas placer claims for 2,880 acres of public land near Crescent Junction, Utah. They formed two companies and drilled their first well in 1920. Over the succeeding years they drilled, or had drilled, through operating agreements to which they were parties, 10 additional exploratory wells. While drilling for oil and gas, they made the first discoveries in the region as early as 1924 that disclosed the existence of the rich deposits of potash and magnesium.

This group has remained in possession of the placer claims over a period of 25 years. They are in possession today. They have kept one or more men on the properties at all times, and have performed assessment work on the claims many times in excess of the requirements under the mining laws. They have spent more than $700,000 in this work. They have complied with the laws and the rules and regulations in every respect.

Early in their experience, the Department of the Interior approved conflicting prospecting permits and leases, overlying and overlapping the placer claims. These permits and leases were filed by prospectors and speculators who apparently performed no work and made no expenditures on the lands, other than the payment of the filing fees. Yet these permits and leases were renewed by the Department, some of them for as long as 18 years. The conflicting permits and leases allowed by the Department have at all stages seriously hampered the placer claimants in their efforts to further drill and develop their claims. When they sought additional outside capital and assistance to perform the expensive drilling operations, these conflicting permits and leases constituted a cloud on the record and created doubts in the minds of those from whom they were seeking financial assistance as to whether the Interior Department would ultimately validate the claims and issue patents thereto. The claimants repeatedly protested the overlying permits and leases, but to no avail.

In October 1941, the Department initiated contest proceedings against the placer claims of one of the two companies of these claimants, based on a field examiner's report made in 1929. Without ever bringing the contest to a hearing, or giving the claimants an opportunity to present their facts and arguments, the Department arbitrarily declared all but one of the claims in question to be invalid, on the grounds of lack of discovery and lack of diligence leading to discovery. A patent was issued for one of the claims. On it the Defense Plant Corporation drilled the Government exploratory well in 1942, under an operating agreement which included the placer claimants as parties thereto.

Immediately after the patent was issued for the one claim and the other claims were declared invalid, the Department ordered three separate additional investigations by three of its own field examiners. In each instance the examiners found in favor of the claimants. It was the opinion of the Department's field investigators that the claimants had been in continuous possession of the claims; they had been diligent; they had made sufficient discoveries; and that the Government could not substantiate its charges in the contest proceedings. In the face of these findings, the Department never took to a hearing the contest which it itself had initiated. Instead, immediately after the reports by the three field examiners were filed with the Department, Secretary Ickes transmitted two amazing, incomprehensible documents to the Defense Plant Corporation, whose drilling operations on the lands of the claimants were by that time nearing completion.

In these documents, a letter by Secretary Ickes and a 30-page memorandum signed by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, the Department decided every issue in advance, adversely to the claimants. It was declared that the claimants had no color of right to any but the one patented claim and that they were trespassers against the United States. It was even declared "that the lands embraced within the claims are nonmineral in character," a statement that on its face was utterly absurd. Secretary Ickes went so far as to suggest to the Defense Plant Corporation that charges of fraud be brought against the claimants. That suggestion was completely repudiated by the President of the Corporation. The degree of animus, bias, and hostility that permeate those two documents is beyond comprehension. It cannot be doubted that Secretary Ickes had personal knowledge of these things, for he had given orders in his Department that all matters pertaining to the Defense Plant Corporation should be reviewed by him personally.

All of these charges were fully answered and refuted by the evidence presented before my committee. I cannot but condemn in the strongest possible terms such ex parte proceeding; such predetermination of issues without a hearing. To put it mildly, they are wholly unworthy of any Government official or agency.

Some time earlier these claimants took the precautions to have applications for potash permits and oil and gas leases filed by individuals in behalf of their two companies. Theirs were then the first applications. In view of their earlier experience with the Department, they took this step as protection against any clouding of their titles that might result in the Department records.

Shortly after the Department declared the placer claims to be invalid, a demand was made upon the claimants that they relinquish their rights to these claims within 30 days or their applications for leases would be canceled. The Department said that their placer claims and their applications for leases were inconsistent, and they must give up one or the other. The claimants were then about to become parties to an interest in an operating agreement with a large potash company to drill four additional deep exploratory wells on the lands within their claims. Faced with what they considered a choice between a hopeless contest with the Department for their placer claims and the probable loss of any chance to obtain permits and leases, they consented to relinquish the placer rights. This was done on advice of counsel, and with reservations. The reservations, however, were not recognized by the Department. The oil and gas leases were issued to the claimants, but the potash permits were denied.

The claimants felt that when they relinquished the placer rights it was "with a gun at their heads." The Department contends that when it made the demand upon the claimants for relinquishment "it was not intended as pressure." It appears to this committee that the Department did resort to pressure and coercion of the strongest and most effective kind. We believe that the Department went much too far when it demanded that the claimants make a choice without even a hearing as to the validity of the placer claims. We believe that citizens have a right to present the other side in any controversy with the Department in the protection of their interests.

My committee feels that a serious injustice was done to these placer claimants by the arbitrary and unwarranted actions of the Interior Department. Since it seems clear that they cannot look to the Department for any redress, it is recommended that a private bill be enacted directing that patents for additional placer claims be issued to the claimants.

I now come to the third public land withdrawal dealt with in this report by the committee. In 1933 some 1,800,000 acres of public lands within the limits of the former Uncompahgre Indian Reservation in eastern Utah were withdrawn from all forms of entry under the public-land laws, and placed under the administration of the Indian Service. The withdrawal order, so-called, consisted only of a letter of recommendation by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, carrying an endorsement of approval by the First Assistant Secretary of the Interior. It was given no publicity, nor even posted in or near the area withdrawn. The Register of the General Land Office at Salt Lake City was never able to obtain a copy of the order.

This withdrawal was made under alleged authority continued in the proviso in section 4 of the act of March 3, 1927. The language of this proviso is wholly negative; and the proviso itself has no relation to anything else in the act. But the Department of the Interior, by a flagrantly distorted interpretation, decided that the proviso is an affirmative grant of power to the Secretary to make "temporary" withdrawals of public lands for the use and occupation of Indians. This interpretation has for many years been widely used by the Department to make many withdrawals, in many States, involving many millions of acres of public lands. Most of the withdrawals, including this one in Utah, are designated as "in aid of legislation." But the withdrawals are allowed to stand indefinitely; for many years after the proposed legislation has been rejected by the Congress.

In New Mexico such withdrawals were made 14 years ago, on a vast scale. For much of that area no proposed legislation has ever been presented to Congress, because the Department knew that

it would be futile to do so. On a part of the withdrawal the legislation proposed by the Department has been repeatedly and definitely rejected by the Congress. Notwithstanding the decisive expression of Congress, I have yet to learn of a single instance in which this type of withdrawal has ever been vacated.

By this procedure the Department has arrogated to itself powers which the Congress has never conferred upon it. The Department has gone further and, by allowing these withdrawals to stand indefinitely after the alleged or legitimate purposes have been served, has in effect created new Indian reservations or additions to Indian reservations. This is in direct violation of three separate acts of Congress—those of 1918, 1919, and 1927. In these acts the Congress has specifically reserved to itself all powers to create Indian reservations or addition to Indian reservations or to change the boundaries of such reservations. The Congress should put an end to this illegal practice on the part of the Department of the Interior by repealing the proviso in section 4 of the act of March 3, 1927. Moreover, the withdrawals made under the alleged but nonexistent authority of this proviso should be vacated forthwith.

The abuse of the privilege of making "temporary" withdrawals of public lands is by no means confined to withdrawals for Indian purposes. Such withdrawals have been made in great numbers, for many purposes, in the interest of various Government agencies, most of which are in the Department of the Interior. I am informed that "temporary" withdrawals made as early as 1862 still remain in full force and effect.

The power of the executive branch to make public-land withdrawals must be delegated by the Congress. The language of both the Constitution and the decisions of the Supreme Court is very clear on that point. It is a favorite practice in the Department of the Interior to refer to the so-called inherent power of the President to make public-land withdrawals. But no such inherent power exists in the executive branch. The Supreme Court has in effect said that the President, as agent of the Congress, has acquired certain powers to make withdrawals because of long-continued acquiescence by the Congress in unauthorized withdrawals. However, if this be true, it cannot be doubted that the Congress can put an end to such unauthorized withdrawals by the simple expedient of eliminating this assumed inherent power.

The time has come when the Congress should redefine the authority of the Executive to make public-land withdrawals. This should be done either by further amendment of the General Withdrawal Act of 1910 or by the enactment of a new law which would codify the authority now embodied in hundreds of separate acts. The Congress should by affirmative legislation provide that (1) prior to the issuance of a withdrawal order there shall be a public hearing or hearings in the State or States affected, and (2) that temporary withdrawals shall be limited to periods of 2 years, unless approved by the Congress, with provision for a limited number of renewals, under strictly prescribed conditions.

My committee renews its recommendation that all existing withdrawals be carefully reexamined with a view to rescinding or modifying those which cannot be justified on the record.

LABOR CONDITIONS AND THE RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I wish to discuss for a few minutes the general labor situation which exists in the United States at this time. We are witnessing today a demonstration of the power of organized labor to stop the wheels of industry throughout this Nation. We see the whole plan of reconversion of our industries to peacetime production stopped, and hundreds of thousands of people are out of employment.

This is to my mind the logical result of the type of legislation which has been enacted by Congress during the past 10 or 12 years and the logical result of the type of administration which the Government has provided under the legislation enacted. During recent years, prior to our entrance into the war, it became popular to pass labor legislation, such as the National Labor Relations Act, which legislation has placed in the hands of organized labor absolute, unbridled power; but nowhere in the legislation has labor been made responsible for the exercise of that power.

I think that when the history of labor relations in this country is finally written, the National Labor Relations Act will go down in the history as the worst piece of labor legislation ever placed on the statute books. Any law which grants vast power to a particular group or class and does not at the same time make that group or that class responsible for the exercise of that power is bad legislation.

Under the provisions of this law the authority of management actually to manage and conduct its business affairs has been seriously undermined and in some instances almost totally impaired. Bad though this law has been, the administration of the law has been even worse. In this piece of legislation the leadership of organized labor has been given authority under which it has been able to build up a dictatorship of the labor racketeer.

Under this grant of power which came from Congress itself during the war period labor groups have extracted from every man who toiled a fee for the privilege of working. They have built up vast money chests, and today we witness a situation in which these powerful groups of organized labor not only believe that they are able to control and dominate the workmen of America but they look with scorn upon the opinion of the great rank and file of the American people and they defy the Government itself.

I think we face a situation in this Nation today in which it is inevitable that we must restrict the power which has been granted to organized labor in the National Labor Relations Act and in other legislation which has been enacted during recent years. If we do not restrict that power, then we most certainly must by law make these labor organizations responsible for the manner in which that power is used.

The conclusion which I have reached is not a conclusion which I have arrived at hurriedly. It was not necessary for me to wait to see the result which would come from the Government granting to labor organizations the power which it had granted, because I thought I knew what the result would be. I can say today that the predictions which I have made with reference to these matters are coming true every day.

When I first entered the United States Senate I fought to secure legislation which would tend to curb the power of powerful organized groups who were proving they had no respect for the rights of the public, the rights of the individual workman, or the power of Government itself; but it seems that the legislation which I proposed at that time was not popular in official Washington circles. It seems that the legislation which I then proposed was not regarded by Members of Congress as essential and necessary.

On the 15th day of February 1943, I again introduced legislation designed to improve this general labor situation, and in a speech which I made on the floor of the Senate on the 1st day of August of this year I pointed out what I regarded as an urgent need for some constructive legislation. In that speech I called attention to a published agreement which had been entered into by Mr. Eric Johnston as a representative of the United States Chamber of Commerce, Mr. William Green on behalf of the A. F. of L., and Mr. Philip Murray on behalf of the CIO. I directed attention to the fact that the sum and substance of this agreement was that they wanted the labor affairs of this country thereafter to be conducted on a peaceful basis with free collective bargaining and without any legislative interference. Certainly I thought then and I think now that if, in this country, we are to have free collective bargaining and if it is to be free from legislative interference, then the proper beginning for such a procedure would be to repeal the National Labor Relations Act which has vested dictatorial power in organized labor throughout the United States.

Therefore, in an effort to test the sincerity of all who were parties to that agreement, I introduced at that time a bill which was simple in its provisions because it merely provided for the repeal of the National Labor Relations Act under which the dictatorship of organized labor has grown up in the United States.

I quote briefly from the speech which I made at that time—on August 1 of this year:

> I am not introducing this bill for the purpose of urging it to the exclusion of other worth while legislation. The thing I am interested in is sound legislation. I believe it will simply be impossible for a sound system of labor relations ever to be built in this country under the provisions of the existing National Labor Relations Act. I am willing to follow my colleagues, Senators HATCH, BURTON, and BALL, and try to improve the situation by making the responsibility of labor organizations coordinate with the power and authority which is granted, or I am willing to vote for a bill to simply repeal

the National Labor Relations Act and leave the matter of labor relations to be worked out strictly on a basis of collective bargaining between employer and employee.

But I should like to warn my colleagues in the Senate that the time is here now when we, as representatives of the people of this Nation, must take some constructive action to deal with the impending general labor situation in the United States. The issue is clear: The Government must either withdraw the authority of law which has created a labor dictatorship in America, it must repeal the National Labor Relations Act and leave the settlement of labor difficulties in the future to free collective bargaining between employer and employee, or it must follow the course which has been charted by my colleagues in Senate bill 1171 and establish in the law of the land the rights of labor, the rights of the employer, and set up machinery to make both employer and employee responsible under Government authority for the exercise of the power granted.

So far as I am concerned, I am willing to proceed along either course, but I am firmly convinced that unless we face our responsibility to the Nation at this time and pass some constructive legislation, we shall face a chaotic condition in the postwar period where industry cannot operate, where jobs cannot be provided, and where chaos will reign supreme. We have fought and won one World War in the interest of sound democratic government; we are engaged in the second World War and will win it. It is to be hoped that the Congress of the United States will have enough foresight to act now to prevent a situation which is going to amount to practically a civil war on the domestic front, if something is not done to make those upon whom the Government has conferred vast power, responsible for the use of that power.

Mr. President, as I foresaw at that time, the labor situation in this Nation is getting worse, not better. We hear a great deal of conversation about conferences between management and labor participated in by the leaders of both management and labor and the Government itself. These conferences look to a better understanding between labor and management with the hope that strikes may be averted and differences in the future settled by more peaceful methods. Of course, all people in the United States would like to see such a situation developed, but the thing that many people overlook is the fact that if we are going to have collective bargaining, it must be bargaining in the real sense of the word; it must not be collective dictation on the part of labor or on the part of management; both labor and management should come before the law as equals.

It is in no sense a function of the Congress of the United States to put on the statute books such legislation as the National Labor Relations Act, which ties the hands of management, which prevents management from even talking freely with its employees, and then to say, "We want to see fair and equal collective bargaining." To my way of thinking, it is absolutely foolish to talk about or to hope for real collective bargaining on a fair and square basis between labor and management when we face the situation which the Nation faces today, wherein organized labor is absolutely free to go into a collective bargaining agreement and to execute a contract and then openly and flagrantly refuse to abide by the contract and leave no recourse whatever to business and industry to secure enforcement of a contract which they have honestly made.

When the United States Government undertakes, as it has done in the National Labor Relations Act, to tell the businessmen of this Nation that they must bargain collectively with organized labor, it then becomes the responsibility of the Government to say to organized labor that when, as a result of such collective bargaining, agreement is reached on a contract, the Government expects to see to it that labor lives up to the contract. If they do not live up to the contract, the rights of such union to act as a bargaining agent should be taken away from them. When any employer undertakes a contract with organized labor, that contract can be enforced in the civil courts of the land insofar as the employer is concerned, but it cannot be enforced insofar as the labor unions are concerned. Such a situation is not conducive to encouraging employers to enter into labor contracts.

When Mr. Thurman Arnold was Assistant Attorney General of this Nation, he gathered together and made available to the public a vast store of authentic information which proved beyond any question of doubt that labor unions were entering into conspiracies against the public in order to further their particular desires and their particular will. He gathered together evidence which proved that, not in a few isolated cases, but in many cases, these conspiracies against public interest actually existed and were in operation.

Facts gathered together by Mr. Arnold proved that the unions were responsible in many cases for actual limitation of production; that they often required men to be employed on the job when their services were of no value whatever; and furthermore, that in many instances the unions required work to be done by the most expensive methods of hand work, out on the job, when the work could have been done far more economically by utilizing other processes. Of course, all that simply means that the cost of the product to the customer is substantially increased because of these conspiracies entered into by the various labor unions throughout this Nation.

Facts were also developed to show that in New York City, force and violence were actually used to take trucks away from truck drivers who were seeking to deliver products into that city, and that employers were forced to pay union drivers who were members of the union local in New York, when their services were not needed, and, in fact, when they performed no service. Facts were developed in these cases to show that acts then performed by the union would have constituted highway robbery if performed by anyone other than by the unions.

But the Supreme Court of the United States told Mr. Arnold, when these cases were presented, that according to the law of the land unions could not be prosecuted for these conspiracies against the interest of the public. The decision of the Supreme Court made it clear that what would constitute an act of highway robbery when engaged in by others, could be performed with immunity by members of the Teamsters' Union.

It is absolutely foolish even to talk about working out any reasonable plan under which labor and management may settle their differences by the process of collective bargaining, so long as there remains in the law of this Nation authority definitely granted to labor unions to violate all laws which other citizens must abide by, and so long as they claim they are acting in the interest of their members.

What we need in this Nation is for Congress to have courage enough to put on the statute books not laws which are oppressive to labor, but laws which are fair to labor, and fair to the great rank and file of the public. I assert that there is no hope that anything but chaos will exist within the field of labor relations until the Congress of the United States has enough courage to face this issue and solve this problem.

If it is the decision of Congress that the National Labor Relations Act is to remain a part of the law of the land, which act places every restriction that can be written by law on the employer in the exercise of his rights as an employer, then certainly there should be additional legislation which would protect employees not only from coercion and threats of the employer, but would protect employee and protect the public interest against coercion and threats from organized labor. If it is the function of Government to protect employees against threats and against violence, it is also the function of the Government to protect those employees against threats and violence from all sources whatsoever.

If we are going to allow to remain on the statute books laws which will say that a mob may not form and take over the property of our citizens, then, if we want to be honest, we must say that such mob may not form under the guise and under the banner of a labor union and do those things which would be illegal for the mob to do under other circumstances.

No nation can command respect for its laws if those laws are written to control one class of citizens and at the same time to grant immunity to some other class of citizens. If we are going to have in the laws of this Nation a requirement which forces employers to enter into collective bargaining with labor unions, and if we are going to have on our statute books laws which force the employers to keep the contracts which they make as a result of such bargaining, it becomes imperative that the employer be assured that when such contracts are made the Government will see to it that they shall be enforced not only against the employer but also against labor unions.

If we are going to have laws in this Nation which provide that wherever business organizations enter into combinations and agreements which adversely affect the public interest, they shall be subject to prosecution under our anti-trust laws, then, if we are going to be honest, we must also provide that these vast combinations of labor shall likewise be subject to prosecution and to civil penalties if they enter into combinations

and conspiracies against the public interest.

So long as the laws of this country make fish of one class of our citizens and fowl of another class, the laws will not have the respect of the public generally. If by law we are going to guarantee to the unions throughout this country the right of their members to strike without losing their status as employees and without losing their right to return to their jobs when the strike is over, we have an obligation to require that during the period of the strike they shall conduct themselves in an orderly manner, and that they shall not use force and violence and the threats of force and violence to achieve their objective.

With the situation as it stands today, under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act employees in an industry may go out on a strike, they may take over the property of the employer by force and violence, and they may apply force and violence to prevent employees who want to work from entering and returning to their jobs in order to work. But still the law says that when the strike is over the employer must take back the goon squads and reinstate them in their former positions.

Is it any wonder that under the operation of such laws violence is the rule rather than the exception? Is it any wonder that under the operation of such laws conditions have developed to such an extent in this country that the labor racketeer assumes himself to be the master of the employer, the employee and the public? How much longer will the Congress of the United States allow itself to be intimidated? How much longer will Congress refuse to act in behalf of the interest of the great rank and file of the American people? How much longer will Congress sit idly by and see the whole program of reconversion, which is for the purpose of providing jobs for our returning soldiers, junked while these labor racketeers exercise the power which Congress has conferred upon them to pose as the dictators of American industry, and arrogate unto themselves the sole right to say who may and who may not work to earn an honest living?

I hope the situation is now so bad that Congress will act before it becomes worse. I am now convinced that this Congress will not repeal the National Labor Relations Act. I am also convinced that this Congress has no intention of passing the Ball-Burton-Hatch bill which seeks to establish a comprehensive method of regulating labor relations, both from the standpoint of the employer and the employee. As I said in my speech on August 1, I would personally welcome the opportunity to vote for this bill, but somehow I have the feeling that the opportunity will never present itself.

Therefore, with the hope that under the conditions which exist today, the Congress will be willing to pass a bill which would at least correct some of the most flagrant inequities which now exist in our laws governing labor relations, I have drafted a bill which I intend to introduce. This bill is designed to do what I regard as the absolute minimum which can be done if we are to have a semblance of fairness or equity in the laws of the United States governing labor relations. This bill, if enacted into law, would accomplish the following objectives:

First. Under the provisions of the bill, if labor unions enter into conspiracies against the public interest they are made subject to prosecution on the same basis that business organizations are subject to prosecution under the antitrust laws.

Second. The bill seeks to encourage collective bargaining between the employer and the representatives of his employees by providing that so long as the employer does not in any sense resort to force or coercion he shall be free to discuss with his employees the merits and demerits of any proposed plan of unionization.

Third. This bill provides that if labor unions in any way use or encourage the use of force or violence in labor disputes, such unions shall lose their right to act as a bargaining agent for their members for a period of 12 months.

Fourth. The bill also provides that if labor unions enter into contracts and then fail to keep those contracts, they shall lose their right to act as a bargaining agent for a period of 12 months, and shall be subject to civil suit for their failure to keep contracts, just as employers are now subject to suit for violation of the contract.

Certainly no one can by any stretch of the imagination say that there is anything radical proposed in this bill. In other words, the bill is simply designed to provide that hereafter labor relations, labor negotiations and collective bargaining, shall be conducted by responsible parties on both sides of the bargaining table, and that each alike shall be subject to penalties for failure to conduct themselves in accordance with the law of the land.

We face in this Nation at this time a situation in which an unbridled labor monopoly, which has been built up under laws which the Congress has passed, is seeking to establish itself as the absolute dictators of the employees, of the public and of business as well. It is a situation which must be corrected if we are to make any progress in reconversion, and if we are to provide jobs for our returning soldiers. I hope that Congress will not longer delay action on this important matter.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill to which I have referred and ask that it be properly referred and given prompt consideration. I also ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1656) prohibiting labor organizations from making contracts or engaging in combinations or conspiracies in restraint of commerce, and for other purposes, introduction by Mr. O'DANIEL, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any labor organization or for the officers, representatives, or members thereof to enter into any contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of commerce. Any person who shall make any such contract or engage in any such combination or conspiracy shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine not exceeding $5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both.

SEC. 2. Nothing contained in the National Labor Relations Act shall be construed to prevent an employer from expressing his opinion concerning any matter affecting the relationship between him and his employees, or in any way to restrict or interfere with the right of an employer to express to his employees his opinion and preferences concerning any labor organization seeking to secure the right to represent such employees, provided such employer does not coerce or threaten to deprive his employees of any rights which they may have under the law.

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the National Labor Relations Board finds that any labor organization, or any officer, or representative thereof, has in any way authorized, encouraged, or promoted the use of force or violence in connection with any labor dispute, it shall thereupon deny to such labor organization, for a period of 1 year, any rights, privileges, or benefits to which such labor organization would otherwise be entitled under the National Labor Relations Act.

(b) Whenever the National Labor Relations Board finds that any employee has used force or violence in connection with any labor dispute, it shall thereupon deny to such employee any rights, privileges, or benefits to which such employee would otherwise be entitled under the National Labor Relations Act.

SEC. 4. Any labor organization which authorizes, encourages, or promotes, a strike or other concerted stoppage of work affecting commerce, in violation of the provisions of a contract between such labor organization and an employer, shall be subject to suit in any court of competent jurisdiction for recovery of any damages sustained by such employer as a result of such strike or stoppage of work.

SEC. 5. As used in this act the terms employer, employee, representative, labor organization, commerce, affecting commerce, and labor dispute, shall have the same meaning as is given to those terms by section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act.

SEC. 6. To the extent that the provisions of this act are in conflict with any other provision of law the provisions of this act shall govern.

NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN GENERAL MOTORS CORP. AND UNITED AUTOMOBILE WORKERS UNION

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I wish at this time to make a few remarks regarding the labor situation, not exactly along the lines followed in the previous speaker's remarks.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a bit of encouraging news in the field of relations with other sovereign states. In the New York Times of Friday, November 30, it was reported that C. E. Wilson, the president of the du Pont-controlled General Motors Corp., had announced his willingness to meet with the President of the United States to discuss the current wage dispute with the United Automobile Workers Union-CIO. This was confirmed in later dispatches from Detroit.

This is progress. Previously, General Motors management had refused to negotiate with the union, in flagrant violation of the National Labor Relations Act, and a week ago appeared to have severed diplomatic relations with the Government of the United States. It is indeed gratifying and reassuring to learn that President Wilson has now

expressed a willingness to meet with President Truman.

Public opinion and the weight of the Federal Government's feeling that the General Motors Corp. should resume negotiations with the union appear to have persuaded the corporation to yield some ground, to the extent that Vice President Harry W. Anderson has now agreed to come all the way from Detroit to Washington, not immediately, or last week when the union was here, but next Tuesday, not to resume negotiations with the union, as would be required if the corporation were obeying the Wagner Act, but to confer with United States Conciliation Commissioner Edgar Warren, who had previously been told that, if he wanted to talk to General Motors management, he could come to Detroit, the capital of the General Motors colonial empire.

In time, the Federal Government, backed by the force of American public opinion, may persuade General Motors management to come back into the United States of America, back into compliance with the Wagner Act, and to sit down with the union, in the presence of United States counciliators, to work out a settlement of the wage dispute which is currently paralyzing production of the largest corporation in the automotive industry. President Wilson, who is on a sit-down strike against collective bargaining, may be persuaded to go back to work.

Why is the General Motors management behaving in this arrogant, high-handed manner?

In my view, the answer may be stated in two parts. First, because the General Motors management is determined to keep a veil of secrecy over its operating methods, its whole financial position, so that neither labor nor customers can have a factual basis for demanding a fair share of the corporation's profits in the form of higher wages and lower prices. Both would, of course, be in line with national policy, which is committed to maintaining purchasing power, now threatened with a drop of $30,000,000,000 in 1946.

Second, and even more serious and sinister, there is the charge made by the union, and substantiated by the corporation's behavior toward both the union and Federal officials, that the General Motors Corp., a rich colony of the vast du Pont industrial empire, is considered by its management to be a sovereign industrial state, in relation to the Federal Government, its employees, and its customers and stockholders.

On the first point, today, far too many industrialists and businessmen, many of them with powerful political alliances, are determined to head the Nation the wrong way in the reconversion and postwar period. Instead of going forward to full employment, full production, full consumption, and stable prosperity year in and year out, they are determined to head the Nation back to the bad past, the past of chronic mass unemployment, of breadlines, of half-way mustard-plaster emergency legislation. Yes; they want to go even further back, back beyond the Wagner Act, back to the twenties, when union organizers were hunted with dogs, beaten, thrown in jail, framed and imprisoned, just for the crime of believing in the right of collective bargaining and of proposing to organize so that more and more could practice what so many preached.

It is easy to understand how a millionaire, say, for example, one of the Du Pont family, which controls and directs the policies of General Motors, should be perfectly sincere in thinking that Walter P. Reuther, vice president of the UAW-CIO and director of the union's General Motors department, is a very fresh, inquisitive young man because in the course of negotiating wages he wants to get a peek at the General Motors Corporation's costs and profits.

Many perfectly sincere officers and controlling stockholders of big corporations seem to think that in the interest of public morality Mr. Reuther and the UAW-CIO, and A. F. of L. and rail labor unions, too, should be restrained, forcibly if need be, from insisting that in wage negotiations the employers should open their books and show their profits. It is their feeling, I am told, and I can believe it, that they look upon the whole procedure as a sort of economic strip-tease act that is bound to result in lowering the Nation's standard of morals.

I should be inclined to agree with that if they would agree to substitute the word "elevate" so that we could all get together on the statement that our moral standards would be elevated if all corporations made a practice of doing what thousands of employers have done for years, namely, talk costs, prices, profits, and future market expectations based on past experience and general business trends when they sit down to negotiate wages, hours, and working conditions with union representatives of their employees. We should all be better off and no one's morals would suffer, economically or otherwise, if that were done.

Actually, if disclosure of excessive profits resulting from too-high prices and too-low wages resulted in the payment of higher wages and the cutting of prices, the corporation might develop a better figure, feel a great deal better, be less afraid of the future, and behave in a much freer, more enterprising, and more competitive manner.

Mr. President, do not misunderstand me. I am not advocating the practice of economic nudism in our business and industrial system. I think corporations and the individual employer are entitled to as much privacy for their legitimate business secrets, know-how, and financial position as a laid-off worker has when he applies for unemployment insurance, or workmen's compensation, or when retired working people apply for old-age assistance. Yes; and more, because I think unemployed and aged workers suffer entirely too much snooping and prying and coercion by investigators and interviewers who are under the supervision of officials with bookkeeping minds.

I think a corporation, or the individual employer, should have about as much privacy, economically speaking, as a boy, aged 18, has when he goes before his Selective Service Board for examination. Maybe a little less, because, after all, the State gives the corporation certain privileges and immunities, such as the convenience of going bankrupt without the owners having to make good individually.

But let us not accuse the Du Ponts and the other multimillionaires and their highly paid hired men in the management of our great corporations of insincerity when they say in tones of great moral indignation: "We certainly are going to keep our profits covered—and we will not let even our own stockholders see them. As for the curiosity of labor—there ought to be a law."

Now, Mr. President, I turn to the second point, the basis, the assumptions on which General Motors management is refusing to negotiate with the union, is defying the national wage-price policy of increasing wages while holding prices, and is treating with the Secretary of Labor and his chief conciliator and with the President of the United States as if they, the General Motors management, were the rulers of one sovereign state and the President of the United States the head of another with whom General Motors management might choose to deal or not to deal, on terms to be dictated or negotiated by the corporation.

Let me read two paragraphs from the page 1 story in the New York Times of November 30:

> President Truman expressed belief today that General Motors Corp. and the United Auto Workers, CIO, should resume negotiations to seek a way out of the strike, which union officials said would not affect the rest of the motor car manufacturers unless there is a conspiracy in the industry.
>
> A few hours later C. E. Wilson, General Motors president, announced in Detroit that he would talk only with President Truman in Washington and that Harry W. Anderson, vice president of the corporation in charge of labor relations, would confer with union representatives in Detroit tomorrow on the question of illegal picketing.

Mr. President, I think the arrogance and presumption of that statement by Mr. Wilson needs no further comment.

General Motors' whole conduct in the course of these wage negotiations, before and after the strike, bears out and verifies the statements made in the Union's supplemental brief, presented in negotiations November 7, 1945. Because this is true, I want to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the conclusions set forth in the brief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Is there objection?

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

GENERAL MOTORS' POSTWAR PLAN FOR LONGER HOURS, LOW WAGES, HIGH PRICES, MASS UNEMPLOYMENT, INFLATION, AND ECONOMIC IMPERIALISM

The most disturbing feature of General Motors' reply brief is its renewed proof of the corporation's determination to write and enforce for itself and all of American industry a policy of reckless and irresponsible economic imperialism within the United States of America and throughout the world.

Such a policy as the brief delineates would weaken and destroy economic and political democracy within the Nation; it would commit us as a Nation to international economic warfare leading inevitably to armed conflict.

We recognize that such a charge, introduced during a wage negotiation, requires substantiation. This we propose to give.

First, let it be understood that this whole question of interlocking national and international economic policy was first raised, not by the union, but by the corporation. We now address ourselves to the issue because it has been reopened by the corporation.

In its reply brief (pp. 7–9) the corporation incorporated the text of GM President C. E. Wilson's October 27 letter proposing an alliance with the union to persuade Congress to lengthen the normal workweek from 40 to 45 hours by amending the Wage-Hour Act. (On p. 32 the corporation proposed a 48-hour week.) Although Mr. Wilson, in the October 19 press conference at which he unveiled the 45-hour workweek proposal, said it was not a proposal to the union, the brief now terms the October 27 letter "a counterproposal." Moreover, new emphasis is given the proposal—already characterized as "unthinkable" by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of the Senate Education and Labor Committee—by the corporation's November 7 appeal to the union to give this proposal serious consideration (p. 11).

The corporation management obviously intends to continue its efforts to mobilize pressure on Congress (p. 7) to weaken the Wage-Hour Act after 7 years of successful and beneficial operation. It proposes to do so at a time when unemployment is rising toward an estimated peak of 8,000,000 early next year. It persists in the face of estimates that lengthening of the workweek would add at least 1,500,000 to the ranks of unemployed veterans and laid-off war workers. It does not deign to notice the practical alternative, proposed by the union and now recommended again, of attaining maximum production and efficiency by going on a three-shift 40-hour-week basis.

The corporation leaves us no choice but to attempt to follow its devious reasoning all over the economic map. We must piece together the corporation's assumptions, points of view, and half-revealed economic plan for the General Motors Corp., all American industry, and trade here and in the world's markets.

General Motors has asked for it—twice. Now it is going to get our answer, stated as flatly, dispassionately, and briefly as possible.

We hope some responsible persons among its officers and stockholders will approach our analysis with open minds and will review and reconsider a policy and plan which, in our opinion, spell ruin for the corporation, for genuine free enterprise, and for economic and political democracy.

Not because we love the corporation more, but because we like depression less, we are determined if it is humanly possible to save General Motors from committing hara kiri. We prefer to believe that American business and public opinion have enough good sense to restrain General Motors and its industrial allies from cutting their workers' take-home pay, soaking their customers, and stealing world markets with a dollar cheapened by inflation.

Let us examine the parts before we measure the scope of the corporation's postwar plan for an economy that, because of unemployment and shrinking purchasing power among wage earners, farmers, professional groups, and small businessmen, and oversaving by management and stockholders of big corporations such as General Motors, means chronic mass unemployment, scarcity in the midst of "overproduction" and want in the midst of "surpluses." (In the automobile industry this means a return within 3 years to the 3- or 4-day workweek, 6-month working year—for those who get jobs at all.)

1. General Motors' wage-price-profit policy, as stated in the reply brief, in the course of negotiations and in letters and Nationwide advertisements, is, as we have hitherto demonstrated:

"High" wages, but 23 percent less than enough to maintain GM workers take-home pay equal in purchasing power to 1944;

Prices as high as the traffic will bear;

"Reasonable profits," whatever is left after wages, materials, and parts costs, etc.;

Prices and profits, none of labor's business;

Profits and costs, nobody's business but the corporation's.

At the very outset the reply brief expresses alarm over the possibility that wage rates may be increased to maintain take-home pay, a proposal advocated by us and the Federal Government as a necessary first step toward achieving a postwar level of living 50 percent better than the American people have ever known. "The demand for higher wages has since become universal throughout all industry" (p. 1).

Parading the economic fallacy that higher wages automatically mean higher costs and higher prices (see pp. 32 and 33 of our brief for proof that they do not), the corporation's anxiety about general increases in all industrial wage rates is touching. It reminds us that General Motors, giant though it is, in terms of control, is a subsidiary of the Du Pont interests, which in turn tie in with other vast concentrations of economic power extending even beyond the Nation's borders. They well know the big profits of high-volume production.

The corporation s alarm and anxiety (pp. 2 and 3) was expressed earlier by GM President Wilson. In the course of his October 19 press conference he warned that other employers who grant wage-rate increases are not "playing the game." Considering GM's dominant position in American industry, particularly with respect to producers of materials and parts, Mr. Wilson's statement on this point is worth quoting again:

"I think the people that have stepped out and raised wages and salaries, instead of lowering prices, if they had the margin to do it, have not been quite playing the game if we are going to stabilize and hold the line" (p. 34, press conference transcript).

Judging by the corporation's offer to the union (p. 34) to raise wages along with prices, Mr. Wilson could not have been quite serious in the last part of his statement to the press.

What is "the game" General Motors is playing that it is suggesting other employers should play or run the risk of being marked down in GM's books? Is it a game that is in the interest of GM stockholders, workers, and consumers, or is it in the immediate, short-run interest of a small ring of insiders and management who, as we showed in our economic brief at page 46, have already achieved a managerial revolution by getting a rule whereby officers, directors, and their associates (holding 30 percent of the voting stock) may act for GM stockholders as a whole, all 400,000 of them? (In citing that rule we remarked that democracy among GM stockholders appears to have been abridged.)

2. In our considered opinion, a dark thread of consistency and intent runs through the GM statements on wages cited above, and from them to the fantastic attempt to justify a 45-hour normal work week as necessary in order to compete with longer work weeks in other countries. In its reply brief the corporation endorsed and quoted the Wilson letter of October 27:

"The workmen of other nations will work far more than 45 hours" (p. 8).

Supporting its proposal that the union join the corporation in pressuring Congress to extend the 45-hour work week, GM argued that during the period of postwar reconstruction "our country will be shipping food, materials, and machinery to other countries" (p. 8).

Nothing is said about General Motors, du Pont, United States Steel, and other large producers selling cars and other products abroad, except that "it is hoped that at the end of this postwar reconstruction period our relations with other countries will be on the basis of a two-way street, where we shall get back goods and services for those we supply" (p. 9).

A similar statement was made by Mr. Wilson in his October 19 press conference:

"Until this aftermath of this war is over, we ought to go back to about a 45- or 48-hour work week. That is what the rest of the world is going to do. That is the only way that we will produce the volume of materials and goods at a sufficiently low price to satisfy the people of our country. I doubt, personally, if that is going to happen. In my own memory I remember the 60-hour work week, 40 or 50 years ago. When I first ran a plant it was 50 hours" (p. 21, press conference transcript).

Here three points are notable:

(1) It is proposed to go back to 45 or 48 hours, at a time when our productive plant and methods permit efficient, economical three-shift, 40-hour-week operation, as General Motors production men well know.

(2) The rest of the world (where cities and productive plants have been destroyed and where acute manpower shortages exist) is going to work long hours, so should we.

(3) Mr. Wilson's nostalgia for the good old days of his youth, when a 60-hour week prevailed.

Mr. Wilson is an appealing homespun front for du Pont controls. (See p. 46 of UAW-CIO brief for members of GM bonus and salary committee.) But Mr. Wilson does not succeed in masking GM's intent, expressed in the reply brief, to get into the world markets quick and deep, during the period of reconstruction and on a competitive wage-cost-price profit basis that, using GM's own gargantuan measurement of reasonable profits, would require that wages be held down and hours lengthened.

One of the most effective known ways to hold down wages is to maintain a large pool of unemployed. Thus the 45-48 hour week ties in with the low-wage advice given to industry by Mr. Wilson in his press conference October 19.

3. The thread of consistency ties in the corporation's statements on prices. The reply brief seems to talk out of both sides of the corporation's mouth. On page 20, the corporation seems to plump for lower prices. Yet on page 34, when the corporation comes to make the final firm offer of an estimated 8- to 10-percent wage increase to the union, it proposes to take advantage of an assumed opportunity to use a wage increase as the screw with which to jack up prices. Page 34 is consistent with the corporation's attempts in statements, pamphlets (Danger on the Production Front) and advertisements to soften up OPA, other administrative agencies and Congress for a price increase and at the same time to plant in the public's mind the idea that labor's wage demands would be responsible, solely and in full, for whatever price increases occur.

No more disruptive strategy could be devised. Labor would lose in lower weekly wages, in longer hours, in lower-purchasing power as prices rose—and labor would be blamed by farmers, business and professional persons for a spiral of inflation to which labor would have become the first victim.

The net of the reply brief's statements on prices is inflation—runaway inflation. We have already rejected the wage-price offer. We again denounce it as pure economic poison.

4. Bringing together the corporation's statements on wages, hours, and prices, discussed above, the pattern is fairly obvious. General Motors is for holding down wages, lengthening hours and raising prices within the United States of America.

5. But, in view of past operations by big business in world markets, and reading again the strange concern and anxiety displayed by the corporation in its brief (pp. 7–11) by

General Motors' president in his letter (pp. 7-9) and his press conference (p. 21 of press conference transcript), regarding world markets and hours, wages and production in other countries during the period of reconstruction, it seems reasonable to conclude that:

General Motors and/or du Pont dominated management are thinking of producing American cars and other products on a low-wage, long-hour, inflated-dollar basis for easier competition on the world market.

This amounts to a program for American economic imperialism, using an inflated dollar—cheap in terms of other currencies, but dear in terms of purchasing power here at home—to fight for ever-larger shares of the world market.

America's production record shows that our hope of sharing in the world's peacetime markets on a healthy and stable basis lies, not in pulling down the income of wage earners and farmers toward the coolie-peasant level of other less industrialized nations, but in the establishment of a high wage, low price, full production, full employment and full consumption economy in which profits, while perhaps lower on a unit basis than du Pont's would wish, can be greater in volume and more stable than ever before.

If, as seems obvious, General Motors management is mixing dreams of economic imperialism—dumping American goods produced with sweated labor and sold for cheap dollars—with its postwar production plans, then the union will fight on that front, too. And we are confident that all of organized labor and the public will unite to oppose such a program for the degredation of the American standard of living.

Were we to embark upon a course of economic warfare such as is implicit in General Motors policy statements, the road to World War III would be a short road, soon traveled.

The world's hope of lasting peace is largely based on raising the standard of living—and the consuming power—of all peoples toward the American standard while at the same time continuing to raise our own.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Old Money-Maker Hate," published in Collier's Magazine of October 20, 1945.

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

OLD MONEY-MAKER HATE

Speaking of Collier's article, Walter Davenport ripped off one recently under the title "Savior From Texas." This one was about hate merchants in general, and a pair named Vance Muse and Lewis V. Ulrey in particular. Muse and Ulrey do business under the name of Christian American Association, Inc.

As you probably remember from the Davenport article, Muse and Ulrey sell hatred of labor unions as their principal stock in trade, and have a working arrangement with Senator W. LEE (Pass the Biscuits, Pappy) O'DANIEL of Texas to push an anti-labor-union constitutional amendment christened by them the God-Given-Right-to-Work amendment. But they also sell various side lines of hate, directed at colored people, Jews, etc., etc., and all dressed up in language disclaiming hatred of anybody or anything.

These hate peddlers of the Muse-Ulrey type probably are in for some boom times, what with the war over and a lot of tensions still unresolved among us, and the desire riding higher in many a bosom to punch some nose which one couldn't see one's way clear to punching while the war was on.

We don't advocate the hate merchants' suppression. That would be contrary to the Bill of Rights and would only drive them underground. But we do advocate their frequent unveiling by magazines, newspapers, radio commentators and so forth; and we do earnestly advise the hate merchants' prospective customers, before they buy a bale of hate, to stop and thing about where their money will go.

In the Muse-Ulrey Christian American case, a total of $67,873.49 was contributed to this organization for its campaign for the anti-union constitutional amendment in Arkansas. This money was whacked around for salaries to Muse and assistants, for lobbying expenses, for personal expenses not itemized, etc.

The hate merchants, in short, make money out of marketing hate. Hate is the commodity they sell, the thing they live by—a purely destructive emotion which makes no jobs, builds no houses, raises no crops, and settles almost no problems of any kind.

It's a strange way to make a living, when you come to think about it, and it's something of a commentary on human cussedness that so many hate merchants can make good livings out of hate, while dispensers of good will and generosity and tolerance so often have to give their wares away.

There's no law to keep you from buying hatred by contributing to one or more hate organizations. But you're just a sucker if you do it, and nobody but the hate peddler who gets your money will profit by it.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1493) to authorize the head of the postgraduate school of the United States Navy to confer masters and doctors degrees in engineering and related fields, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

APPOINTMENT OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES IN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such Organization.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, in the light of all the events which have occurred since the San Francisco Conference, I doubt very seriously that the plan agreed upon at that Conference will serve any worth-while purpose, but it is desired by the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, who are charged with the responsibility of conducting our foreign affairs. Therefore, Mr. President, I intend to vote for the pending measure, for that reason, and for that reason only.

Mr. MILLIKIN obtained the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Austin	Hart	Overton
Ball	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hill	Russell
Briggs	Hoey	Saltonstall
Brooks	Huffman	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Stanfill
Butler	Kilgore	Stewart
Byrd	Knowland	Taft
Capehart	La Follette	Taylor
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Carville	McCarran	Tobey
Chavez	McClellan	Tunnell
Connally	McKellar	Tydings
Donnell	McMahon	Vandenberg
Downey	Magnuson	Wagner
Eastland	Maybank	Walsh
Ellender	Mead	Wheeler
Ferguson	Millikin	Wherry
Fulbright	Mitchell	White
George	Moore	Wiley
Gerry	Murdock	Willis
Gossett	Murray	Wilson
Green	Myers	Young
Guffey	O'Daniel	
Gurney	O'Mahoney	

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

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, yesterday there was considerable interest in the matter of confirmation under the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. At this time I wish to offer a committee amendment which I think will meet the wishes of Senators who were not in agreement with the attitude of the committee yesterday, and will at the same time be in entire harmony with the action of the committee. If Senators will follow me, the amendment is on page 2, line 16, after the words "the President." It is proposed to insert "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate." That refers to the delegates to the Assembly and requires Senate confirmation.

In line 20, on page 2, at the end of the paragraph, it is proposed to insert, "Such representatives shall each be entitled to receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum for such period of appointment as the President may specify." That simply means that the delegate to the Assembly may receive a salary at the rate of $12,000 per annum.

On page 3, line 4, after the words "United Nations", it is proposed to strike out the remainder of line 4, and down to and including line 8, and insert "or the principal representative in such other specialized agencies as may be established by the United Nations Organization." The effect of that amendment is that any member of the Economic and Social Council, or any member of the Trusteeship Council, or the principal representative of the United States on any other commission or body that may be created shall be subject to confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas wish his amendments to be considered en bloc or separately?

Mr. CONNALLY. I offer them all as one amendment. The reason why I offer them all as one amendment is that they all relate to the same subject. If we do not adopt all of them, we shall not wish to adopt any of them.

Does the Senator from Colorado prefer that I leave the amendment pending?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I prefer that it be acted on now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 16, after the word "President", it is proposed to insert "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

At the end of line 20 it is proposed to insert: "Such representatives shall each be entitled to receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum for such period of appointment as the President may specify."

On page 3, line 4, after the words "United Nations," it is proposed to strike out the remainder of line 4, and down to and including line 8, and insert, "or the principal representative in such other specialized agencies as may be established by the United Nations Organization."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] on behalf of the committee.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I wonder if we may have section 2 (d) read as proposed to be amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read section 2 (d) as proposed to be amended.

The Chief Clerk read as follows.

(d) The President may also appoint from time to time such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations at such salaries, not to exceed $12,000 each per annum, as he shall determine: *Provided*, That the advice and consent of the Senate shall be required for the appointment of any person to represent the United States in the Economic and Social Council or in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations, or the principal representative in such other specialized agencies as may be established by the United Nations Organization.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I merely wish to make this comment: I am very happy to join in urging the amendment which the able Senator from Texas has worked out in consultation today. My complaint against the Millikin amendment yesterday related solely to the fact that it undertook to make a full, round-the-clock job of representation on the General Assembly, and I know that in many instances, that would rob the General Assembly of the type of representation which we may wish upon it. On the other hand, I totally agree, and always have agreed, that the members of the General Assembly should be confirmed by the Senate, and that the chief representative of the United States upon the other instrumentalities should be confirmed. I believe that this is a very happy arrangement to settle the entire question.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I merely wish to say that I have never had any objection to the confirmation of these representatives by the Senate. In fact, I have repeatedly voted for measures providing that all appointees receiving salaries of more than $5,000, or some such sum, should be confirmed by the Senate. I am strong for Senate confirmation. But when we were drafting this measure and considering it in the committee several Senators were apprehensive that the requirement that confirmation must be had in the case, for example, of a Member of the House of Representatives appointed to one of the periodical meetings, might result in the House feeling that we were infringing on its prerogatives and privileges. For that reason alone I consented to the provision originally carried in the bill. But it is entirely agreeable to me to require that all the delegates to the Assembly and the heads of any other important bureaus or organizations shall be confirmed by the Senate. The only possible trouble might be that at a meeting of the Assembly or the United Nations Council an agency might be established composed of certain members, and the Senate might not be in session and there might be a little delay. However, I am willing to take that hazard. I think the amendment ought to quiet the fears of all Senators who voted yesterday under the idea that some such provision was necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas on behalf of the committee.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I am much gratified with the amendment which the Senator from Texas has offered. It meets almost all the points which I made yesterday in connection with an amendment which we fought out, and it meets all the points of an amendment which I proposed to discuss today. I believe that the Senator and the committee have done a very constructive thing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I shall read section 4 of the bill:

The President shall, from time to time as occasion may require, but not less than once each year, make reports to the Congress of the activities of the United Nations and of the participation of the United States therein. He shall make special current reports on decisions of the Security Council to take enforcement measures under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, and on the participation therein under his instruction, of the representative of the United States.

It will be noted that under the bill the President is not required to make current reports on matters which in his judgment may lead to decisions and that he need not make current reports of his instructions to our representative on the Security Council as to such preliminary matters.

I have an amendment intended to correct these deficiencies. The amendment is also broad enough to require that such current reports shall cover the actions of our representative to the Security Council whether or not they are pursuant to the instructions of the President.

Mr. President, I request that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On pages 3 and 4, it is proposed to strike out section 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 4. The President shall, from time to time as occasion may require, but not less than once each year, make reports to the Congress of the activities of the United Nations and of the participation of the United States therein. The President shall make special current reports (a) on matters being dealt with by the Security Council and which in his judgment may lead to decisions to take enforcement measures under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, (b) on such decisions, (c) on the participation in such matters and decisions by the representative of the United States to the Council of the United Nations, and (d) on the President's instructions to said representative regarding such matters and decisions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, as will be observed, the proposed amendment would require special current reports not only on decisions of the Security Council and on the action of our representative as to such decisions, but also would require current reports from the President on situations being dealt with by the Security Council which—and please note this—in the judgment of the President may lead to decisions to take enforcement measures.

I emphasize the discretion which this proposed amendment leaves in the President because I would not want to require that he burden himself or the Congress with reporting irrelevant or unimportant details.

This part of the proposed amendment would put no more on the President than a duty of good faith. Nothing less should be acceptable. I have proposed this discretion for the President because it was suggested early in the debate that a blanket duty to report everything would not be practicable, and with this I agree.

The proposed amendment would also require that such current reports on matters preliminary to decisions shall include the President's instructions as to such preliminary matters.

The bill as now drawn requires a current report on the actions, under the instructions of the President, of our representative to the Security Council, on decisions to take enforcement measures, but not on instructions leading up to such decisions. The proposed amendment would broaden this provision so as to cover such actions on important preliminary matters and with respect to decisions whether or not taken under the President's instructions.

The proposed amendment raises the question whether Congress should content itself with news of a fait accompli.

The proposed amendment emphasizes the right of Congress to be informed on matters which may lead to its own action in its own reserved field. It emphasizes the right of the people of the United States to be informed on matters which may take their sons into war. It emphasizes the moral principle that the destiny of this Nation and the world shall not be decided in secret. It poses the question whether we mean it when we talk of open covenants openly arrived at.

Our history is not free of instances where the fate of nations has been decided in secret with the secret approval of our Chief Executive. Am I making an extravagant draft on imagination when I would provide against the possibility of repetitions?

While we are opening the Town Meeting of the World, let us not close our own Town Meeting, the Congress of the United States.

The proposition that in order to preserve peace and to protect the rights of the peoples of the world there must be no dark corners, there must be no censorship, there must be full exchange of information, has been so eloquently, effectively, and recently argued in this body that I shall not presume to add my lesser talents to further elaboration. All that was said in these matters as to foreign countries applies equally here at home.

Every reason that requires the lifting of the iron curtain between the nations of the world requires also that we do not lower the iron curtain between the executive and legislative branches of this country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the bill makes provision for reports by the President to the Congress. I think Senators are aware of the fact that actually a good deal of the work to be done by the Secretary of State, particularly, will not be such that it can be made public currently, because to do so would interfere with the operations. However, there is no intent to keep from the public the action of the organization when and if it is desirable to make it known.

I think the President of the United States can be trusted to make such reports. He is directed to make certain reports, and in addition, he is given authority to make such additional reports as he may see fit to make.

So, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado. [Putting the question.]

The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I offer and ask to have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "on its call."

On page 5, line 17, beginning with the word "The", it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 2 on page 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> Nothing in such agreement or agreements shall authorize the President, and the President shall have no authority, to make available to the Security Council any armed forces to enable the Security Council to take action under article 42 of said charter, unless the Congress has by appropriate act or joint resolution authorized the President to make such forces available to enable such Council to take action in the specific case in which the Council proposes to take action.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, it has been stated that the power we are granting to the President of the United States to appoint a delegate who shall have power to vote to send a police force to—as it is termed—"put down aggression" is not the power to send us to war. The question immediately arises: What is war? No dictionary or text helps us much. The word has many meanings. War is a contest of arms, a struggle of violence between nations—but, clearly, not every use of arms or every contest.

James Grafton Rogers in his recent work suggests, in speaking of war:

> Slowly the conception emerges. War must be declared because it reaches many people. A declaration is in part a summons to citizens. It also gives notice that many legal rights are changed. Treaties are canceled. Trading and even corresponding with enemies is no longer proper. Enemy persons and property are restrained. Contracts and debts suspended. Our ships at sea and our own property and citizens abroad have only the protection force can provide. Vast and autocratic control of people by the government is released by a declaration of war—the right to control prices, ration food and clothing, even to seize factories and to arrest our own people without the right to demand the charges against them or secure public trial.
>
> The Constitution says, therefore, in effect, "Our country shall not be committed formally to a trial of force with another nation, our people generally summoned to the effort, and all the legal consequences to people, rights, and property incurred until the House, Senate, and the President agree."

Mr. President, a noted columnist has stated, in criticizing a speech which I recently delivered on the floor of the Senate, that fortunately, as he said, my voice does not carry very much weight any more in the Senate. I agree with him that it does not carry very much weight with reference to the pending measure, and it has not carried very much weight on this floor with reference to our foreign policy. It seems to me that any person who is so blind that he cannot read the signposts along the road, and cannot interpret their meaning, overlooks public opinion in the United States of America. The time will very shortly arrive when it will not be my voice that will be heard in the Senate of the United States, and it will not be the voice of any other Senator. It will be the voice of the woman who sits knitting by the fireplace or the stove. It will be the voice of the boy who returns from the war with his arms and legs gone, and, perhaps, blind, deaf, and insane. It will be the voice of the worker in the factory, the people out in the "sticks" and in the little towns. It will be the voice of the small businessman such as the small merchant. It will not be the voice of some person in Washington who sits in his gilded cage and disseminates propaganda, nor the voice of the commentator over the radio. No, Mr. President, it will not be the voice of the high-salaried columnist who broadcasts propaganda, but it will be the voice of the common people of this country that will be heard, and that voice will be effective in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, my voice has not been effective, but if it had been effective there would not have been enacted some of the measures which were passed prior to the time we entered this great conflict, which today everyone concedes has left the world in the most chaotic condition it has ever known, and has saved for us not the "four freedoms," or even the freedom from fear, but has left in the world the greatest fear that has ever been experienced since the Dark Ages, and has brought about dictatorship, starvation, degredation, anarchy, and disease.

Mr. President, briefly as I can I wish to discuss the question of the wisdom of granting power to the President of the United States to authorize his appointed delegate to vote to send any part of our armed forces into foreign countries for the purpose of putting down aggression, or for the purpose of putting down what some may say is aggression, which may or may not affect the peace and security of the people of the United States, or their property. Aside from the constitutional question involved, is it the part of wisdom to grant such power to the President? I submit at the outset that we have never sent a delegate abroad clothed with authority to bind us to take action in connection with any international affairs, and we have never authorized any executive spokesman to use future powers, as distinguished from past powers, to order into action American armed forces.

Mr. President, Mr. James Grafton Rogers, one of our foremost authorities in this field, writes as follows in his book, World Policing and the Constitution:

> This new territory needs to be as thoroughly mapped and mooted as our grandfathers debated and explored the consequences of the admission of Missouri or Nebraska on the political equilibrium of the slave question, or as our fathers grew fiery in debate over imperialism when we wondered whether and, if so, how and with what consequences, we should undertake to own and rule the Philippine Islands. The writer happens to be one of those who would be glad to see this country enter an international organization of the type now discussed but he is not one who welcomes our doing it in a burst of thoughtless enthusiasm. He fears reaction, repentance and disillusion unless we have discussed thoroughly, indeed almost torn to shreds, the question of means and commitments involved.

Indeed, it must be acknowledged that this whole new field of international relations into which we are entering must be explored in terms of the constitutionality of the President's powers to participate.

Surely no one welcomes the thought of what might result from hasty, blind, or foolish action on our part. Yet, Mr. President, we have been told that we must hurry the passage of the pending bill because the world is waiting for it, regardless of whether or not the people of the United States understand to what they are being committed by the Congress of the United States, or understand the secrecy which has surrounded every move that has been made not only prior to but all during the war and since then. Even the international newspapers and commentators have criticized the secrecy which has been practiced with reference to our foreign relations.

Strangely enough, the report of the Foreign Relations Committee admits that in section 5 dealing with economic sanctions:

> The committee realizes that the powers proposed to be granted to the President under this section are very great.

But Mr. President, in support of the proposition contained in section 6 that the Congress shall authorize the President to use American armed forces without any further reference to the Congress, the committee states simply, that even any kind of an amendment to this proposition contained in section 6 would, in its opinion, "violate the spirit of the United States Constitution under which the President has well-established powers and obligations to use our armed forces without specific approval of Congress."

The Supreme Court has never made a decision on the subject. I challenge any Member of the Senate to find such a decision of the Supreme Court.

At best it is only in recent years, when liberalism in the United States has swung away from a determination to limit the powers of the executive to the present incomprehensible determination on its part to surrender all powers to the President, that this proposition affirming the President's right to use American troops without consent of Congress has been given any serious consideration whatever.

The report of the Foreign Relations Committee clearly reveals that its findings do not rest on any constitutional basis whatever, for the report concludes:

> In order that there may be no doubt about the availability of our armed forces, the committee believed it wise that the Congress should in this legislation confirm its view that the President has the power and obligation, in compliance with our undertaking under the Charter, to make the forces provided in the agreements available to the Security Council.

Mr. President, in the request of the Foreign Relations Committee that the Congress confirm its view that the President has the power to make our armed forces available to the Security Council, the Congress is merely being asked to delegate its own powers to the Executive. What does the Constitution have to say on this matter? What are the powers of the Congress as provided in article I, section 8, of the Constitution? I read:

> The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes * * * to provide for the common defense * * * to regulate commerce with foreign nations * * * to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin * * * to define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas and offenses against the law of nations * * * to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water * * * to raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years * * * to provide and maintain a navy * * * to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces * * * to provide for calling forth the militia to repel invasions * * * to regulate generally the militia, and, finally, to pass laws to carry into effect the foregoing powers and all other powers vested in the Government.

Again I submit, Mr. President, that there is no mention in the Constitution of any power of Congress to delegate its authority to the President and for him in turn to authorize his appointee to an international organization to vote to put down aggression in foreign countries which may or may not directly or indirectly affect the interests of the United States.

What are the powers granted to the President in the Constitution? We read under article II:

> The Executive powers shall be vested in a President * * * the President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States (and of the militia when in national service) * * * he shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties, providing two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls * * * and all other officers (although the Congress may exempt posts) * * * fill up all vacancies * * * during the recess of the Senate * * * he shall give to the Congress information of the state of the Union and recommend measures and shall receive ambassadors and other public ministers * * * he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

Mr. President, James Grafton Rogers says of the provisions of the Constitution which define the powers both of the Congress and of the President:

> Congress alone is to "declare war." There is in this connection no mention of the President. His veto or approval of a declaration is, of course, contemplated, as the requirement is made that "every vote" should have his concurrence. Although the history of England to that date and our own history since shows that war has scarcely ever been declared without executive request, and, indeed, that the declaration has been usually an inescapable consequence of executive steps, we do not find the President especially mentioned on this point. The phrase does not read "on recommendation of the President," nor that the "President with advice and consent of Congress may declare war." The omission is significant. There was to be no war unless Congress took the initiative.

If we say to the President of the United States, "You may send a police force, or a part of the Army and Navy, to put down aggression," is there any Member of the Congress who does not believe that thereby we commit the whole of our Army, the whole of our Navy, and the entire Nation immediately to war? In that situation lies a fait accompli. We might just as well, it seems to me, say to the President of the United States, "We delegate to you the power to send at any time the whole Army and the whole Navy." We are only fooling ourselves and fooling the people of the country when we say that we will give to the President power to put down aggression with a small force, and not at the same time delegate to him the full power to declare war at any time, or have our representative vote to declare war at any time when, in the wisdom of the Council, it is determined that a particular nation has become an aggressor.

Mr. President, who should determine when a nation has become an aggressor? As I pointed out the other day, the League of Nations was never able to define an aggressor. Not only that, but when the Japanese went into Manchuria and the League of Nations declared Japan to be guilty of aggression, it could not back up its decision because the British representative on the League of Nations stood on the floor and defended the position taken by Japan, and the Japanese representative said that the British representative had defended the Japanese position far better than he himself could have done.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It is undisputed that the war-making power is vested in the Congress. The proposal now before the Senate is to transfer the war-making power. Does the Senator think that can be done without a constitutional amendment?

Mr. WHEELER. I, myself, do not think so.

Mr. President, while the Constitution admittedly is no more specific in its delegation of power to either the Congress or the President than in the provisions to which I have already referred, there is more than ample evidence to prove what was in the minds of the framers of this document concerning the nature of the President's power to used armed forces without the consent of Congress which they were ready and willing to grant him. It is perfectly clear that the President was not to be empowered to declare war or to use American armed forces for war purposes without a specific and prior authorization by Congress.

It is interesting to note, Mr. President, the treatment the question of war received at the constitutional convention. Mr. Rogers informs us "the business of declaring the country embarked on war was always treated by the convention during its sessions as a legislative function." The subject of war was not mentioned in Governor Randolph's Virginia Resolutions. It was not mentioned in various other first sketches, such as the Paterson suggestions or the Sherman papers. But, in an outline by Alexander Hamilton, the Senate was given sole authority to declare war and its advice and consent required for treaties. The President was to be Commander in Chief and to direct the war when commenced. On May 29, 1787, a draft was presented by Charles Pinckney, which set the style of the Constitution which was later adopted. This draft proposed a Congress of two Chambers, a House of Delegates and a Senate. The latter alone

was authorized to declare war, "to make treaties and appoint ambassadors."

Mr. President, the Articles of Confederation of 1777, themselves, provided that Congress alone, under the articles, could determine on peace or war. Article IX states:

> The United States in Congress assembled shall have the sole and exclusive right and power of determining on peace and war excepting in the cases mentioned in the sixth article.

And, Mr. President, the sixth article specifically states:

> No State shall engage in any war without the consent of the United States in Congress assembled unless such State be actually invaded by enemies or shall have received certain advice of a resolution being formed by some nation of Indians to invade such State, and the danger is so imminent as not to admit of a delay till the United States in Congress assembled shall be consulted.

In chapter 69 of the Federalist, Alexander Hamilton defines what was clearly in the minds of the members of the Constitutional Convention regarding the nature of the powers they were willing to grant to the President insofar as war was concerned:

> The President is to be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. In this respect his authority will be nominally the same with that of the King of Great Britain, but in substance much inferior to it. It will amount to nothing more than the supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces, as first general and admiral of the Confederacy, while that of the British King extends to the declaring of war and to the raising and regulating of fleets and armies—all of which, by the Constitution under consideration, would appertain to the legislature.

President Jefferson's attitude toward his own war powers was clearly evidenced in an incident in 1801 when he forbade our Navy to take offensive action against Tripoli, which had declared war upon us, because Congress itself had not declared war.

Mr. President, I do not see how there can be any mistaking of the mind of the framers of this Constitution concerning the President's war powers, and it is on this point that the claims of those who support the constitutionality of the provisions of this bill are wrong. I want to quote from the Collected Papers of John Bassett Moore, recognized by everyone as one of our outstanding authorities on international as well as constitutional law, who says:

> I have occasionally heard the suggestion that there can be no objection to conferring on the President dictatorial powers as regards peace and war because, forsooth, he can, in the exercise of his constitutional power as Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, or in the conduct of diplomatic intercourse, at any moment plunge the country into war.

That is the argument which is being used by many at the present time. Mr. Moore continues:

> I utterly deny this. There is only one case in which the President is empowered to use the military forces for purposes of war without the express authority of Congress, and that is to repel invasion. The use of any of his powers so as to plunge the country into war would be a palpable violation of the Constitution and of his oath of office. The fact that such loose notions can be entertained in the United States of Executive prerogative should of itself be a solemn warning against the adoption of such legislation as that proposed, since it would remove the last doubt that Congress had abdicated its functions as the law-making power and set up an absolute dictatorship to be exercised when the country is at peace as well as when it is at war. It would be as sensible, by an act of five lines, to repeal all laws because all living men have the physical power to violate them.

What stronger language from a great authority could we find than the particular statement by Mr. Moore?

Mr. President, it is perfectly clear that the framers of the Constitution deliberately intended that the President should use neither his diplomatic nor treaty-making powers nor his position as Commander in Chief for any other purposes than to secure the defense of the realm by repelling attacks or invasion and for the protection of American lives and property.

But we have been told time and time again in recent years of the long list of incidents in which the President has so exercised his alleged constitutional authority for the purposes named as to warrant the recognition of his right to use American troops in the future without any further reference to Congress, and we are told that the recognition of such a right and the granting of such power is constitutional.

The President has never had the right to take America into war. This was the one specific possibility against which the framers of the Constitution so zealously guarded. There is no question that the President has the power to plunge America into war any time he chooses, but I submit, Mr. President, that the President of the United States has neither the moral nor the legal right so to act. I refuse to consent to give him the legal right to do something which at present he has neither the moral nor the legal right to do. If he does, as is claimed, have the moral and legal right now to plunge America into war at the slightest provocation, why is the Senate of the United States being asked to pass upon the constitutionality of these powers? If there is any real doubt in the minds of the proponents of this bill as to its constitutionality, is it not incumbent on them to ask for a constitutional amendment that will remove that doubt once and for all?

Mr. President, what proof can we derive from the instances of Presidential use of American troops without the consent of Congress which are cited from the past in support of this legislation? I hold in my hand a list of these instances that have been cited, and I challenge anyone in the Senate to prove that, with one or two exceptions, the President in using American armed forces without the consent of Congress has even remotely dreamed that he was deliberately engaging this country in war. The whole long list of these incidents proves conclusively that the Presidents of the United States, in using American armed forces without the consent of Congress, have recognized their moral and constitutional obligation to use those forces only for the protection of American lives and property, or for the defense of the realm, or where their use was specifically provided by treaty which afforded the United States the privilege of protecting its own citizenry and property on foreign soil.

Mr. President, since the American people have not had made clear to them the real distinction between the nature of the past use of American forces by the President, without the consent of Congress, and what is now being proposed in this present legislation, I believe it will be illuminating to cite the major instances in the past which are being used to justify this complete break with America's traditional domestic and foreign policies.

Anyone advocating the legislation now pending before us who would have the country believe that the long list of instances in which the President has used American armed forces without the consent of Congress constitutes a chapter in our history of which we can be passionately proud is misleading the American people. There are some few instances, instances at best where the use of this Presidential power has brought neither honor nor glory to this Nation.

Mr. President, three important military interventions and occupations in our history have been initiated under Presidential authority in Caribbean countries. These are the cases of Haiti, the Dominican Republic, and Nicaragua. All were the product of disorder and bloodshed, all were forced by the fear of intervention of European power, and not one constitutes anything of which the American people have reason to be either proud or grateful. We are informed by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], that the President has used American armed forces to enforce treaties without the consent of Congress. The Senator is technically correct; but, so far as I have been able to discover, from the list of such instances compiled by James Grafton Rogers, there is no relation whatsoever between what is being proposed by the pending legislation and the treaties to which the distinguished Senator referred. So far as I can determine, there are four major instances in which the President has used American troops to implement a treaty without the specific and prior consent of Congress.

First, there was the treaty with Colombia, ratified in 1846, 100 years ago; to implement that treaty American troops were sent to Colombia in 1856, 1860, 1868, 1873, 1885, 1895, 1901, 1902, and 1903. But I submit, Mr. President, the nature of the treaty itself is very enlightening. The treaty merely provided that the United States could send troops into Colombia, not for armed intervention, but for protective purposes only. In other words, the treaty itself provided that we could send troops to Colombia for the purpose of protecting American property and American citizens. I submit further that the last incident in 1903 resulted in the Panama Revolution and in the payment of $25,000,000 in reparation to Colombia by the United States Government. Would anyone cite this as a precedent he desires to see repeated?

The second instance is a treaty between the United States and Great Britain signed in 1862 which purported to suppress the slave traffic at sea by setting up courts and authorizing seizure and search of slave-bearing traffic But, Mr. President, there are no recorded instances where American troops were used to implement this treaty.

The third treaty was signed between Mexico and the United States in 1882 as a reciprocal agreement that permitted the pursuit of cattle thieves by either party into the territory of the other.

Mr. President, the fourth treaty is really a series of treaties with China dating all the way from 1858 to 1901, which were purely protective in character and which provided only for the protection of American lives and property of the pirate- and bandit-infested Chinese seaboard.

I believe there is one instance, namely, the Boxer uprising, of the President using American troops for the political purpose of preventing the domination of China by any other power, although such an admission has never been forthcoming from this Government.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. In the case of the Boxer uprising, were not the American troops used to protect the lives of our own nationals?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct; yes.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the talk about treaties, political commitments, and military alliances—all of which come under the category of treaties—is somewhat misleading.

In the December 1943 issue of the Reader's Digest, Mr. William Hart writes in his article on American internationalism that only three times in our history has America ever joined an alliance. He wrote:

> In the course of our history we have given three outstanding permanent commitments to foreign countries. The outcome of all three has been extremely embarrassing and distressing.
>
> (A) In 1788 we signed with France a treaty of alliance. It was the only alliance treaty that we ever signed. We promised to guarantee forever against all other powers the French possessions in America. In 1798, by a simple act of Congress, without French consent, we repealed and repudiated it.
>
> (B) In 1882 we signed a treaty with Korea whereby we undertook to take diplomatic steps if any third country should deal "oppressively" with Korea. In 1905 Japan dealt with Korea certainly "oppressively" by conquering it; and in 1910 it further dealt with Korea certainly "oppressively" by annexing it. Did we take any diplomatic steps against Japan? Absolutely none. On the contrary, we were the very first Government to recognize the Japanese conquest of Korea by withdrawing our diplomatic legation from Korean soil and by this proclaiming to the world that Korea, our "ally," had ceased to exist as an independent country.
>
> (C) In 1846 we signed a treaty with Colombia whereby we undertook to "guarantee" the "sovereignty" of Colombia over the Isthmus of Panama. This commitment was in full force and vigor in 1903. In that year there was an artificially concocted revolution on the Isthmus. Did we then help Colombia to restore its sovereignty over the Isthmus? We did the reverse. We used our armed forces over the Isthmus. For doing so we ultimately paid Colombia an apologetic indemnity of $25,000,000. We acknowledged that in changed circumstances we had violated a commitment given in circumstances long gone by.

Mr. President, four conflicts at arms which amount to undeclared war have taken place in our history. The first was the naval war with France during the years 1798 to 1800. The second and third instances were the First and Second Barbary Wars. And the fourth, the Mexican hostilities 1914 to 1917, all of which were carried on by the President without the authorization of Congress. But I welcome any interpretation of these armed conflicts to prove that they constituted a use of American troops by the President of the United States without the prior authorization of Congress for any other purpose than that of protecting American lives and property or providing for the defense of the realm or our national security or for implementing treaties which were purely protective agreements we had reached with other countries and which by their very terms merely recognized our right to defend American life and property.

I earnestly solicit from my colleagues any intimation in the Constitution of the United States that could be distorted into proof that such action on the part of the President was ever intended to be legalized by the framers of that document. The truth of the matter is that all the talk about preventing war and about enforcing the peace is war talk and calls for war measures and war powers and acts of war. The fact that the forces supposedly would be limited by an agreement drawn up on paper does not refute my claim that even the initial use of our quota forces will constitute an act of war and such use will demand that each such act be immediately successful and backed by the full resources of our economic and military power. Where, Mr. President, does the Constitution provide that any President of the United States shall be empowered to direct the domestic and foreign relations of this Government toward the imposition of our will on any nation or group of nations without let or hindrance or advice or consent of Congress?

I quote again from Mr. Moore:

> It is evident that the United States has no more power to prevent other countries from going to war than other countries have had or now have to prevent the United States from going to war. We have had two civil wars, (1) that which resulted in the establishment of our national independence, and (2) that which resulted in the preservation of our Federal Union. We should not have relished being starved by foreign powers into the abandonment of either of those two wars. We have also had four formal foreign wars; and as we certainly should have resented and repelled, by all the means in our power, any attempt by other countries, by starvation or otherwise, to deprive us of our belligerent rights, such an attempt would necessarily have tended to extend the area of war rather than to diminish it. In saying this I believe that I speak for the great body of my fellow countrymen, past, present, and to come, and without regard to sex or to age.

I now quote from Professor Borchard of Yale, one of the great constitutional authorities in the United States and a leading authority on international law. In speaking of the present Charter and the Constitution he has this to say:

> A serious question of constitutional law is involved in the implementation of the San Francisco Charter by the United States. Assuming that the Potsdam agreement does not make the San Francisco Charter academic, the Charter provides in article 43 that all members of the United Nations shall "undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces * * * necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security."
>
> A question was raised during the Senate debate in July and since then, as to who can speak for the United States and whether these agreements with the Security Council would have to take the form of treaties, requiring the constitutional approval of two-thirds of the Senate, or whether the agreements must be made by Congress as a whole, voting by simple majority. Some opinion has also been expressed that the President alone could make such an agreement without Congress—at least so far as concerns the use of the limited quota. The President is supposed to have sent a cable from Potsdam announcing his intention to "submit" any and all agreements of this nature to a majority vote of both Houses.
>
> Before these questions can be intelligently discussed certain assumptions of fact must be made. Since it is agreed that no international police force has been established, each nation's quota, as agreed upon, must retain its own national identity in the combined forces. Thus the United States quota will operate under its own flag, its own officers, its own uniforms, be subject to American orders of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and engage the responsibility of the United States. When, then, it engages in any belligerent action against a proclaimed "aggressor"—all preliminary conditions for such action being assumed to have taken place—the United States is involved. If it bombs or shoots up that nation's inhabitants, it is hard to see how the conclusion can be avoided that this is an act of war and the United States is at war, even if the "aggressor" fails to resist. And if he does resist, it is hard to see how the number of troops engaged can be limited to a specific quota. The use of the limited quota commits the Nation. The imposition of the national will on a resisting nation is now involved, with all its consequences. The same is true of the application of sanctions, a hostile measure which can be equally harmful, if not so violent. To escape this conclusion by calling the imposition "peace enforcement" or any other pleasant name does not alter the fact that it is an act of war. This effort to assign to the armed action of the United States some name other than "act of war" or a "state of war" is the crux of the debate whether to give the President and his delegate the unreviewable power to dispose as he wishes of the limited quota, with report to Congress, whereas the employment of additional forces is admittedly an "act of war" requiring the consent of Congress. That the use of the limited quota, probably 5,000 at least in number, is the crucial test of United States committal to war is not universally appreciated.

Not only is it not universally appreciated over the country, but it does not seem to be universally appreciated here in this body.

It has been said that since the President can use the armed forces of the United States

for the protection of American citizens abroad, it follows that he can make these agreements or give his consent thereto without the consent of Congress or the Senate. His action in landing troops for the protection of American citizens, described by J. Reuben Clark, Jr., Ellsworth, Offutt, and others, is limited to small, backward, or weak countries, where the American citizens or his property is in immediate danger or where the intervention is assented to, where small forces are involved, and where the activity could not possibly lead to war. If the President even faintly suspects that intervention might lead to war, it is his duty, as President Wilson undertook in the Vera Cruz expedition of 1914 against Mexico, to obtain the consent of Congress for his proposed enterprise. Nor is the President here engaged in the administrative task of "executing the laws" or "carrying out" a treaty.

I appreciate that what these great writers on constitutional law and international law say will have no effect upon the vote which is to be taken in the Senate.

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator has referred several times to a very eminent authority, Hon. James Bassett Moore.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. As bearing upon his authority, was he not at one time a member of the Permanent Court of International Justice?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct. As I stated a moment ago, he is one of the most highly esteemed and outstanding lawyers. He is recognized by every lawyer in the United States, and by everyone who knows anything about his capacity, as the outstanding lawyer and authority of his time on international law. I have also quoted from Professor Borchard and from James Rogers.

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it the Senator's thought that the Congress has ever had much influence on whether or not the Nation went to war?

Mr. WHEELER. No; it is not. As a matter of fact, the Congress has never made war, and in my judgment has never been responsible for war. It has always been the acts of the diplomats that have led us into war. It is a step-by-step process.

We talk about putting down aggression. When is a nation an aggressor? It does not become an aggressor overnight. It becomes an aggressor step by step. No one has been able to define very clearly who is an aggressor, and when he becomes an aggressor, except in the case of an absolute act of aggression, when the aggressor actually moves in and takes over another country. However, the new technique used by Hitler, by Soviet Russia, and by other countries, has been to send their agents into a country in advance, in an attempt to undermine its government.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In the case of the Japanese attack, neither the Congress nor the President made the decision. It was made in Tokyo.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In that case it was immaterial whether the Congress or the President, under the Constitution, had the power to make war.

Mr. WHEELER. When a country is attacked, everyone recognizes that as a matter of sovereignty it has the right to resist the attack. When the Tripoli pirates attacked us and Jefferson refused to retaliate without a declaration by Congress, it was Hamilton who criticized him and stated that he did not need an act of Congress when we were attacked, because when someone else attacked us, that fact, in and of itself, was an act of war and we had the right, as a matter of sovereignty, to resist it. I think it is perfectly plain.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As a practical matter, the Senator does not seriously believe, does he, that the right of Congress to make war will ever be very significant in modern warfare?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course not. Not only is it not significant in modern times, but it never has been.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not see why the Senator thinks it is necessary to argue that the war power must remain in Congress, when it has never been important.

Mr. WHEELER. It has always been important from a certain standpoint, and in this instance we are starting with an entirely new philosophy of international relations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We hope it will be new.

Mr. WHEELER. I am sure the Senator recognizes the fact that it is. In every one of the instances in the past in which such action has been taken it has been said that the action was in defense of treaties, or to implement treaties. Under many such treaties we have been allowed to intervene for the protection of American property; but we have never pursued a policy under which any President of the United States has sent troops into foreign countries to put down aggression in Europe or Asia. We have done it in the interest of protecting American sovereignty, American interests, American citizens, and American property. Now we are starting on an entirely new theory of international relations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It seems to me that the fact that the old policy has so obviously failed is a very good argument for attempting something new. We should not continue within the restraints of the old policy and expect another war in 15 or 20 years. That is no argument against trying something new.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand what the Senator says. The question was presented to me by one of the leading editorial writers of the country. He said to me, "I understand that you are opposed to giving the President the power to send a delegate who can vote to put this country into war without the consent of Congress."

I said, "That is correct."

He said, "You know, do you not, that any President can get us into war at any time he wishes to do so."

I replied, "That is correct. He has the power to do so, but he has no legal or moral right to do so, and I refuse to give the President of the United States the legal right to do that which he has no legal or moral right to do at the present time."

Particularly during the past few years, we have passed resolutions giving the President vast authority in advance. Such authority related largely to domestic issues. While it affected the economic life of the Nation in many instances, in this case we are dealing with something which seems to me of far greater importance. We are jeopardizing the lives of American men, and not merely their property. I cannot subscribe to that view without having the President of the United States come to the Congress and say, "Here is the situation which faces us." Whenever the President has sent a message to Congress asking for a declaration of war, the Congress of the United States has never at any time denied the request.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator says that we are dealing with the power to jeopardize the lives of our citizens. The real purpose is to try to create such a situation that there will be no more war. That is the real purpose. It is to establish an effective system to prevent war.

Mr. WHEELER. That is where the Senator and I differ. I agree that the real purpose of the Charter is an attempt to get the nations around the table to talk things over, and prevent war in the future. I agree that that is a good purpose if it can be accomplished. I hope it can and will be accomplished. But when we go further and give to a few men authority to try to perpetuate the status quo before we know what the peace treaty is to be, I must object. The American people do not know what the peace treaty is to be. They do not know what is going to happen to the various countries of Europe. No one else knows what is going to happen to them. There are rumors and statements in the press; yet we are proposing to establish a so-called peace organization to maintain the status quo when we do not know what the peace plan is to be.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not the principal purpose of the Charter to maintain the status quo.

Mr. WHEELER. Whether it is the main purpose or not, the Senator and I know that that will be the effect of it. The Senator knows perfectly well that Russia will never give up what she has taken in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. She will never give up Poland and the other nations which she has taken over.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that there is still room for some flexibility under this organization.

Mr. WHEELER. In my judgment, it is wishful thinking. I hope that I am mistaken.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I hope the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. WHEELER. I hope I am mistaken with reference to the good that may come from it.

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Suppose India should revolt against England and the Security Council should say, "This is an act of aggression." I take it the Senator's view is that our boys would have to go over

there to help England put down the rebellion or aggression.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Or if the Chinese should say, "We want Hong Kong," and if England should then say, "You cannot have it," and should contend that the taking of Hong Kong by the Chinese was an act of aggression, our boys would have to go into China.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. Perhaps in Java poor people will say, "We are sick and tired of working for 7 cents a day," and they will get together and do what our forefathers did here in the United States. Then if the Security Council should say that was an act of aggression, our boys would have to go into Java and fight there.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. The net result will be that one man—I understand that Mr. Stettinius has been picked for the job—can vote in the Security Council to send our boys to fight in foreign lands.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. President, Mr. Borchard further says:

The Constitution provides that Congress alone, not the treaty-making power, has the power to declare war and make regulations governing the use of the armed forces of the United States.

* * * * *

Since the power to declare war, however perfunctory it may have become, is expressly reserved to Congress by the Constitution, I doubt whether a treaty to this effect would be valid. Moreover, it implies that the President would first make the agreement and then submit it to the Senate, a procedure he has stated he will not follow.

There remains, therefore, only Congress which has power to bind the delegate, and it is believed, unless the form of this Government is to be changed, that this method must be followed. If not, the delegate or the President could vote the United States into war, without Congress, and that would be contrary to the Constitution. The delegate can perhaps vote in the negative without Congress, but it is believed hardly in the affirmative. A correct procedure—constitutional processes—must be followed. However Congress may be notified of an impending vote in the Security Council, it must act before the President is warranted in executing its instruction by communicating with the delegate. The delay is unavoidable. No agreement is necessary, but the limitations on size, occasion, and place of use of American forces must be strictly observed. If the President makes an agreement to this effect, tentative at best, he can no longer submit it to the House. He is compelled to make it a treaty, which does not suffice. At best, it requires implementation by Congress before it is constitutional. Considering the subject in the light of everything that has happened, it would seem that an act of Congress is necessary to reconcile the Charter with the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, as I said at the outset, I appreciate that there is a certain trend toward hysteria when we refer to this peace organization; and if we try to speak of the Constitution or of changing the method of conferring war powers or of the giving dictatorial powers to the President of the United States, such comments will have no effect whatever on the vote which will be cast in the Senate.

In conclusion I wish to refer once more to aggression, by quoting further from Professor Borchard:

In the second place, the whole conception of aggressor, in my opinion, is a delusion and a betrayer of reason in a world such as this. To assume to judge the morals of other nations as peoples strikes an unresponsive chord in the breasts of the judged. When the term, moreover, is identified with certain selected powers as constitutionally aggressive, it is likely to arouse uncontrollable resentments and to poison international relations.

The attempt to hold down an impossible status quo and to defend it in the name of law and order makes a mockery both of law and of peace. To enforce the unhealthy status quo by hostile measures, whether called sanctions or by any other name, only adds irresponsibility to inexpediency. It enlists hostility, starvation, and possibly war on behalf of a condition that requires not perpetuation but change. Yet it is change which is pronounced illegal, after it is provoked and almost compelled by the maintenance of unnatural, precarious, and manifestly ephemeral conditions. This is the new morality to which Europe has unhappily retrogressed. It is hardly surprising that apprehension, uneasiness or hysteria marks the mental state of every people on the Continent.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, we now have before us the question of implementing our responsibility in the United Nations Organization.

I have three purposes in rising to speak briefly at this time. It is our primary obligation, as Senators, to be sure that we do nothing which transgresses the authority which has been vested in us. It is unfortunate that the people of the United States are little concerned with the mechanics of the Organization we propose to set up. It is a safe assertion that only a small percent of our people have read the Charter framed at San Francisco earlier this year. Too few of them know, or understand, the responsibilities which will rest upon our country in carrying out the terms of that Charter, with the pending legislation supplementing it.

The great body of the people have but one ambition and one longing. That is that we may do something that will avert a tragedy that will bring suffering vastly greater than any this country has ever known, and that conceivably could destroy civilization itself in our time. We, as citizens and as Senators, are possessed with the same longing, and we are determined to do all in our power to avert such a catastrophe.

Indeed, in the face of the hopes and aspirations of our people and the tremendous dangers which could lie ahead of us, we cannot afford to accept the responsibility of leaving undone anything which offers any reasonable hope of preventing war.

But—and I repeat for emphasis—while we strive to accomplish that common hope, we must also make certain the safety of our people. We have a charge to keep for the men and women who sent us here.

Therefore, the first point I wish to stress this afternoon is that we need to give some attention to the importance of the General Assembly in relation to the Charter and the pending legislation. In listening to the debate on this proposal I have come to the conclusion that too many persons have lost sight of what appears to me to be the greatest hope for peace contained in the United Nations Organization. We have neglected a proper appraisal of the power for peace which will be developed in the Assembly of the United Nations Organization. Too much emphasis has been placed on the hope of preserving peace through the Security Council of the United Nations Organization.

Mr. President, force is a vain thing for safety. It lasts only until overcome by superior force. Permanent peace will not come to the world because we are able to set up a police force larger than any of the police forces which will be maintained by the various nations. If we put our faith in this world organization only with the thought in mind of finding a formula by which to overcome evil force through superior power, we will hardly succeed. History reveals that permanent peace comes through understanding among peoples and nations, through confidence and trust, which are developed by association and negotiation. We find the instruments for the promotion of these most essential ingredients for peace in the General Assembly.

Take the case of the United States and Canada. For thousands of miles we have a common border, yet it is trite to point out that we have never fought the Canadians in modern history and that such a thought never enters the mind of any sane man, yet neither the United States nor Canada worries about the economic power of the other. No Canadian suggests that we need a common security council to protect each of us from the other. The peace we have—and this would be just as true if Canada were larger than the United States in physical and industrial power—has come through mutual understanding and a common striving to be peaceful.

The same thing can well take place between us and other nations, and among nations of the world generally.

To make peace, we should know what makes wars. Can anyone deny that ignorance among the people of a nation makes for war with other nations? The antidote, then, is more education—everywhere in the world. Can anyone deny that hunger makes for war? The antidote, then, is more agricultural production of needed food and fiber—everywhere in the world. Can anyone deny that a lack of understanding makes for war? The antidote, then, is more full and frank discussion by representatives of nations and more travel in other nations by all peoples.

Perhaps I can place special emphasis upon the effectiveness of the General Assembly in promoting and maintaining peace among peoples and nations, by quoting the words of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] when he commented in Detroit last February 5 on the preliminary agreements reached at Dumbarton Oaks:

The genius of Dumbarton Oaks in correct perspective, is not the use of military force at all. The genius of Dumbarton Oaks is the exact opposite. It is the substitution of justice for force. It is the substitution of

international law for piracy. It is the substitution of peace for war. Its genius lies in the organization of these pacific mechanisms which shall stop future frictions short of the necessity for force. Its genius lies in the mobilization of the vigilant moral and spiritual power of enlightened civilization against the dark and evil forces of recurrent savagery. If this power has been dormant and impotent, it is because it has lacked a vigorous world instrument for organized expression. In my deep conviction, Dumbarton Oaks, in proper form, can supply this tremendous instrument.

As we know, Dumbarton Oaks paved the way to San Francisco and the magnificent accomplishments attained there.

I want also to quote our former distinguished colleague, the present Associate Supreme Court Justice, Harold H. Burton, who made the following statement last June 12, on this floor, in reference to the San Francisco Charter:

> The great objective of the Charter of the United Nations * * * is to maintain peace and security, and its greatest contribution to that end consists of the several mechanisms established and extending from peaceful investigations to the use of economic or military force. None of these mechanisms would be available were it not for the Charter. They constitute an unanswerable reason for its ratification and against its rejection.

Continuing, our former colleague, Associate Justice Burton, declared:

> I wish to call special attention to the fact that there is a specific provision that any state, whether a member of the Organization or not, may bring to the attention of the General Assembly, or of the Security Council, any dispute, or any situation which may lead to international friction, or give rise to a dispute—an organized international forum open to the world. It is also provided that the parties to any dispute, the continuation of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security should obligate themselves—and they do so obligate themselves by their membership—first of all, to seek a solution by negotiation, by mediation, by conciliation, arbitration, or judicial settlement, by resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or by other peaceful means of their own choice.

So we see, Mr. President, that the General Assembly is not a secondary function of the United Nations Organization, but the primary part of that great Organization. If the United Nations Organization is to succeed, we must not always be thinking of the means of force, but of the means of settling disputes by peaceful means wherever and whenever possible, and with a minimum of force when it is necessary to employ it at all.

In order to place the General Assembly on a level of importance with the Security Council, I supported the amendments offered by the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] to require confirmation by the Senate of the President's appointees to represent the United States in the sessions of the General Assembly. I believed that through this method the joint responsibility of the Senate and of the Executive, in our representation both at the meetings of the Assembly and of the Security Council would be more firmly emphasized.

Mr. President, my second purpose in speaking at this juncture in this debate is to support the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. I have offered a similar amendment in briefer form, but I am willing to allow the matter to be determined by the vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana. His amendment should be incorporated in Senate bill 1580 in order to unify the American people behind this venture into world cooperation. The amendment would reserve to the Congress of the United States the final decision with reference to committing our sons to any military expedition into a foreign land for the purpose of preserving peace. I have sent to the desk a similar amendment to the pending bill which would maintain this very elementary safeguard to the functioning of a free government. I withdraw the amendment until the Senate has voted on the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

Most of the arguments which have been presented in public forums and by typewriter strategists against placing in the Congress the final vote on the use of American soldiers in enforcing a final Security Council decision have been specious and academic. It is true, as the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] said with such vigor and force here last week—on November 28—that "wars from now on will start suddenly and will be lost quickly."

I certainly agree that the unleashing of atomic energy has made mandatory many changes in the world, and no change caused by this infernal invention is more plainly indicated than is the futility of an international army to preserve peace. If I seriously believed that any scientific discovery has made impossible the operation of a representative republican form of government, I would despair of the use of further mental energy to preserve our safety and permanence as a nation. The unleashing of atomic energy is of colossal import, but it does not mean that all of our long-tried rules of debate here in the Senate must be altered without consideration; it does not mean that our Constitution must overnight be rendered without effect over our present and future deliberations; it does not mean our inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and all the other gains man has made in his long struggle for freedom are now out of date. Many Americans have underestimated the significance of the unleashing of atomic energy, but many others have "atomic bomb jitters" with results in thinking which are just as fallacious.

The atomic bomb revolutionized the material world, but it did not bring a revolution in the realm of the spiritual. It did not repeal any moral laws. It did not, of itself, mean that every long-standing, tried and true rule of conduct in modern society was ipso facto outdated.

Therefore, Mr. President, let us not overlook the fact that we are debating here today whether or not to deliver more power into the hands of the executive branch of the Government—into the hands of one man, if you please. I have heard many of my colleagues say on many occasions that from now on we must think of decentralizing power instead of centralizing it. Now, I find it difficult to believe that the men who are supporting this proposal are the same men who spoke here so many times before, and advocated principle diametrically opposed to the idea of centralizing power.

Too many people in our Government, and too many citizens of our country, have been led to believe that in order to expedite action, it is necessary to place the power to send our soldiers into an expedition ordered by the United Nations Organization solely with the representative of the United States on the Security Council. In all the history of the wars in which this country has engaged, there was never a time when the Congress of the United States refused to grant quickly a declaration of war when this Nation was attacked, or when its safety was in jeopardy.

Let us just think back to about 4 years ago. When Japan attacked Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, it did not take long debates, consultations, and deliberations to galvanize this Nation into one spirit. The very next day—the day after Pearl Harbor was attacked—this Congress voted overwhelmingly to go to war. Hitler could not have asked better cooperation of the Reichstag. Stalin certainly could not have obtained much quicker response from the Supreme Soviet. And it is doubtful if any President, meeting in secret session with his Cabinet, could move any more swiftly than did the people of the United States, acting through their Congress.

Mr. President, we hear a lot in this and in our companion body about "secret diplomacy." If we allow our delegate complete freedom of action on the Security Council, if we deliver this further power to the Executive, we are inviting more secrecy in our foreign affairs. We of the Senate will be by-passed in regards to important information which we and the people must know in order to arrive at intelligent decisions in the coming months and years.

I believe such a grant of power over the lives of American boys is unconstitutional and I believe that if such a proposal could be carried before it the Supreme Court would declare it unconstitutional. I believe that before next December the voters will learn what we are doing here, and I am confident that they will reject decisively the idea of the Senate and the Congress thus voting away their powers to any one person.

Personally, I cannot see how the effectiveness of combined military action would be in any way hindered by leaving the decision for the use of force to the Congress of the United States in each case. If we in Congress, who are representatives of the people, are kept informed by the Department of State of what is happening in the world, certainly we have the intelligence and the courage to vote for, or to reject, whatever proposals are made along this line from time to time. If the Congress cannot be persuaded, then it is a sure sign that the people cannot be persuaded—and if the people cannot be persuaded, then what is proposed certainly should not be done.

The whole tenor of the argument of the proponents of this legislation re-

flects, consciously or unconsciously, the belief that the people cannot understand the issues and that we must follow the fuehrer—or leadership—principle. Presumably, the delegate who would have the power to put us into war would be better informed and more intelligent than all the people of the United States, including the Senate and the House of Representatives. Therefore, according to the reasoning of the proponents, he could decide more impartially and more fairly and more justly when to use our armed forces. This is rank fascism, if carried to its ultimate conclusion, and I would reject it for that reason, if for none other.

If the decision to use armed forces were to be left with the Congress—where the Constitution provides that it should belong always—it would create a closer cooperation between the Executive and the Congress in the dangerous problems which arise in every age. And, I repeat, if this provision for congressional approval to send our boys to war is upheld, there will be much closer unity of the American people behind the United Nations Organization.

Mr. President, it is true that the President of the United States is charged with the responsibility of protecting the safety of the United States against an armed attack. It is true that the President can use the armed forces to protect the lives and property of our nationals abroad, and he should so use them.

Several Presidents have exercised their responsibilities along these lines as the occasions demanded, but there is no precedent for the President using our armed forces merely on an opinion of a threat which might lead to war. And there is certainly no precedent of record in which he turned over our armed forces to a superauthority to be used wherever and whenever that superauthority determined.

If I were a delegate to the United Nations Organization, I would not want to commit this Nation to an adventure which might eventually lead to the expenditure of billions of dollars and the loss of hundreds of thousands of lives, without the advice and approval of the Congress. The responsibility is too great for any one man. It is knowingly embraced only by dictators.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Suppose our delegate votes to put down an aggression in a dispute between Bulgaria and Rumania, let us say, or Rumania and Greece, or some of the other Balkan states, which have been fighting back and forth for many years, and the aggressor nation refuses to desist. Then we have committed this whole Nation to war. In my judgment, if such a thing should take place without the authority of the Congress of the United States, there would be such a revulsion of feeling among the American people that some would think an atomic bomb has hit them. The people of this country are not going to stand for such a thing. Anyone who thinks they are for such a philosophy, certainly, as I stated a moment ago, is blind to the signposts along the road.

Mr. WILLIS. I heartily concur in the Senator's observation. I wish to add that the only authority to prevent such a situation is the Senate, or the Congress of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not a fact that it has taken us approximately 5 days in the Senate to discuss the particular legislative proposal now pending? My recollection is that in 5 days Holland, a nation which had tried to maintain its neutrality, had tried to keep out of the war, and had successfully kept out of the last war, was completely overrun and dominated by Nazi Germany in the same period of time we have been discussing the pending bill.

Mr. WILLIS. In case of an imminent emergency, such as an act of aggression on the part of any nation, by which the safety of the United States was threatened, there would be no long debate. We who were present during the debate 4 years ago know that the commitment of this country to war to defend our lives and the shores of the country was accomplished in a matter of moments, not of days.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the Senator from Indiana further yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I call attention to the fact also that there has never been any time when the President of the United States came before Congress and asked for a declaration of war that the Congress did not vote for it almost automatically.

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator is correct historically.

Mr. WHEELER. What the Senator is talking about is whether in case of an attack, let us say, by Rumania or Bulgaria, or Yugoslavia, upon Italy, or upon Greece, our delegate should have power to vote us into the war. Of course, the American people should have a right to say whether they want to be committed to such a war or not. They have that right, and it should not be left to any one man to say this Nation is going to pledge the life blood of the boys of this country to put down an aggression by another country, when we do not know anything about the facts in the case.

It is said that we have to make some such provision because of the length of time involved, because there must be speed. That is no argument for violating the Constitution of the United States. It is no argument for committing this country to war in order to defend some other country, when our interests are not involved, and may never be involved.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana further yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Along the line the distinguished Senator from Montana has been discussing, the fact remains, however, that twice in this generation we have found that what goes on elsewhere is of concern to the United States. It is important to put out a fire when it first starts, and, therefore, it is important to us to see that an international fire is extinguished before it ultimately engulfs us.

Mr. WHEELER. If the Senator from Indiana will yield, of course, that policy would lead us to the position where we would become involved in every war anywhere in the world. In any dispute between any two nations this country would be involved. I cannot see that the American people want to become involved in every dispute between nations all over the world, because there is a possibility of our interests being affected.

This country did not get into the war just closed until we were attacked by Japan. Notwithstanding the fact that Holland had been attacked, that France had been attacked, that Czechoslovakia had been attacked, that Russia had been attacked, both the Republican candidate for President and the Democratic candidate for President went before the people of this country, knowing that they wanted to keep out of the war, and in order to get votes at the election promised the people over and over and over again that they would keep the country out of war. That was because they knew the sentiment in this country was for keeping out of the war.

Does the Senator think we should be involved today in the war between Iran and Russia? Russia is the aggressor. Should we become involved in all the small wars which are going on all over the world?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say, in answer to the Senator, that we must determine whether the world is to be governed by law or by force. What we are trying to do here is to set up a system of international law and order. If we are to have a system of international law and order, then it is of vital concern to the American people that any lawless gangster nation that is getting ready to start in shall be stopped as it starts, and not after it has gotten considerably underway.

Mr. WHEELER. If that is the philosophy we are following, then what we should do would be to stop Russia tomorrow, because Russia is an aggressor in Poland, she is an aggressor all around the Baltic and in the Balkans, and for that reason we should go to war with Russia tomorrow. I venture to say that no Member of the Senate will deny that Russia is an aggressor in those countries.

Similarly it is true, if we can believe the reports that come out of Manchuria, that Russia is an aggressor in Manchuria at the present time, and that her armies are fighting in north China against the Nationalist Government.

Mr. President, that is the situation which confronts us; so if we follow the philosophy of the Senator from California and the philosophy of others who are talking about law and justice, we should declare war, if we are to carry out their theory of government and their theory of American foreign policy.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I shall yield in a moment. I might say that the Senator from California is making the same mistake that has been made here so often, and persisted in; that is, he is overlooking the effectiveness of the General Assembly to

go along with the nations through periods of irritation and friction, and try to remove the causes of the friction. If we are kept informed as to what is going on through all the negotiations, the need for calling out our troops for war will become apparent quickly during the long period of the processes which have been set up to maintain peace through peaceful means.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to comment on the remarks of the Senator from Montana to the effect that we should declare war.

The theory of the remarks of the Senator from California is that if we establish the proposed organization and institute a system of law, the control provided for in such law should be exercised in all the places he has mentioned. I do not understand the Senator from California to say, nor have I said, that this Nation as an individual nation, outside of any such system, should undertake to attack any other nation. That is an entirely different theory than that applicable to this situation. No one has proposed—I do not think the Senator from California is proposing—that this Nation, acting individually and aside from any international system such as we hope will grow out of the United Nations, should undertake to police the world. I certainly have not said that, and that is a complete misconstruction of the theory that both of us, I think, have in mind. I think the Senator from Montana the other day, when he quoted from Thomas Jefferson, agreed that our ultimate purpose or objective was that we should establish some system of law.

Furthermore, and with regard to the Senator's remark about how quickly we acted in December 4 years ago, that action was utterly without significance. We were already committed to the war at Pearl Harbor, and to say that we acted quickly in that instance has no significance. The fact is, I think, that our hindsight should inform us that we should have acted about 2 years before that time, and that if we had done so, then likely the war either might have been stopped or its seriousness greatly reduced. During those 2 years we sat here and acted as if we were neutral and tried to pursue a neutrality policy, and, of course, that proved utterly fruitless and resulted in the worst and greatest war we ever had.

I think the fundamental assumption of the Senator from Montana that we have a choice, that we can stay in or out of a war, is the real crux of this matter. If we grant the Senator's fundamental assumption, then his argument follows, but if we cannot stay out of war, if we are actually a part of the world, then I think the argument of the Senator from Montana is absolutely meaningless, because we had no such choice, and I think we will have no such choice in the future.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Senators speak of having a world organization, and of world peace and law and order. The very Charter itself gives Russia a veto power so that if she wants to take over a part of China, or of any other country, she can veto any proposal to prevent her from doing so. The same is true with respect to Britain and the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator permit me to draw his attention to my remark made the other day that this Organization has its weaknesses, but we hope to develop it to the point where it shall be strong. I grant that it is not effective in the field to which the Senator referred, but, so far as I can see, this is the only way to proceed toward that goal.

Mr. WHEELER. A Senator said to me the other day that the reason he was going to vote for the bill was that he believed what it provided did not amount to anything. But after all it seems to me a principle is involved in this question. Senators should not vote for something merely because it does not amount to anything. We should consider the principle involved.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I did not say it did not amount to anything.

Mr. WHEELER. No.

Mr. WILLIS. I should like to add to the discussion that we are here thinking of the minds of the Mrs. Smiths and the Mrs. Browns and the Mrs. Jones out in the far reaches of the country, and it is for us to determine whether they want us to continue to retain in the Congress the responsibility to send their boys to war, or to place the responsibility in the keeping of some one person.

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

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It is a very well established fact that we can have no peace which is not based upon justice. A few days ago the Senate voted down an amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] providing that this Organization should work for justice. How can we have peace without justice? The peace which came after the Civil War is still lingering because of the carpetbagging we carried on in the South. That is what we are doing in Europe. The proposal contained in the amendment that the peace shall be based upon justice, and that the United Nations Organization should strive to establish justice was voted down. It seems to me there is a contradiction here which spells tragedy.

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

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

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The whole issue that is drawn out of the amendment under consideration, and which is being supported by the able Senator from Indiana, I take it, is whether when force is called upon, the representative of this Government in the United Nations Organization shall of his own decision do as he pleases, without reference to the Congress, or whether he shall report to the Congress what is about to take place and, if force is needed, that the question whether this country shall vote to use its armed force shall be determined by the Congress. That, I take it, is the exact issue upon this amendment?

Mr. WILLIS. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. We agreed, to begin with, to the Connally resolution back in 1943, which was the first step in the acts of the Senate toward taking part in a world organization. Then later we agreed, by a very large vote, to join the United Nations and subscribe to its Charter.

The question now is as to the third step; that is, what powers shall the representative of this country have in representing us in the world organization? Shall Congress give up the power vested in it under the Constitution of our country, or if not under the Constitution, then certainly by what has been the way of our Government for many years, as the representatives of the people to say when we desire our armed forces to be used on an extensive scale?

Mr. President, I think the pending bill goes too far. I want to comply with the Charter and our obligations under the Charter in every respect, but I do not believe we are called upon to go so far as to say that the President may instruct our representative to use whatever forces are set aside under the agreement that is referred to and provided for in the bill, without taking the matter to Congress.

I listened with great earnestness and I was very much impressed on yesterday when the able senior Senator from Michigan was arguing the question whether agreements contemplated by this bill should be made and confirmed and ratified as a treaty, or whether they should be approved by legislative action of the Congress. I recall that he said he favored legislative action on the subject. One of the important reasons why he favored it, he said, was that instead of having 64 Senators decide upon the question of how many troops should be set aside to the United Nations Organization, he preferred to have a majority of the House and a majority of the Senate, 266 Members of the Congress, to pass on that subject, which would give a much better response from the people of the Nation.

Now I want to ask a question. I do not intend to take up much of the time of the Senate, and I shall stop in a moment; but I want to ask, If it is so important to have a majority of both the Senate and the House pass upon how many troops shall be set aside, is it not vastly more important for those bodies to pass upon when and how the troops shall be used?

Another question occurs to me, if the able Senator will indulge me, a question that is rather practical.

Mr. WILLIS. I am sure the Senator is rendering a helpful contribution.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator, and I assure him that I shall not trespass upon his time more than a moment longer.

What are we going to do if Russia and Poland become involved in war? What are we going to do if a conflict arises between the Free State of Ireland and the British Isles. What is going to take place if in the future the people of India, believing in their hearts that as a result

of World War II freedom would be granted to people who wanted to rule themselves, should start a war against Great Britain? Are we going to leave the decision as to what we should do in those instances to one man, or are we going to leave it to the representatives of the people, as we have in the past?

Take for instance, an incident which happened within this very week, when the British warships shelled the Javanese and killed many of them. We do not know why. Britain has no right of domain over that island. What part are we going to take? Shall we leave that decision to one individual? I would not want to leave it to the President of the United States, whoever he might be, unless the interests of our country and the American people were jeopardized, and under such circumstances the President has the right under the Constitution to use our armed forces temporarily.

Mr. President, I think we are taking a very dangerous step. I think we are going too far under the pending bill when we take from our own people, through their representatives, the right to say when armed forces shall be used. We have never heretofore done such a thing. We have never taken so long a step. We know what has happened in many instances when American interests and American lives have been jeopardized, such as in the Venezuelan incidents, the Boxer Rebellion in China, when Americans were being set upon and killed, and the Vera Cruz incident, when our ships shelled the Mexicans. But never has the President for a moment thought that he had the power of extended use of troops in any number. Even when the Vera Cruz incident took place, Senators will recall that President Wilson, believing that he may have gone too far, came to the Congress and asked approval of his actions. I think we are going much too far, and far beyond our obligations under the Charter, when we vest in any man the right to order into battle the troops of America.

Mr. WILLIS. I thank the Senator. Of course I cannot answer quickly the questions which he raises, but he has opened our eyes to the far-reaching implications of our action today.

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

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I interject to say that it appears to me that we are turning over control of the war-making power to a foreign council upon which we have a representative, and we shall be in the minority. The Security Council will have control of it.

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

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I believe I have a somewhat different view of the obligations which we have assumed under the United Nations Charter than has the Senator from West Virginia. I do not believe that I agree with the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana. It seems to me that the crucial point in this whole authority is section 3, where we give the President the right to vote for the use of armed forces, and to vote for the use of economic sanctions. Once that authority is given, it seems to me that, taken together with our general obligations under the treaty which we have approved, we are morally, and I believe should be legally, obligated to supply troops to carry out that vote.

My difficulty with the bill is the unlimited power in section 3 to the delegate to vote as he chooses, or rather as the President chooses, on any question which may impose upon us the obligation to use troops. I believe that Congress should at least lay down the rules as to when such a vote shall be taken. I am not at all sure that Congress should not reserve to itself the right to say when that vote shall be taken, because the vote is not a vote determined by law. It is not a vote determined by any principle. It is simply a vote based upon national policy, which may lead to war; and it seems to me that national policy leading to war is a concern of the Congress of the United States, and not solely of the President of the United States.

I have felt very strongly that the difficulty with the bill, as I see it, is with section 3. It may be that since the Senate has absolutely refused to limit that authority in any way, perhaps the only recourse we have is to try to limit section 5. I do not quite agree with the theory of the amendment because it seems to me that with the Charter before us, if the Security Council, with our representative on it, votes for the use of armed force, and commits us to that course—because under section 3 we are delegating to him authority to do that for us—then I think we are morally and legally obligated to send the forces provided for in the United Nations Charter.

Mr. WILLIS. Let me say in response to the remarks of the very able Senator from Ohio that we are in this situation: We are asked to vote a blank check on the most precious treasures we have in our country, the lives of our young men. We are asked to give a blank check to some person in the Security Council while we in the Congress of the United States are supposed to be the guardians of such treasures.

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

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I ask the Senator to yield in order that I may reply to the Senator from Ohio. He states that he is in disagreement with me. I find that in his conclusion he is very much in agreement with me. It is a question of the power of the representative to vote for the use of troops. That is what I tried to make clear. I do not want one person, whoever he may be, to be endowed with the power to vote the use of troops as he shall determine in any instance. It might work out well if he always voted to put our troops in on the side of the strong power. But when a powerful country invades a small one, even though we know that the large country is the aggressor, and when a large country friendly to us sails its great ships up to an island and destroys people who are trying to establish self-government, are we going to leave it in the hands of one man to say that American troops should be used there, or whether they should be used at all? That is the danger. If we dare to use them in behalf of any other than the powerful nation, we shall have war; or such use of troops will be vetoed under the provisions of the Charter.

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

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I may point out that in such a case the large nation which sailed its navy to the shores of the small nation would veto the use of force against it, so we would be in the position of having nothing to say in the matter.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes. This Organization may prove to be very much like the alliance which grew out of the Napoleonic wars, known in history as the Holy Alliance. The large powers of Europe allied themselves for the declared purpose of keeping peace. That alliance kept the strong nations together and made Europe safe for kings. It prevented uprisings. It kept the peace, but it kept the peace at the expense of suppression of the people of the various countries under their monarchs. When the alliance broke down, uprisings occurred throughout the whole of Europe. If this is to be an organization in which we join the big fellow, right or wrong—and we must join him when we are outvoted—we are taking a step which is not very appealing from the standpoint of justice and fairness. If we must decide against the small nation, whether we wish to do so or not, and that determination is to be placed in the hands of one individual, as this bill would do, I say that we are going unnecessarily far in subscribing to the Charter.

Mr. WILLIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the third purpose which I had in rising to speak was to point out the fact that it seems to me that we are placing too much emphasis on the use of force and upon expediency, rather than the implements of safety which we have in our own hands. Speaking on this subject the other day, the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] remarked that the only atoms the scientists have succeeded in splitting are the unstable atoms of one type of uranium and plutonium, which are scarce on the earth. He later declared, "The centuries have taken their toll and only the stable elements remain on the earth."

I should like to carry that thought over into the realm of government. The tempests of time and the storms of history have been able to split up the unstable governments of the world, but the centuries have taken their toll and only the stable type of governments remain.

Although our representative Government, based firmly in the hearts and minds of millions of persons, is young so far as recorded history is concerned, it is the oldest such government among all the great powers in the world today. Kings and dictators, princes and fuehrers, have come and gone, but the representative Government of the United States still stands. The atom bomb may change many things, but it will not—it cannot—change the principles on which we, as a free people, have built the richest, the most powerful, the finest,

and the freest government on the face of the earth.

For 40 years the war lords of Japan were driving the Japanese people to get ready for war.

For 20 years, under Mussolini, the Italian people prepared for war.

For 20 years, under Joseph Stalin, the Russian people prepared for the war Stalin knew was coming.

For 12 years Germany was driven under the lash and spur of Hitler and the Nazis to supreme efforts to get ready for a war which Hitler intended to wage against the civilization of the world.

In 3 years, under the American system of free government, with our free labor, our free agriculture, and our free society, we overcame the 40-year lead of Japan, the 20-year lead of Russia, and the 12-year lead of Germany, and not only held up our own end on a financial basis but we shipped billions of dollars' worth of supplies to our allies and poured millions of men and women into the struggle—all this without ever seriously impairing our living standards in America.

What marvelous power is responsible for this genius of the American people to accomplish these miracles?

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

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I interrupt at this point because the Senator is so ably and eloquently paying tribute to what has been done in the way of contribution by this country in the case of the recent war, and in the case of rehabilitation and peace after the close of this war. I wish to invite the Senator's attention to a provision in the bill which, so far as I know, has not as yet been discussed. On page 6, in section 7 of the bill, we find the following language:

> There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the United Nations as apportioned by the General Assembly in accordance with article 17 of the Charter.

There is a blanket authorization for the expenditure of money by this country without any budget, without a bill for it—a signed blank check, so to speak, authorizing money to be paid out, upon the direction of whom? Upon the direction of the United Nations.

Throughout this war we expended vast sums. We authorized the appropriation of money and then appropriated it to the War Department, the Navy Department, and the State Department. But we never used such language as is contained in the bill, without knowing what those agencies wanted, and without having them send to us requests for what they needed. No such blanket authorization was made even to our own agencies of Government.

We well know that the power to tax is the power to destroy. That has been too well proved through the years of history. This is not a tax measure, but it does authorize the expenditure of money, and authorize the appropriations of money, which in turn calls for taxation, without any requirement that there shall be submitted to Congress a demand, a budget, a request, or an estimate as to what may be needed—a blanket authorization without limit, if you please. We do not know what that may mean, nor do we have any idea of what part of the expenses will be apportioned against the United States. Yet this bill commits us to pay any such future levy that may be made upon us by the United Nations.

Mr. WILLIS. I thank the Senator for calling our attention to this very grave tax upon our economic solvency.

Mr. President, I again ask, What marvelous power is responsible for this genius of the American people to accomplish these miracles? That power was inherent in our American system of government, economy, and society. Such wonderful feats could not be and were not achieved under any other form of government. All that we have and all that we are today in the United States of America is due to our American system of free government, free enterprise, and free society. These are the things we must keep. We must not give them away to the control of any supergovernment, made up of representatives of governments who have never accomplished anything of like kind. Not only do we owe it to the people of America to preserve this power, but we owe it to the civilization of our day to see that it is not dissipated in an uncertain attempt to keep the peace of the world. We must always bear in mind that the maintenance of a strong, free America is the basis of our greatest contribution to world peace.

I will rest my case in this instance with the thoughtful men and women of America who want world cooperation, who desire everlasting peace, who have all the hopes and fears of which men are capable, but who still do not want to throw away the rights that were won for them and their children through long centuries as their ancestors gave their lives in fighting and defeating tyranny. Let us not put shackles on America.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I have been somewhat astonished at the trend and drift of the debate on the pending measure. I distinctly remember the adoption of the United Nations Charter by the Senate and some of the provisions of that Charter. I was particularly interested in chapter I of the Charter, in which its purposes are stated. The first is—

> To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

So the first purpose, of course, is to settle, by peaceful means, disputes between nations.

Then, Mr. President, in article II of the Charter of the United Nations, I find the following language in paragraph numbered 2:

> All members, in order to insure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present Charter.

That is to say, we have certain obligations which we entered into at the time of adopting the Charter and becoming a member of the United Nations Organization. As I understand the Charter of the United Nations, our member of the Security Council will not determine whether force shall be used. The Security Council itself, of which our representative will be one of the members, will make that determination.

As I have understood the arguments which have been made today, they begin by stating that we shall take the benefit of this security organization and shall say to the other nations of the world, "We are going into it with you." Mr. President, we made some rather binding obligations at the time when we entered the Organization, as I understand., In chapter VII we find the following language:

> The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the members of the United Nations to apply such measures.

The following are some of the things which may be done to enforce peace without the use of force:

> These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.

Mr. President, we may go that far without the use of force.

But in article 42 it is provided that we may go further. Article 42 reads as follows:

> Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the United Nations.

That is what we have obligated ourselves to do.

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

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. If what the Senator says is correct—and I take it that he means that the Security Council of the United Nations Organization can call upon the United States for an unlimited amount of land or naval forces, whatever it may choose to specify——

Mr. TUNNELL. I have not said so.

Mr. WHEELER. But it follows as a logical conclusion from what the Senator says——

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator from Montana voted for that very article of the Charter.

Mr. WHEELER. Very well; but I did not vote for it with the idea that the Security Council could call upon us for whatever number of land or naval forces the Council might want us to furnish.

Mr. TUNNELL. I have not said that.

Mr. WHEELER. But the Senator's argument is that the Security Council could call upon us for any number of

troops which it wished to have us provide.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator is fairly good at determining what various matters mean, and when the Senator voted for the adoption of the Charter, his vote gave me considerable confidence in the Charter, for I knew he would be afraid of anything which was too strong.

Mr. WHEELER. But I am trying to point out that if the conclusions which the Senator from Delaware is attempting to draw——

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I have not had a chance to draw any conclusions as yet.

Mr. WHEELER. But the Senator said this is what we promised.

Mr. TUNNELL. Well, is it not what we promised? Did I not read provisions of the Charter to which the Senator from Montana subscribed?

Mr. WHEELER. But the Senator from Delaware referred to what would be done by the pending bill.

Mr. TUNNELL. I have not yet discussed the bill.

Mr. WHEELER. But the Senator means that by the bill we would give the Security Council certain power. If the construction which the Senator and the leaders are placing on the pending bill is the correct one, then there would be nothing in the world to prevent us from saying, "We will give you these troops, but we want the Congress of the United States to pass upon the question, because under the Constitution of the United States it is the duty of Congress"——

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Montana would permit me to tell what I think the bill means. The Senator is stating his understanding of what I think the bill means, although I have not as yet had a chance to say what I think it means.

Mr. WHEELER. Very well.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, the last thing I read, before I was interrupted, was the concluding sentence of article 42, which is as follows:

> Such action may include demonstrations, blockades, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the United Nations.

Mr. President, we went further than that. In article 43 we said:

> 1. All members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call—

Not when Congress gets through talking, not after several days of debate, not after atomic bombs have blown up the world, but on the call of the Security Council—

> and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

Mr. President, that is what we voted for.

In the second paragraph we voted for the following:

> 2. Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces—

The numbers are covered in the agreements which we have agreed to make—

> their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided.
>
> 3. The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council. They shall be concluded between the Security Council and Members or between the Security Council and groups of Members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

Now we are told that must be done by a treaty. I do not take that statement very seriously because I do not believe the Security Council is a sovereign power, as we understand the term. I think it is a combination of representatives of signatory nations. I do not think the agreements which are referred to at this point of the Charter are treaties in the sense of the treaties which are referred to in our Constitution.

Mr. President, we have gone thus far; we have agreed that we shall do this much.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, does the Senator care to yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator overlooks one statement. I agree with much of what the Senator has said. But we never agreed that under any circumstances we would vote in the Security Council to use these forces; and unless we do vote in the Security Council to use the forces authorized in sections 41 and 42, they will be wholly ineffective and cannot be used.

Mr. TUNNELL. What does that prove?

Mr. TAFT. If we want to use force I think we may use it. But there is no obligation on us to use it, and there never was. The right of the President to grant unlimited power to our delegate to veto or not to veto is inconsistent with the Atlantic Charter itself. I think it is highly unjustified. I invite the Senator's attention to what I said at the time I voted for the ratification of the Charter. I said:

> There is this consideration, however, in dealing with the power of our representative to authorize sanctions or force. If we assume certain definite obligations I am prepared to leave to the President the performance of those obligations. But the veto power given under article 27 makes every individual case a question of national policy and not of justice. There is no obligation of any kind on us to vote for sanctions or for force——

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I am willing to yield in order that the Senator may ask a question. I am not willing to yield in order that he may make speeches at this time.

Mr. TAFT. I am trying, if I may, to answer the Senator's contention.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I am willing to yield in order that the Senator may ask questions, but I am not willing to yield in order that he may have an opportunity to make speeches at this time in answering any of my contentions.

Mr. TAFT. After all, Mr. President, the Senator's time is unlimited, and I hope he will be kind enough to allow me to finish what I started to say.

Mr. TUNNELL. I have control of whether or not I will yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is apparently afraid of legitimate argument.

Mr. TUNNELL. I am not afraid of legitimate argument, nor any argument which the Senator from Ohio is capable of making. That is my position with reference to his comments.

Mr. President, here is the language of the Charter with reference to the promise which we have made to maintain a force:

> All members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements—

And so forth. We agree to keep that force on tap for the use of the Security Council. What is there in that language that does not imply that we are already obligated? If the English language means anything at all, we are already obligated. Are we going to say to the world, "Yes; we are a member of the United Nations, but if some difficulty arises we want the right to hold a session of Congress, which may last anywhere from 1 month to a year, and determine whether or not we will carry out our obligation"? That is what has been suggested. We would have the same right to declare war after the enactment of the kind of law which has been proposed as we have now. If such a law were enacted it would not give Congress any additional power to declare war. Our friends are arguing, "Let us go back to Congress." What is the use of passing this measure? We can go to Congress at any time and have war declared. If there is no virtue in the Security Council itself, or if it means nothing, why should we pass this bill?

Apparently it is thought that the other nations of the world may be deceived into believing that we are actually agreeing to something which we are not agreeing to at all. It is being said in effect, "We will join the Security Council, we will join the United Nations Organization, we will enter into an agreement, but when the time comes to perform our part of the contract or agreement we will tell you then whether we were in earnest at the time we entered into the agreement, or were trying to dupe the rest of the world." Mr. President, I ask, Did we mean what we said we meant when we entered into the agreement, or did we not mean it?

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

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator realize that England, Russia, China, and France have reserved the right to veto any use of force, and that, after all, all we are trying to do is to reserve the same right with respect to the vote of our representative on the Security Council? Is it not a question of whether the right of veto shall reside in the President or in the Congress, or, to some extent, in the President under rules laid down by

Congress? Is not that the question that we must decide?

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I do not understand what the Senator is talking about, because we have the right of veto. That right was reserved in the Charter. We have not been discussing that phase of the matter. The question is, Have we really entered into an organization with the idea of participating or not participating? If the Organization is a fake, let us get out of it. Let us say so. If, after each dispute that arises, we want to go back to Congress and determine whether the United States will "welsh" on what it has agreed to, or will provide the force it has said it will provide for the benefit of the Security Council, let us tell the world now. Let us not wait until after our country has joined the United Nations Organization, and after some necessity arises for the use of the United Nations Organization, and then say, "Well, I guess we will take the matter back to Congress and decide whether we will help or not."

Article 43 provides in part:

All members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call—

Not next year, not the year after, or 10 years from now, but on its call; not on the determination of Congress, not on the determination of any individual, but on the determination of the Security Council.

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

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator would not object to the President of the United States advising our representative on the Security Council how he should vote with regard to a certain issue, would he?

Mr. TUNNELL. That is provided for in the bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes. The question I ask is, Why not let the Congress itself advise our representative on the Security Council?

Mr. TUNNELL. With reference to how he shall vote?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; with regard to a given issue as it arises.

Mr. TUNNELL. Is the Senator speaking with reference to our military force being used in war?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes, that is correct; whether or not our representative on the Security Council should vote to use force.

Mr. TUNNELL. I did not understand the Senator's comments, if that is what he said, and I do not think the RECORD will bear him out.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, that is certainly what I intended to say, and I believe the RECORD will bear me out. Let me say further that of course, if we are outvoted on the Council we are lost. But I am talking about what our representative should do. I think he should be instructed by the Congress.

Mr. TUNNELL. The arguments which I have heard this afternoon were on the question of how the force shall be used.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; and we should determine how our representative shall vote.

Mr. TUNNELL. As I suggested a moment ago, are we going to let the world think that we are a member of the United Nations Organization? Are we going to let the world think that we are entering into this agreement in good faith? Are we going to tell the world that we are going to keep forces on hand subject to the call of the United Nations? Are we going to say that when the time comes we will reserve the right to say, "We did not mean it at all; we were just playing with a little thing like the peace of the world"?

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

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Under the pending bill, the only difference between the proposal I have made and the proposal which the Senator is suggesting is that I am saying that I think the Congress of the United States should have the right to say how our representative shall vote. The Senator from Delaware is saying that the question should be left to the determination of the President. If the Senator did not understand my argument this afternoon it was because of the fact that my use of the English language and the citation of the authorities did not make my position very clear.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator was very clear in his statements. I understood him perfectly.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, assuming there was being discussed in the Security Council a proposal to use force, does the Senator think that Congress could pass a resolution directing the President not to vote for the use of our forces?

Mr. TUNNELL. I think it would probably require several months of unlimited debate in the Senate to find out what was the will of Congress.

Mr. TAFT. I am asking the Senator why he thinks Congress would have the power to direct our representative on the Council, or direct the President, not to vote for the use of forces.

Mr. TUNNELL. Oh, I think there is no question about Congress having the power. What I am trying to do is to argue for an organization which would have some effect on the peace of the world If the object is completely to destroy it, then adopt a provision that it is necessary to go back to Congress every time there is a desire to do something, and the world organization will be destroyed, so far as its usefulness is concerned.

Congress has passed on the United Nations Organization. I think the Congress will pass on the whole matter when it appropriates the money. I do not think Congress is being ignored, but what we have been hearing all afternoon was about a declaration of war. What we have agreed to do is to be prepared to keep on tap a force for the use of the Security Council, on its call, not on the call of the President, not on the call of the delegate to the Security Council, but a force that is to be kept for use on the call of the Security Council.

Mr. President, there is no question about the matter, either we favor an organization which will have some power back of it on its call, or we do not favor it. I favor it, and I hope the bill will be passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WILLIS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Austin	Hawkes	Overton
Ball	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Hoey	Saltonstall
Briggs	Huffman	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Stanfill
Byrd	Kilgore	Stewart
Capper	Knowland	Taft
Carville	La Follette	Taylor
Chavez	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Connally	Lucas	Tunnell
Donnell	McClellan	Tydings
Downey	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	McMahon	Wagner
Ellender	Magnuson	Walsh
Ferguson	Maybank	Wheeler
Fulbright	Mead	Wherry
Gerry	Millikin	White
Gossett	Mitchell	Wiley
Green	Moore	Willis
Guffey	Murdock	Wilson
Gurney	Myers	Young
Hart	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER].

The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. WHEELER. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "on its call."

On page 5, line 17, beginning with the word "The", it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 2, on page 6, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Nothing in such agreement or agreements shall authorize the President, and the President shall have no authority, to make available to the Security Council any armed forces to enable the Security Council to take action under article 42 of said Charter, unless the Congress has by appropriate act of joint resolution authorized the President to make such forces available to enable such Council to take action in the specific case in which the Council proposes to take action.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to say one word before the vote is taken. I hope the Senate will reject the amendment. It is known as the Wheeler amendment, having been offered by the senior Senator from Montana. It provides that the President may not send any troops anywhere, at any time, unless there has been a prior specific authorization by the Congress. We are authorizing the President in the general bill to take action, and if the Wheeler amendment should be adopted there

would be no use having a Security Council. We might as well wipe out the Security Council. Adoption of the amendment would paralyze the activities of the Council.

Mr. President, the bill provides that agreements shall be brought back to the Senate and the House for discussion and action. The Congress can limit the troops and throw all sorts of safeguards around them.

I hope the Senate will not kill the bill by adopting this amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, the amendment in nowise kills the Security Council or the purposes of the Organization. All in the world it does is to provide that before American troops may be used to put down aggression, when the Security Council may say aggression has occurred, the proposal must come back to the Congress of the United States and, in accordance with the Constitution of the United States, Congress shall pass upon the question whether American boys are to be used to put down aggression or to place this country in war.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the cases in which the troops will be necessary are emergency cases, such as the invasion of the Rhineland by Mr. Hitler's forces. Under the plan proposed by the Senator from Montana, in the case of an emergency, when the action must be instantaneous or not at all, the President would have to say, "Well, we will talk about that. We are going to take the matter back to Congress"; and before Congress could ever act the invasion would take place, and then it would be too late to act.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, permit me to say a word. After all, it is the Senator from Texas who has renewed the debate. I am going to vote against the amendment so far as that is concerned, but the statement made by the Senator from Texas that the matter under consideration relates only to emergency cases, is not the fact. Under article 39, if the Security Council considers that there is a threat to the peace—there may be no invasion, there may be no aggression on the part of the Nation against whom troops are to be used—if the Council decides there is a threat to the peace, and it may or may not be an emergency, it may act. So far as I am concerned, I feel that the mistake is in authorizing unlimited power, under section 3, to our member on the Security Council to vote.

I propose to vote against the Wheeler amendment because if we adopt section 3 we shall have voted to give our delegate the power to do as he pleases, and once having done that we are morally and legally obligated. Therefore, I shall vote against the amendment, but I think the objection that should be made is to the fact that we are laying down no rules, but under section 3 are giving our delegate unlimited power to act against any nation in any case where that one man thinks that the use of force against some nation will promote peace and security, if you please. Not justice, but merely peace and security. The power we give, I think, is the greatest power over life and death that has ever been given, but once we have given that power by adopting section 3, and once the individual, acting under the authority we have given him, has voted on behalf of the United States for the use of force I think we are morally and legally obligated to go through with it. I do not feel, however, that I can vote for the pending amendment.

Certainly the argument made by the Senator from Texas that this is merely an emergency matter, only to be used in such a case as when Hitler marched into the Rhineland—no; that is not the case. The power is given to do it in any case.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas did not say anything of the sort.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. Not knowing how he would vote, I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and allow my vote to stand.

I am informed that if present and voting the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] would vote "nay."

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

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

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

I wish to announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business. Both of these Senators would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business as heretofore stated.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business. He has been excused.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 9, nays 65, as follows:

YEAS—9

Brooks	Moore	Wheeler
Chavez	Revercomb	Wherry
Langer	Shipstead	Willis

NAYS—65

Austin	Hart	Myers
Ball	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Hayden	Overton
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hill	Russell
Briggs	Hoey	Saltonstall
Butler	Huffman	Smith
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Stanfill
Capper	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Carville	Kilgore	Taft
Connally	Knowland	Taylor
Donnell	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Downey	Lucas	Tunnell
Eastland	McClellan	Tydings
Ellender	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ferguson	McMahon	Wagner
Fulbright	Magnuson	Walsh
Gerry	Maybank	White
Gossett	Mead	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Wilson
Guffey	Mitchell	Young
Gurney	Murdock	

NOT VOTING—22

Aiken	Cordon	O'Mahoney
Andrews	George	Pepper
Bailey	Glass	Reed
Brewster	Hatch	Robertson
Bridges	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	McFarland	Tobey
Bushfield	Morse	
Capehart	Murray	

So Mr. WHEELER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I desire to offer two amendments. I do not know whether the Senate wishes to proceed with them at this time or not. Does the Senator from Kentucky wish to have the Senate complete consideration of the bill tomorrow? I believe these are the only amendments left.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, we hope to finish consideration of the bill today.

Mr. TAFT. Then I shall be very glad to proceed.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 9. The representative of the United States on the Security Council shall urge upon the Security Council immediate action

under article 26 looking to a limitation of armaments and of the use of weapons such as the atomic bomb, rockets, and poison gas, and effective amendments to the Charter to secure the enforcement of the undertakings of nations with respect thereto.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as I have previously stated, my objection to the bill is that it implements up to the hilt the use of force under the provisions of chapter VII, and does nothing whatever to set up the General Assembly, which is one of the great agencies for maintaining peace, and is stated to represent one of the great advantages of the Charter. The Senate has in effect made our representatives to the Assembly of inferior rank.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have read the amendment rather hastily. It reads, in part, as follows:

The representative of the United States on the Security Council shall urge upon the Security Council immediate action under article 26 looking to a limitation of armaments and of the use of weapons such as the atomic bomb, rockets, and poison gas.

That is a limitation on the use of atomic bombs, rockets, and poison gas. I think perhaps the Senator's intention was to eliminate them rather than limit their use. Am I mistaken in that respect?

Mr. TAFT. No; I think it could be a prohibition.

Mr. TYDINGS. As the amendment now reads, it is confined to a limitation of the use of atomic bombs and other weapons. I do not believe that a limitation on the use of atomic bombs would be very effective. I suppose what the Senator is looking to is a limitation of armaments and a prohibition of the use of such weapons.

Mr. TAFT. I shall be very glad to modify the amendment by striking out the word "use" and inserting the word "prohibition."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The modification of the Senator's amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 4 of the amendment it is proposed to strike out "use" and insert in lieu thereof "prohibition."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is modified accordingly.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, no action whatever has been taken toward implementing the provisions for the settlement of disputes by peaceful means. No suggestion has been made that we adhere to the International Court of Justice. The entire emphasis of the bill is on unlimited power to use force, a force which, under the veto power which is imposed, would be completely and wholly ineffective.

The effort of this amendment is to submit a proposal under article 26, indicating that while we are authorizing the use of force, we are also suggesting that the nations proceed to a limitation of armaments under article 26.

Of course, there is no use in limiting armaments if the only means of enforcing such limitation is the present provision of the Charter for the use of force, because any of the large powers could immediately veto the use of force. So if article 26 is to be in any way effective, there must also be effective amendments to the Charter to secure the enforcement of the undertakings of nations with respect thereto.

Article 26 provides for the submission of plans, to be submitted to the members of the United Nations, for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments. It seems to me that covers the prohibition of the use of various weapons. Those plans must necessarily involve an amendment to the Charter. There can be no plans for an effective limitation of armaments unless in some way the Charter is implemented to permit the United Nations to enforce the provisions regarding any violation of that particular limitation. As I have said, so long as the veto power exists, obviously such a limitation may not be effective.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did the Senator mean that in that particular instance the veto power should be abolished with regard to the agreement as to the limitation of armaments?

Mr. TAFT. That is my belief. My belief is that the only way we can effectively prevent the use of atomic bombs is to eliminate the veto power and to provide authority to limit the development of weapons which may destroy the world.

The amendment would provide only an instruction to our delegate to start the machinery in behalf of securing some kind of an effective limitation of armaments, instead of relying on the use of force, which, as the Charter is written, I say is wholly ineffective against the great nations of the world, who could be the only dangerous aggressors in the world. I suggest that we at least join in a move in the direction of peace and in the direction of limitation of a force which itself may destroy the world.

I cannot believe it would hurt the bill to adopt the amendment. I think it would enable us to say, "We are not only interested in force. We are not trying to rule the world with three or four other great nations. We are trying to achieve peace."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with that thought, but I did not understand the original amendment to mean that.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am quite willing to submit the amendment to the judgment of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. [Putting the question.]

Mr. TAFT and Mr. WHERRY requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the name of Mr. AIKEN.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, is it in order for me to speak at this time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to ask two questions. First, let me say that I do not like the idea of confining the amendment to advice which we may have to offer to the Security Council, because in my judgment there will be a far greater possibility of effective evolution in behalf of arms limitation through the recommendations of the General Assembly in the first instance, than in the case of the Security Council in the first instance. I call attention to the fact that article 11, defining the functions of the General Assembly, says:

The General Assembly may consider the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments,

Mr. President, my first complaint is that from my point of view, this amendment addresses itself to the wrong body in the United Nations Organization, so far as hopes are concerned, if it is to be addressed only to one, and that the dignity and importance of the General Assembly in respect to this particular problem, among all possible problems, should not be overlooked.

Secondly, I very seriously question whether we are now prepared to start to lay down any rules in respect to the control of atomic energy. We have just commenced an inquiry into that question and we have gone merely far enough to realize how utterly little we know about the possibilities of control or what is involved in control or whether control can be made effective.

So far as I am concerned, I have gone far enough to understand that I want a total prohibition of the use of atomic energy for military purposes; but I have also gone far enough to understand that, except as we can develop a practical system of international inspection upon an over-all basis which is complete and adequate and utterly searching, I am not so sure that we in America are prepared to discuss, as yet, such a development.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not also a fact that until such a system is developed, it is also impractical really to limit arms?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think it is.

All I wish to say is that it is with the greatest reluctance that I disagree upon a subject of this nature with my distinguished friend the Senator from Ohio. I am totally sympathetic with the objective to which he addresses himself, but I seriously question whether in the pending bill at this moment we are yet ready to make our first statutory approach to the question of the control of atomic energy.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as to the first question, let me say that article 26 reads as follows:

In order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources, the Security Council shall be responsible for formulating, with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee referred to in article 47, plans to be submitted to the members of the United Nations for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments.

So far as the atomic bomb is concerned, I would just as lief offer the amendment, regardless of whether the atomic bomb had ever been invented. The other modes of warfare are sufficiently destructive so that we should undertake a limitation of armaments and we should undertake to prevent the use of rockets, poison gas, and other arms which also are capable of destroying entire nations.

It seems to me that the plan provided by the amendment is an approach. The Charter itself makes provision for the Security Council to start out now on a plan for the limitation of armaments. The plan is to be submitted to the members of the United Nations; the plan must come to us and to the other members. They may not be able to agree on any plan; but when we have assigned that function to the Security Council, I cannot understand why it should be suggested that they should not immediately proceed with it.

I think they may work out an approach to a solution of the atomic bomb problem which may be entirely acceptable. Of course, they may not. But it seems to me that the pending amendment provides the only way to start on a course which may preserve the world.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The amendment would require a study of the method; would it not?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; it requires such a study. They shall be responsible for formulating a plan and submitting it; that is all.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I should like to say just a word before the vote is taken. I hope the Senate will not agree to the amendment. The Charter already provides, as has been suggested by the Senator from Ohio, for the responsibility of the Security Council in regard to this matter. It must cooperate with the Military Staff Committee. Of course, the Military Staff Committee cannot be organized until the Charter is put into effect.

This is a matter which can receive the attention of the Congress if it desires to undertake to instruct the delegate of the United States at any time in regard to such a matter. I see no occasion for projecting this question into the Organization before it is organized.

Furthermore, the President and the Premiers of Great Britain and Canada have recently made a joint statement with regard to the atomic bomb. We do not know much about the atomic bomb. I happen to be a member of a committee which is seeking information with regard to it. Scientists and soldiers are not agreed upon it, nor are statesmen. It is a matter which will continue to receive a great deal of attention and study, and I think that the entire subject should be left to the Charter where it is stated that at an appropriate time studies and examinations will be made with reference to some plan of disarmament.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in view of what has been said, and in view of what we all know, does the Senator from Texas believe it is proper at this time to delegate to a member of the Security Council any powers whatsoever with respect to atomic energy? In other words, no one knows all about atomic energy, and at this time it would seem to me to be unwise for the Congress to grant power to a member of the Security Council to start fooling around with atomic energy and discussing it, when he knows little or nothing about it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will not the Security Council, and will not our delegate, have as much authority to initiate something along this line without this amendment as they would have with it?

Mr. CONNALLY. Absolutely. The Charter specifically provides that they shall have jurisdiction.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I think there is nothing wrong in what the Senator from Ohio wants to accomplish, but I certainly assume that the very fact we are setting up a Security Council and Assembly to settle these questions, embracing the whole compass of the matters set forth by the Senator from Ohio, together with bacteriological warfare, which is not mentioned and which can be more horrible, perhaps, than all the other methods of warfare put together, not including the atomic bomb, as well as many other forms of offensive and defensive warfare, will eventually be taken up and considered. While I am sympathetic with what the Senator wants to do, and I am in accord with him, it seems to me that the adoption of the amendment would be loading the bill down with a great many details.

Mr. CONNALLY. I certainly concur with the view of the Senator from Maryland.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

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

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

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

I announce further that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

I wish to announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business. Both of these Senators would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business, as heretofore stated.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business. He has been excused.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—16

Ball	Hawkes	Taft
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Wheeler
Butler	Langer	Wherry
Byrd	Russell	Wilson
Donnell	Shipstead	
Fulbright	Smith	

NAYS—54

Austin	Hayden	Murdock
Bankhead	Hill	Myers
Barkley	Hoey	Overton
Bilbo	Huffman	Radcliffe
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Capper	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Carville	Kilgore	Stanfill
Chavez	Knowland	Stewart
Connally	La Follette	Taylor
Downey	Lucas	Tunnell
Eastland	McClellan	Tydings
Ellender	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ferguson	McMahon	Wagner
Gossett	Magnuson	Walsh
Green	Maybank	White
Guffey	Mead	Wiley
Gurney	Millikin	Willis
Hart	Mitchell	Young

NOT VOTING—26

Aiken	George	O'Daniel
Andrews	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Glass	Pepper
Brewster	Hatch	Reed
Bridges	McCarran	Robertson
Buck	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Moore	Thomas, Utah
Capehart	Morse	Tobey
Cordon	Murray	

So Mr. TAFT's amendment was rejected.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, after line 20, it is proposed to insert the following:

Any action taken by the President under this section shall cease to be effective after 3 months, but whenever the United States is called upon to act under article 41 of said Charter, the President shall promptly recommend to Congress appropriate legislation to carry out the obligations of the United States under said article 41.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, so far as I know this is the last amendment to be proposed to the bill. It deals with section 5, which has hardly been discussed. It is the section which implements the President's power to impose economic sanctions.

The President may issue rules and regulations which will have the force of law, and which, under paragraph (b), may subject a person to a fine of $10,000 and imprisonment for 10 years.

The character of those regulations is not specified in detail. The words are very broad. The language is:

Through any agency which he may designate, and under such orders, rules, and regulations as may be prescribed by him, investigate, regulate, or prohibit, in whole or in part, economic relations or rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication between any foreign country or any national thereof or any person therein and the United States or any person subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or involving any property subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

That certainly is a wide-open provision. The amendment provides that the President may take this action in an emergency, when the Council acts. In order that there may be no delay, he may continue to act, but his action will be good for only 90 days. Then he will have to come to Congress. He should come to the Congress immediately, as a matter of fact, and ask Congress to enact laws to carry out the obligations.

Under the provision I have read the President may impose any kind of censorship. He may go into anyone's home, he may investigate anything, he may have a person's books brought into court, he may examine all his correspondence, and, as I have said, he may impose censorship. It seems to me the language is sufficiently broad to enable him to regulate economic relations or any means of communication involving any property subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. I should say that under this provision the President's power could be stretched so that he could investigate and prohibit any action remotely related in any way to the country involved in the particular economic sanction.

Mr. President, I think this is a legislative matter. I think Congress should act. It seems to me probably the greatest delegation of regulatory power Congress has ever been asked to give the President. The distinguished Senator from Colorado pointed out that all the embargo acts in the early days of our history contained specific date limitations on the power of the President. Under the provision I am referring to the actions might go on for years, so far as any authority of Congress is concerned.

Mr. President, I have only to add that I do not think the amendment would interfere with the operation of the Charter in any way. Under my amendment the President would retain the emergency power to act, which, incidentally, may never extend beyond 90 days in any case. But if the power is to be permanent, Congress should enact a statute, it should impose the penalties, Congress should limit the President's power so that it may not be used at any time that may suit the whim of the administration in office at the time. It seems to me this is an amendment which Congress might well adopt to prevent some of the abuses which certainly may well arise under the power that is to be delegated in the section affected.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in order that we may understand what the effect of the amendment would be, it might be advisable to read section 5 of the bill, on page 4, to which the proposal is offered as an amendment. I read:

SEC. 5. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, whenever the United States is called upon by the Security Council to apply measures which said Council has decided, pursuant to article 41 of said Charter, are to be employed to give effect to its decisions under said Charter, the President may, to the extent necessary to apply such measures, through any agency which he may designate, and under such orders, rules, and regulations as may be prescribed by him, investigate, regulate, or prohibit, in whole or in part, economic relations or rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication between any foreign country or any national thereof or any person therein and the United States or any person subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or involving any property subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

The amendment proposes that any action taken by the President under the section I have just read shall cease to be effective after 3 months. No matter what the conditions are, no matter what the justification for an extension of the time may be, it must cease at the end of 3 months, under the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio. The amendment reads:

Whenever the United States is called upon to act under article 41 of said Charter, the President shall promptly recommend to Congress appropriate legislation to carry out the obligations of the United States under said article 41.

As I understand, that instruction is not necessary as a part of the bill. I think we have the right to assume that any President, whoever he may be during the years in the future, will discharge his obligation by recommending to Congress any legislation he may deem necessary to carry out our obligations under article 41 of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. LUCAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield first to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Suppose this amendment were adopted, and suppose the Parliaments of Great Britain and of France, and of all the other countries in the United Nations Organization, passed similar provisions restricting their members on the Security Council, and their Prime Ministers. What kind of action could we get if 30 or 40 or 51 parliaments had to debate a question before there could be any action?

Mr. BARKLEY. What would be done by this amendment, if it should be adopted, would be to tie the hands of the United States and the President of the United States, so that he would be required to annul within 3 months any action which might be taken under article 41 of the Charter.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me suggest, too, that the economic sanctions under article 41 cannot be put into effect originally without the consent of the United States, because we are members of the Security Council.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. In just a moment; but I shall yield first to the Senator from Illinois, as he asked me to yield.

This amendment will do two things if it shall be adopted. It will handicap the President. It will tie his hands and limit him. And, in response to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] who presupposes that other nations might do the same, let me say that suppose none of them should do the same, then we would be out on a limb by ourselves.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have not studied the amendment, but as I listened to its reading by the Senator from Kentucky I reached the very definite conclusion that the amendment really would amend the Charter. If we adopt it it would represent an attempt to amend the Charter, and certainly affect the basic principles of the Charter.

Mr. BARKLEY. In effect it would amend the Charter.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the amendment would not amend the Charter in any way. The Charter imposes an obligation on the United States, once our representative on the Security Council has voted for economic sanctions, to impose economic sanctions. That is our obligation. But, as I understand the Senator, he says Congress is wholly incompetent to carry out the obligations of the United States, that Congress will not do it, that we cannot leave it to Congress because the Congress is an unreliable body, and Congress may not keep the promise of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. TAFT. That is in effect the argument. There is nothing in the Charter that says these sanctions shall be imposed by the President or the Executive. As a matter of fact the Executive has never had any power of this kind, as contrasted with the use of the armed forces of the United States. The Executive has never assumed to have power to impose economic sanctions except under the express delegation of authority by the Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Section 5 of the bill authorizes the President to do certain things, after investigation. The amend-

ment of the Senator from Ohio seeks to limit his power. Whether the Senator's amendment in effect amends the Charter may be an academic problem, but the Charter does not limit the United Nations with respect to the length of time during which sanctions may be in effect. This amendment, however, seeks to limit the time to 3 months. Whatever the President may do under section 5 of the bill would be limited to 3 months, and then he would be under the obligation to come to Congress. He will do that anyhow if he thinks it is necessary to do it. In two respects the amendment is a handicap against the United States by limiting the sanctions that may have to be imposed by the United Nations, or their effect, to 3 months, and then by assuming the President will not do his duty by coming to Congress, unless the Congress tells him by this amendment to do so.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if we adopt section 5 there is no duty imposed on the President to come to Congress. Congress then says, "You handle it. Handle it in any arbitrary way you please. Call anybody in you want to and examine him. You may send him to jail for 10 years." If we say that, then it will be our fault. If we should adopt the language as it now is, there would be no duty on the President to come to Congress.

My contention is that this is a function which ought to be performed by Congress. We should be the ones to carry out economic sanctions. I am willing that for 90 days the President may have such authority. That is a long enough period. But it seems to me that after 90 days the Congress should have the right to perform that function, and perform it wisely, and impose the restrictions in the mildest way and with the least damage to our Nation, and in a way that would inconvenience in the least manner the people of this country. Whereas the regulations otherwise authorized to be issued by the President may be absolutely arbitrary and far beyond what Congress may even today consider necessary or necessary in the future.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT.]

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CONNALLY demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HAYDEN. I announce that my colleague, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], is necessarily absent on account of the serious illness of his mother. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. WAGNER (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED.] Not knowing how he would vote, I transfer that pair to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and allow my vote to stand.

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

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

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

I announce further that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. Both these Senators are necessarily absent, but would vote "yea" if present.

I wish to announce that if present and voting the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

All of these Senators would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business as heretofore stated.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business. He has been excused.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is detained on official business. He has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. If present the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 7, as follows:

YEAS—65

Austin	Guffey	Mitchell
Ball	Gurney	Murdock
Bankhead	Hart	Myers
Barkley	Hawkes	Overton
Bilbo	Hayden	Radcliffe
Briggs	Hickenlooper	Russell
Brooks	Hill	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Hoey	Smith
Butler	Huffman	Stanfill
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Capper	Johnston, S. C.	Taylor
Carville	Kilgore	Tunnell
Chavez	Knowland	Tydings
Connally	La Follette	Vandenberg
Donnell	Lucas	Wagner
Downey	McClellan	Walsh
Eastland	McKellar	White
Ellender	McMahon	Wiley
Ferguson	Magnuson	Willis
Fulbright	Maybank	Wilson
Gossett	Mead	Young
Green	Millikin	

NAYS—7

Langer	Shipstead	Wherry
Moore	Taft	
Revercomb	Wheeler	

NOT VOTING—24

Aiken	George	O'Daniel
Andrews	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Glass	Pepper
Brewster	Hatch	Reed
Bridges	McCarran	Robertson
Buck	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Capehart	Morse	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	Murray	Tobey

So the bill S. 1580 was passed.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 266, making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. I make this motion in order that the bill may become the unfinished business.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 266) making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I ask if it is the purpose to go forward with the joint resolution today?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona to proceed to the consideration of the UNRRA appropriation measure.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with an amendment, on page 2, line 2, after the numerals "1947", to strike out:

Provided further, That, insofar as possible and practicable, agricultural commodities determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus supply shall be utilized in filling United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration requisitions for food and agricultural commodities.

No part of the appropriation herein shall be available subsequent to December 31, 1945, for the furnishing of relief or rehabilitation supplies or services to any country unless and until (A) the President has received

from the Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration a certification to the effect that the furnishing by such Administration of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services, in the case of such country, will be made only under agreements between United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and such country or other suitable arrangements providing:

(1) That all trade agreements and all barter agreements of such country with other nations, together with satisfactory information on all exports from, and imports into, such country, whether for governmental or private account, will be made available to United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

(2) That such country shall supply accredited United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration personnel with all necessary facilities, credentials, documents, and safe conduct in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreement, including all necessary inspections and investigations.

(3) That the Administration, if it determines such a course to be desirable, will be permitted, during the period of its operations in such country, to retain title to all motor transport equipment supplied by the Administration, and will also be permitted to route such equipment and to direct the use of the fuel and lubricants supplied by the Administration.

(B) That for the purpose of keeping the people of the United States fully and properly informed as to the need for and the use of the relief and aid being or to be furnished various countries and peoples by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, that none of the funds appropriated hereby, or none of the commodities, supplies, materials, or services purchased or obtained through the expenditures of funds provided herein, shall be furnished to or used in any country of which the controlling government interferes with or refuses full and free access to the news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration by representatives of the press and radio of the United States; or maintains any barrier—technical, political, legal, or economic—to obtaining, dispatching, and disseminating the news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, or discriminates against the representatives of the press and radio of the United States in rates and charges for facilities used in collecting and dispatching such news; or censors, or attempts to censor, in time of peace, news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration which may be prepared in or dispatched from such country by representatives of the press and radio of the United States.

So as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an additional amount fiscal year 1946, to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the act of March 28, 1944 (Public Law 267), to be available for expenditure in the manner specified in the appropriation for this purpose in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Participation Appropriation Act, 1945, $550,000,000: *Provided*, That no relief or rehabilitation supplies procured out of funds heretofore or herein appropriated shall be shipped to any country except in the Far East after December 31, 1946, and in the case of any country in the Far East after March 31, 1947.

SEC. 2. This act may be cited as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Participation Act, 1946.

CLAIM OF EASTERN CONTRACTING CO.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on the call of the calendar on November 23 the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] objected to House bill 2518, Calendar No. 771. I have just talked with him, and he has withdrawn his objection. I therefore ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2518) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Eastern Contracting Co., a corporation, against the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I ask what the bill is?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is a claims bill, unanimously reported from the Committee on Claims.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

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 the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs.

Maj. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as assistant to the Chief of Engineers, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance, vice Brig. Gen. John Jennings Kingman.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Charles A. Donnelly, of New Orleans, La., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Louisiana, in place of Joachim O. Fernandez, resigned; and

Floyd S. Daft, to be senior scientist in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Shackelford Miller, Jr., to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jorge Luis Cordova Diaz to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James E. Mulcahy to be United States marshal for the southern district of New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATION OF FRANK OLSON TO BE REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE, BLACKFOOT, IDAHO

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank Olson to be register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] has any report to make on this nomination.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I do not know what the Senator means. I have secured the endorsement of the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say that as a member of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys I feel that I have an obligation to Members of the Senate.

As I understand, and as appeared from the evidence adduced in the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, this nominee was convicted of bootlegging in Idaho and served a term under a Federal sentence. He is now proposed for appointment to a position of honor and profit, and his nomination is before the Senate of the United States for confirmation. It was my understanding that the Senator from Idaho would report the record to the Senate at the time the nomination came before us. Therefore, I raised the question. I feel that under the circumstances, until the case is further aired, I should object.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, that was not the understanding which I had. The question was brought up in the committee, and the Senator from Iowa stated that he would not object to the appointment, but he suggested that I await the arrival of the junior Senator from Idaho and secure his endorsement. I did so. I did not understand what he meant. He stated that if the junior Senator from Idaho agreed it would be agreeable to him. That was my understanding.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, in view of the lateness of the hour and the controversy which seems to have arisen over this nomination, can it not be passed over for the day?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination will go over, and the clerk will state the remaining nominations.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in view of the statement which has been made by the Senator from Idaho, I feel that I should state my version of the affair.

This question arose in the committee, completely out of a blue sky so far as I was concerned. A record was produced showing that this man had been convicted and had served time. I stated in the committee meeting that because he was being endorsed by a member of the committee I would refrain from voting against him in the committee, but I asked that the record show that I refused to vote for him. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] joined me, and we both stated that we desired to wait until the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT] had arrived, and then we would ascertain whether both Senators approved the nomination after examining the record.

At no time did I state that I would not object to this man's appointment. I feel that there is a duty upon me as a member of the committee to inform the Senate with respect to information which came to the committee, and which I think might well be considered by Senators when they come to the question of confirming the nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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 tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 5, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 4 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Shackelford Miller, Jr., to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

Jorge Luis Cordova Diaz to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

James E. Mulcahy to be United States marshal for the southern district of New York.

IN THE NAVY

TO BE FLEET ADMIRAL

William F. Halsey, Jr., to be fleet admiral of the United States Navy.

TO BE VICE ADMIRALS, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Charles A. Lockwood, Jr.
Jesse B. Oldendorf
Daniel E. Barbey
Charles H. McMorris
Frederick C. Sherman
George D. Murray

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Mervyn H. Gallagher, Doheny Park.

HAWAII

Antone Nobriga, Jr., Hanamaulu.
John E. Ventura, Kihei.
James L. S. Spalding, Pepeekeo.

KANSAS

Ralph Ganson, Canton.
Merlyn E. Beougher, Gove.
Bert S. Vaughn, Selden.

WASHINGTON

Bette M. Robertson, Belfair.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O God, above our drifting years, Thou art the soul of the universe, whose star of hope never dims in a nightless sky. In all our ways, help us to walk aright, that we may live and labor in peace with one another. No one among us is so gifted or ungifted but that the Christ can enrich him a thousandfold. Grant that our mental and heart powers may be unclogged by hidden motives or unclouded by deception that in us all graces may flower into blessed fullness.

O Spirit of the Most High, fan into a glowing flame the embers of unity and cooperation through our land, that the ugly wounds of vacillation and suspicion may be healed, releasing untold treasure, unspoken comfort, and unwrought deeds. O let the word become flesh and dwell in us, in factory and in office, throughout America, liberty's wonderland, with tolerance and justice for all men.

The Lord God be merciful and gracious to our President. Give him courage and the assurance of Thy wise guidance in all his decisions. In the name of our Redeemer we pray. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4407) entitled "An act reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 32 and 39 to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. BALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 304) entitled "An act to amend the act authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1862) entitled "An act relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes."

DISCHARGE OF FATHERS FROM THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. ELLIS. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

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

FOREIGN RELIEF

Mr. BUFFETT. 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 Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a telegram from Msgr. Bernard Sinne, of the Archdiocese of Omaha, from which the following is taken:

> From December 9 to 16 the Catholics of the United States have a national drive for canned foodstuffs for Europe. * * * In the name of the priests and people, I appeal to you to help us obtain permission for sending foodstuffs into Germany. Please answer this wire at your earliest convenience.

Mr. Speaker, can anyone explain why the American people should be taxed billions for UNRRA, a political relief organization, yet when the Christian churches of America voluntarily seek to help their brethren in central Europe they will find our Government cold-bloodedly blocks their errand of mercy. I again urge the administration officials responsible for this inhuman situation to take down their barriers against church, private organization, and personal relief in central Europe.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, December 6, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short resolution adopted by the American Legion.

AMERICAN COMMUNISTS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I see in big headlines, "Party line at the State Department." The Communist Party is now picketing the State Department with banners reading, "Hurley Out and Byrnes Must Go." Mr. Speaker, I want to say that is getting to be a pretty bad state of affairs when we let those Communists, who do not believe in our form of government, endeavoring to oust the Secretary of State because he does not want to aid and assist the Communist Party into power in America, thus overthrowing our form of government. It is a pretty tough job, and I think the President of the United States ought to use the "big stick" now, and I think the Congress ought to get after them and clean every hoodlum out of this country. I want to tell you that the Communists have no business here. If they do not like this country, let them go back to Russia. Let them go to some other country that they admire. It is about time that we cleaned them out. If there is anything or anybody I dislike, it is a traitor to America. They apply for citizenship to our country and then try to overthrow its Constitution and its liberty. Let us start now to clean them out, or they will clean us up.

America first, last, and all the time for me.

LATIN AMERICA GOOD-NEIGHBOR POLICY

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, the New Deal's good-neighbor policy in South America is collapsing just as has its home-economy plan. Instead of good will in these neighboring countries, we are building up, through our constant meddling, bitterness and suspicion, which could have dangerous consequences.

You cannot go around shaking a "big stick," bullying small nations, failing to consult other nations, and interfering in domestic policies, like Ambassador Adolf Berle has recently been doing in Brazil, without causing discord and ill will. We would resent any ambassador from a foreign country telling us who we should elect as President, and Brazil has a right to resent any interference on the part of Mr. Berle.

Brazil has been a good friend of the United States during the World War. Let us not sacrifice that friendship by meddling in foreign political internal affairs.

S1C PAUL T. STEWART

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

[Mr. REECE of Tennessee addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Robert H. Wood, editor of the Aviation News.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from the December Democratic Digest by Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State, on the St. Lawrence waterway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

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

PRICE CONTROL

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain documents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

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

FRENCH INDOCHINA

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is reported that some eight American Victory ships were turned over to the British Government to redeploy British and French soldiers to French Indochina to maim civilians actively engaged in the independence movement there.

These ships should be used to bring our marines and GI's home from India and China forthwith.

This is the same brave British Government which fights its way into peaceful villages in Palestine, killing the innocent with American lend-lease machine guns, tanks, and planes—the same courageous British who used tear gas and V-bombs on civilians in Burma, Dutch territory. Remember, this is the same British who are asking us for a huge loan to bolster and further their imperialistic cunning and imperialistic cruelty in Asia and in the Levant.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in two instances; in one to include a radio address delivered last Sunday at the special Elks memorial program at Lawrence, Mass.; and in the other to include a newspaper article taken from a periodical.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein petitions and letters from several church groups and also excerpts from a very brilliant speech delivered by Archbishop Cushing, of Boston.

OUR CHINESE POLICY

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, revise and extend my remarks, and include therewith a letter from Secretary Byrnes.

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

There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and to include a set of resolutions of the Farm Bureau of Wapello County, Iowa.

MORAL CONDITIONS IN JAPAN

Mr. LECOMPTE. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, within the last 2 or 3 weeks at least four Members of the House have extended in the RECORD a letter and a statement published in a number of newspapers and magazines by Chaplain Lawrence Lacour relative to the moral conditions prevailing in Japan and the attitude of the Navy in dealing with the problem. The situation is both revolting and nauseating almost beyond human comprehension. I am well acquainted with the Reverend Lawrence Lacour. He is a resident of Oskaloosa, Iowa, a man of unquestioned integrity and a devout Christian gentleman, imbued with patriotism. He went into the Navy to serve as chaplain in any way that would be useful. For many years as a distinguished clergyman he has held successful evangelical meetings

throughout the Middle West. His statement cannot be easily dismissed, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] have very properly called attention to the unspeakable conditions as described by the Reverend Lawrence, and have asked the Navy Department for an investigation.

If Chaplain Lecour's letter results in a thorough investigation and cleaning up of a bad situation he will richly deserve an award of the Legion of Merit.

THE PULPIT

Mr. REED of New York. 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. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there are certain professional men of great influence, I speak particularly of clergymen, who in attacking our Congress, both branches thereof, because they are not satisfied with the speed with which Congress is operating, are doing a great disservice to the country. The Congress has managed the affairs of this Government for more than 150 years, as a result of which this Government is the hope of the world. Those who are offending most by lashing Congress are men who have come here from other countries, men who have been recently naturalized so that they can profess to speak as Americans.

Mr. RANKIN. And think as aliens.

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; I will accept that remark. They think as aliens. The way they have heaped abuse on this Congress is a national disgrace. Of course, they lend encouragement to all the feeble-minded who are Communists and everything but Americans. Many of these propogandists have come from a nation that has never failed, whenever the opportunity presented itself, to aid those who would weaken or destroy this Republic.

The Speaker. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

MANAGEMENT AND LABOR

Mr. LANDIS. 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. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, it was the hope of the American people that the management-labor conference would recommend a solution to insure industrial peace after collective bargaining and conciliation had failed. Since the conference has closed and has failed to give us a solution to this problem it is time for the House Labor Committee to hold hearings on this important problem. The President suggested that well-reasoned and workable legislation be passed at the earliest possible moment. Speaking as one of the Republicans on the Labor Committee, and I believe speaking for other Republicans on the committee, I want to say that I am ready and willing to get busy right away and do my part in solving this vital problem. We know the country is anxious to get started on a reconversion program.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Tulsa Tribune of November 30, 1945.

Mr. BUFFETT (at the request of Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of demobilization of the armed forces, and to include excerpts from a letter and a bulletin.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Julius Barnes before a club at Detroit, Mich. The manuscript is too long for printing without receiving permission under regulation No. 10 of the House. I am informed it will cost $208. I renew the request I made yesterday, notwithstanding the additional cost.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert an address he delivered before the Executive Club in Chicago.

LEND-LEASE

Mr. DWORSHAK. 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 Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution which would create a select committee for the purpose of investigating the operations under the Lend-Lease Act, particularly with reference to the transfer of ships, articles, materials, and equipment; also, the expenditure of funds under that particular statute.

On August 17, the President issued an Executive order terminating Lend-Lease operations, but apparently they are continuing unabated.

The President also stated that about $41,000,000,000 have been expended under this program, while in reality the Congress has appropriated a total of $66,000,000,000. In the rescission bill currently before the Congress, there is recaptured only about $1,500,000,000 from this fund. The Lend-Lease Act originally was claimed to have established the United States as the arsenal of democracy. Now, the Congress should have some concern lest Lend-Lease make the United States the arsenal of imperialism.

With conditions so chaotic throughout the world, Americans do not want lend-lease funds diverted to defeat the allied objectives in this war, as outlined in the Atlantic Charter. It is now time to have an accounting of the use of these funds, particularly when it is recognized that hostilities ended almost 4 months ago.

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

BARBITURATES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my remarks and include as a part thereof a resolution and discussion by the American Pharmaceutical Association regarding the misuse of barbiturates.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Evening Star entitled "Mr. Hull's Views."

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include an editorial from the Indianapolis Star and in the other a statement made before the Military Affairs Committee by Mr. Donald Dushane.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Governor Thye, of Minnesota, to the Honorable Clinton Anderson.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday next and 15 minutes on Friday next after the disposition of the legislative business of the respective days and special orders entered for those days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

REDS PICKETING THE WHITE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, sometimes Representatives get some unexpected though ineffective help. In the Washington Post of this morning on the front page is a picture that should bring

a great deal of comfort and encouragement to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] and the ardent supporters of his criticism of General Wedemeyer and Patrick Hurley. This picture has above it the headline: "Red pickets want Byrnes out."

One of the placards reads: "Bring our Marines home."

We all know, of course, that the Maritime Union is shot through and through with communism and that it called a strike because it says we are not getting the soldiers out of China or out of the other countries fast enough. The Communists want the servicemen out of the way of Russia. That is all right with me, for I never cared overmuch about their being sent over there in the first place. I never wanted our country involved in this war. After we were in I did my best to support the war and never found fault with those who were fighting it.

On the other placard, as shown on the front page of the Post, there is the statement: "Hurley out. Byrnes must go, too."

It is not very often that a Congressman or a group of Congressmen in the conduct of a program are supported by a Red picket line here at the White House. Perhaps, or should I say no doubt, the gentleman and his associates have no connection with the individuals doing the picketing.

TREASON COMES TO WASHINGTON

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, 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, treason has come to Washington.

When the representatives of the Communist Party, dedicated to the destruction of this Government, can march up and down in front of the State Department in open daylight bearing placards demanding the ousting of the Secretary of State because he does not bow to the militant will of their subversive leaders, then I say treason has come to Washington.

On yesterday Harold J. Laski, a Communist, from overseas, came to Washington and conferred with certain of his fellow travelers. He went to New York last night and made a speech in favor of abolishing American sovereignty, which means getting rid of the Government of the United States. That is the program of these traitors.

We see Members rise on this floor and denounce Chiang Kai-shek, and demand that we take away from him the weapons of war we gave him while he was fighting on our side against the savage Japs and helping to save the lives of American boys, while the Chinese Communists were driving the knife into his back and into the backs of his men, thereby costing the lives of thousands of American boys on the islands of the Southwest Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, it is time the American people woke up to what is going on, denounced treason in whatever garb it may be found, and drove it forever from American soil.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow after the disposition of the business of the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

COMMUNISM

Mr. DIRKSEN. 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. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the House, and it has its inception in an experience I had in Chicago last week addressing a large group of farmers. One of them came to me and asked, "Where can I obtain a copy of an objective treatise on communism so that I can understand it?" I said, "In my judgment, I do not know whether you can find a simple, factual, objective, narrative treatise that will show the impact of this new ideology on our own form of enterprise or not."

It occurred to me as I studied over the matter that perhaps a joint committee ought to be created to select a number of objective writers to prepare a very simple treatise, and then have 25,000,000 copies printed at Federal expense, and send them into the libraries and into the school rooms and make them available for free distribution to every citizen in the land. That, in my judgment, will be the greatest antidote to the march of communism that I can think of.

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

COMMUNISM

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, we have an interesting fight taking place in the State Department. It is a fight to determine whether or not the Communists are going to run the Democrats out or the Democrats are going to run the Communists out. We Republicans are watching the outcome with interest.

SAUNDERS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 693) for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 693) entitled "An act for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment and the Senate agree to the same.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
J. M. COMBS,
JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 693) for the relief of Saunders Memorial Hospital, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report:

The bill as passed the Senate appropriated the sum of $25,000 to Saunders Memorial Hospital as the result of losses sustained by such hospital for the failure of the United States Army Engineers Corps to carry out a contract to lease or purchase such hospital to the United States, for the duration of the present war and 6 months thereafter.

The House reduced the sum to $10,000, and at the conference the original sum of $25,000 was agreed upon as being the proper amount.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
J. M. COMBS,
JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. J. D. WHITESIDE AND ST. LUKE'S HOSPITAL

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2930) for the relief of Dr. J. D. Whiteside and St. Luke's Hospital, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$3,259" and insert "$1,888."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$7,828.66" and insert "$4,596.16."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES LYNCH

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2835) for the relief of James Lynch, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Sen-

ate amendment and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McGEHEE, HOLMES of Washington, and PITTENGER.

ESTATE OF THOMAS McGARROLL

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 3390, an act for the relief of the estate of Thomas McGarroll, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,926.50" and insert "$5,571.50."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPHINE BENHAM

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 1457, an act for the relief of Josephine Benham, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McGEHEE, JENNINGS, and COMBS.

L. WILMOTH HODGES

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 874, an act for the relief of L. Wilmoth Hodges, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree with the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. COMBS, and Mr. JENNINGS.

ALBERT E. SEVERNS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2335, an act for the relief of Albert E. Severns, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree with the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. HOOK, and Mr. PITTENGER.

I FAVOR AN HONEST AND REAL INVESTIGATION OF EVERY UN-AMERICAN AND SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] are, as usual, seeing ghosts under the bed. And following these two gentlemen, my good colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] suggested that a congressional committee be appointed to make a real investigation of what communism does or does not mean and distribute the findings to the number of 25,000,000 copies.

While I do not dispute that there is a relative threat from communism, we must remember that a more immediate danger exists from those Fascists, Bundists, and Nazi ideologists who labored for years before the war and throughout our participation in the conflict to destroy our democratic form of government.

Hitler and Goebbels poured millions of dollars into propaganda activities in this country to discourage our war effort, to divide our people, and to try to undermine our morale. Those diabolical experts in psychological warfare made the prediction that even if the Nazis lost the war there would be no victors, because their propaganda would be so well implanted that the Allied Nations would be divided among themselves and that each of the Allied Nations would be disrupted within itself.

I am willing to join the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in requesting that a congressional committee be appointed to make an investigation; but let it be authorized to investigate also the activities of these secret Fascist organizations, and especially the sources of the funds which finance the thousands of dollars' worth of seditious, un-American pamphlets, booklets, and other publications.

I will heartily join my colleague and give favorable consideration to such a resolution if the investigation is made inclusive of all foreign ideologies threatening American security. Let the American people have the truth, but the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

If we do that I am sure we will find that there exists a definite, deliberate, and well-financed campaign backed by reactionary forces in this country to try to discredit as communistic every liberal group, and every movement working for improvement of the lot of the average citizen, and every legislation measure designed to accomplish that end. I am confident that such an impartial investigation would find that behind this whole vicious campaign of smearing there are economic interests seeking to muzzle free speech, or to confuse public opinion by beclouding free discussion of vital public issues, in order to protect their own position of wealth and power.

I think the true picture will show that these miscreants, who dare not risk a public judgment founded upon a well-informed citizenry, employ the services of professional demagogs and rabble-rousers of the type of Gerald L. K. Smith, Joe Kamp, William Pelley, Joe McWilliams, and others like that sorry group of alleged seditionists still trying to evade justice in the courts. Speaking of national menaces, here are men and women who, in our Nation's most trying days, did their utmost to undermine the war efforts, to blast our confidence, besmirch America's motives, and spread disunity.

Today they are still rampant on the American political scene, spreading their poisons of racial and religious bigotry.

These Benedict Arnolds, quislings, bundists, silver shirters, and such nefarious villains, in seeking to distract attention from their own seditious activities, invariably turn upon our patriotic, liberty- and freedom-loving citizens, especially those of foreign extraction.

Even that great patriot and statesman, Franklin D. Roosevelt, did not escape the villainy and the denunciation of these rascals. Moreover, they were privileged to use a congressional committee—the Dies committee, just as they now appear to be using the Wood committee—as a shameful weapon against the Congress itself. Many good persons were unjustifiably accused, as was ultimately shown by indisputable evidence. We supported from taxes a weapon cast for our own destruction. How ambitious these scoundrels were. Their campaign ranged all the way from President Roosevelt to Shirley Temple.

This dastardly propaganda was so thorough in operation that it was supported not only by a few with great wealth, but by some large newspapers, tax and tariff beneficiaries, and radio commentators. Many honest, well-intentioned American men and women, constantly denied access to the truth, were misled and imposed upon.

Who, Mr. Speaker, benefited from this long campaign of vilification and representation? Whom did it profit to mislead and fool the American people?

They hide in the shadows of Hitler's great lies. The last thing they want is a thorough investigation. It would take years of painstaking search in the cracks of the woodwork of our Nation to ferret them out. Some already are in felon's cells. Would the Department of Justice and the State penitentiaries want to turn these wretched traitors loose upon helpless society before their terms have expired, even to give testimony?

I am a believer in the light. The truth will expose these recreants in their full infamy. It will enlarge the stature of those who have been unfortunate enough to suffer from the smears, the distortions, and the lies of those who fear the people.

We can see the benefits of the truth, and the whole truth, by watching the conduct of the Republican members of the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee. For months and years selfish and shameless people have tried to suggest that the great Franklin D. Roosevelt invited war with Japan, even encouraged

war with Hitler. Do not these charges run true to form—accusing one whose lips are forever sealed? By his death, by his memorable record of leadership, Franklin D. Roosevelt has discharged any debts which might have lain against his memory. Yet in a minute and painstaking search, cataloging every deficiency of every individual whose name might be turned up, these defamers of true greatness have tried to find some mud to sling; but they have not been able to present a scintilla of evidence to prove anything except that the late President did everything in his power to ward off the horrors of a war he knew and dreaded.

The great name of Roosevelt, farseeing statesman, pathfinder, trailblazer, fearless executive, lover of peace, will stand in Himalayan and resplendent stature for countless centuries and long after even the tombstones of his petty traducers shall have crumbled into meaningless dust.

The Pearl Harbor investigation daily unfolds the sad truth that the charges against our late President are inspired by hatred, jealousy, envy, malice, all with a view to providing political capital, and with a sinister underlying motif of racial and religious animosities unworthy even of those who bring the charges. What a motive, to smear the name of a truly great man for the sake of a political campaign.

While traducers indict and persecute the memory of our late President, they are giving Russia a little rest. When the hearings have been concluded, the wild dog pack will be in full tongue again to malign and libel Russia—Russia, where 15,000,000 men and women perished to beat back tyranny in freedom's darkest hour. Those lives were given, not only that Russia might survive, but that the world, as we knew it, might live by their death. Even now we can hear the wild dogs yapping here in this House as the so-called Committee on Un-American Activities insinuates that any organization in America having a kind word for our communistic ally is, per se, subversive.

I doubt that Russia needs defense; if she does, let me rest that defense on the testimony of a single witness, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

General Eisenhower has very recently stated publicly:

> If the American people had a chance to study the Russians at close range, and vice versa, I am certain there would be a fine mutual understanding and respect between the two peoples. I rubbed elbows with Marshal Zhukov and others, and have the highest regard for them. I was always able to get along with them.
>
> What most people do not realize is that the Russians are a good deal like us. They enjoy life like us Americans, are full of fun, and have a fine sense of humor. I have no fear about future amicable relations between our own country and Soviet Russia. There will have to be some give and take in our relations, but eventually things will work out well.

Mr. Speaker, it has been well and truly said, "give the people light and they will find their own way."

I will gladly concur with my colleague in his proposal for an honest, all-inclusive investigation if every dark and fearsome force in America is brought under the searchlight. Let us investigate the Communist Party—yes; but let us investigate also the bundists, the klansmen, the shadowy figures who hide in the night and gnaw at our freedom.

Let us have such an investigation as our beloved majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] conducted a decade ago. Let us turn up all the stones in the cellar—not just the ones painted red or pink.

I would have this committee uncontrolled by any group. I would have it fearless and without preconceived notions; not the tool of one or two newspaper publishers or dyspeptic cynics in our own body, but the good weapon of our democracy against the forces that would enslave us without our knowing it.

I want the guilty unmasked and the guiltless absolved. I want the accused to have their day in court. I want no man unmolested because of his wealth or power. I hope that a committee such as our friend suggests may be created, subject to the conditions I have named; and I hope that it will courageously, thoroughly, and without fear or favor, bring forth the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

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?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

REVERE SUGAR REFINERY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1955) for the relief of the Revere Sugar Refinery.

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

Mr. McGREGOR and Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin objected; and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

ADOLPHUS M. HOLMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1841) for the relief of Adolphus M. Holman.

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

Mr. McGREGOR and Mr. SPRINGER objected; and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

TENDERING THANKS TO GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 243) tendering the thanks of Congress to General of the Army George C. Marshall, and the members of the Army of the United States who have fought under his direction during the wars; and providing that the President of the United States shall cause a medal to be struck to be presented to General Marshall in the name of the people of the United States of America.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the joint resolution will be passed over without prejudice.

There was no objection.

TRANSIT INVESTMENT CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1266) for the relief of the Transit Investment Corp.

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

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. McGREGOR objected; and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

DAVE TOPPER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2062, for the relief of Dave Topper.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dave Topper, Toledo, Ohio, the sum of $6,926.48. Such sum represents the amount of an alleged loss sustained by the said Dave Topper in connection with the sale of 44 surplus motorcycles which he had purchased from the Treasury Department, Procurement Division, on November 9, 1944, under the name of Topper Sales Co., such loss resulting from the establishment by the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration on December 2, 1944, of a ceiling price upon used motorcycles.

With the following committee amendments:

> Page 1, line 6, strike out "$6,926.48" and insert "$2,014.88."
>
> At the end of the bill, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

BUNGE CORP. AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2187) for the relief of the Bunge Corp., the Corporation Argentina de Productos de Carnes, Herman M. Gidden, and the Overseas Metal and Ore Corp.

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

Mr. McGREGOR and Mr. DOLLIVER objected; and, under the rule, the bill was recommended to the Comimttee on Claims.

JOSEPH E. BENNETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2091) for the relief of Joseph E. Bennett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joseph E. Bennett, doing business as Joseph E. Bennett Co., Boston, Mass., the sum of $41,705. The said Joseph E. Bennett Co. was the low bidder on a contract for the construction of certain

temporary buildings at the airport at Presque Isle, Maine, and was on September 1, 1941, awarded the contract (DAW 175-eng-22, dated September 5, 1941) for such construction. Through an error in the engineers office in Boston he was furnished with an unrevised and incorrect set of plans for the purpose of enabling him to estimate for his bid, and the sum directed to be paid to him represents (1) the additional cost of $39,129 which he incurred in completing the contract under the correct plans; (2) a profit of $1,956, or approximately 5 percent of such additional cost; and (3) the cost, in the amount of $620, of the performance bond with respect to the additional construction called for by the correct plans.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after "the sum of", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert the following: "$39,129, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses sustained under contract (DAW 175-eng-22, dated September 5, 1941) in the construction of certain temporary buildings at the airport at Presque Isle, Maine, beginning in September 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

MRS. CLARA M. FORTNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1667) for the relief of Mrs. Clara M. Fortner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Clara M. Fortner, of 220 West Magnolia Street, Auburn, Ala., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of her son, Frasier Fortner, who was killed by the collision of a United States Army plane with an Eastern Air Lines plane copiloted by him at the Thirty-sixth Street Airport, at Miami, Fla., on September 22, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The 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.

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY TO CONVEY CERTAIN PROPERTY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1117) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey Casa Dorinda estate in Santa Barbara County, Calif., to Robert Woods Bliss and Mildred B. Bliss.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever he shall determine that such property is no longer needed for exclusively public purposes the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to convey to Robert Woods Bliss and Mildred B. Bliss without consideration (1) all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to the real property situated in Santa Barbara County, Calif., known as Casa Dorinda estate, which is described in a certain grant deed by which said property was conveyed to the United States, dated November 23, 1942, and recorded in the official land records of Santa Barbara County, Calif., at page 492, book 559, (2) all right, title, and interest in and to the appurtenant sewer line and easement mentioned in said deed, and (3) all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in any of those certain articles consisting of books, furniture, and household furnishings, tools, garden equipment, and other articles of personal property conveyed by deed of gift from Mildred B. Bliss and Robert Woods Bliss to the United States of America dated November 23, 1942, and which are more fully described in exhibit A thereof: *Provided*, That the conveyance of such property as herein authorized shall be upon the condition that the grantors shall release the Government from any and all claims with respect thereto and with respect to any personal property which may have been loaned to the Government in connection therewith: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall cause to be removed any improvements or alterations made to the premises at the Government's expense, if in his judgment the value thereof shall substantially exceed the cost of restoring the premises to their condition at the time of the Government's entry thereupon.

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.

IDA M. RANEY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 684) for the relief of Ida M. Raney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ida M. Raney, of McCrory, Ark., the sum of $750, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her on January 22, 1944, when she was struck by a flying rock fragment thrown into the air by an explosion which occurred during a military demonstration at Camp Robinson, Ark., which she was witnessing as a guest of United States military personnel: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The 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.

MRS. ALAN SELLS AND THE ESTATE OF ALAN SELLS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 779) for the relief of Mrs. Alan Sells and the estate of Alan Sells.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to Mrs. Alan Sells, of Topeka, Kans., the sum of $7,745.35, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her and for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by her, as a result of an accident which occurred while she was riding as a passenger in a United States Army vehicle near the Topeka Army Air Base, on February 1, 1944, and (2) to the estate of Alan Sells, the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of the claim of such estate against the United States for compensation for the death of the said Alan Sells as a result of such accident, and for funeral expenses incurred by it in connection therewith: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The 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.

JOSEPH A. HANNON AND ELEANORE M. HANNON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 801) for the relief of Joseph A. Hannon and Eleanore M. Hannon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joseph A. Hannon and Eleanore M. Hannon, of Coquille, Oreg., the sum of $6,542.52, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for the destruction of their house and personal property in Coquille, Oreg., and for personal injuries to Eleanore M. Hannon as the result of the crash of a United States Navy airplane on October 15, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$6,542.52" and insert "$6,191.52."

Line 7, strike out "their" and insert "all."

Line 9, strike out "and for personal injuries to Eleanore M. Hannon."

The committee amendments were 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.

GREGORY STELMAK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 998) for the relief of Gregory Stelmak.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gregory Stelmak, of Hartford, Conn., the sum of $4,365.58, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him, and for reimbursement of hospital, medical, and other expenses incurred by him, as a result of an accident which occurred when he was struck by a United States Army vehicle while walking along Village Street, in Hartford, Conn., on October 18, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The 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.

CHARLIE B. ROUSE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1017) for the relief of Charlie B. Rouse and Mrs. Louette Rouse.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charlie B. Rouse, of Tullahoma, Tenn., the sum of $81.50, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained and expenses incurred by him as the result of an accident involving a United States Army reconnaissance car on Highway No. 41 near Tullahoma, Tenn., on August 12, 1944; to pay to Mrs. Louette Rouse, of Tullahoma, Tenn., the sum of $1,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained and medical and hospital expenses incurred by her as a result of said accident; and to pay to Mrs. Louette Rouse, of Tullahoma, Tenn., the sum of $50 for the benefit of her minor daughter, Rachel Rouse, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by the said Rachel Rouse in said accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The 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.

E. D. WILLIAMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 247) for the relief of E. D. Williams.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to E. D. Williams, of Glendora, Calif., the sum of $1,300, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained as the result of an accident involving an Army truck and a De Soto airflow sedan in which he was the driver, at the corner of Barranca and Cortez Streets near Glendora, Calif., on November 1, 1943: *Provided*, That no amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGREGOR: On page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,300" and insert "$614.57."

The amendment was agreed to.

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.

ROY S. COUNCILMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1250) for the relief of Roy S. Councilman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Roy S. Councilman, Corona Del Mar, Calif., the sum of $894. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Roy S. Councilman against the United States for personal injuries sustained on August 8, 1944, when two United States Navy airplanes dived so close to a fishing boat on which the said Roy S. Councilman was fishing off San Mateo, Calif., that their backwash threw him from a bait box to the deck of the boat, causing him to injure both of his knees.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 3, insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

LEONARD HUTCHINGS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1464) for the relief of Leonard Hutchings.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Leonard Hutchings, the sum of $10,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the loss of an arm and other personal injuries he received in a collision with an Army vehicle near Liberty, Ariz., on the 24th day of April 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

Line 6, strike out "his claim" and insert "all claims."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

CAROLYN LAMB

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1796) for the relief of the legal guardian of Carolyn Lamb.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Carolyn Lamb, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of said Carolyn Lamb, who died August 30, 1944, as the result of an accident caused by an Army truck operated by a member of the United States Army crashing into said Carolyn Lamb on August 28, 1944, said Carolyn Lamb being a resident of Lakeland, Fla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "the legal guardian of Carolyn Lamb, the sum of $5,000" and insert "Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Lamb, of Lakeland, Fla., the sum of $2,291.50."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Lamb."

VIOLA THERIAQUE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1836) for the relief of Viola Theriaque.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to Viola Theriaque, of Springfield, Hampden County, Mass., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $4,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States arising from personal injuries suffered when the car in which she was a passenger was struck by a Government motor vehicle operated in connection with the United States Army at Westover Field, Chicopee Falls, Mass., on Main Street, Springfield, Mass., on July 31, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the sign "$", strike out the bill down to the colon in line 1, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof "2,500 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings sustained as the result of a collision between the car in which she was riding and a United States Army vehicle in Springfield, Mass., on July 31, 1944."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

MAX HIRSCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1848) for the relief of Max Hirsch.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to remove from the records of his office the debt which has been raised therein against Mr. Max Hirsch, county Farm Security Administration supervisor, Anderson, Mo., in the sum of $289.65, together with interest thereon from date of loss of the public funds for which he is accountable and which were destroyed by fire, without his fault, on November 24, 1943.

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.

THOMAS SUMNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1854) for the relief of Thomas Sumner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Thomas Sumner, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries resulting from being struck by a Government-owned automobile operated by William B. Hancock, bearing United States Government license No. 14000, on August 12, 1942, at Salt Lake City, Utah.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,000."

Line 6, strike out the figures "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$2,000."

Line 7, after the word "injuries" strike out the remainder of the bill and insert ", medical and hospital expenses sustained as the result of being struck by a United States Army truck in Salt Lake City, Utah, on August 12, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGREGOR, of Ohio, to the committee amendment: On page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,000" and insert "$750."

The amendment to the committee amendments was agreed to.

The committee amendments as amended were agreed to.

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.

MARY H. OVERALL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2087) for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay from any funds not otherwise appropriated the sum of $1,280, to Mrs. Mary H. Overall, Murfreesboro, Tenn., for the loss of a barn and contents by fire caused by military personnel during the Tennessee maneuvers, and $1,500 to Thomas I. Baker, Murfreesboro, Tenn., for the loss of a Fordson tractor which was in the building at the time of the fire and damaged beyond repair.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, insert:

"Such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

SOLOMON SCHTIERNMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2171) for the relief of Solomon Schtiernman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Solomon Schtiernman the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained when a United States Army plane crashed at the Montefiore Cemetery, Suffolk County, Long Island, N. Y., on December 7, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the name "Schtiernman" and insert in lieu thereof "Schtierman."

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$1,500."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Solomon Schtierman."

ARNOLD MECHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2289) for the relief of Arnold Mecham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Arnold Mecham, of Nampa, Idaho, the sum of $2,120. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of said Arnold Mecham against the United States on account of injuries sustained and resultant losses when the automobile he was driving was struck by an Army vehicle on United States Highway No. 30 near Boise, Idaho, on December 7, 1943.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, after the figure "1943:" insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

MIRTIE PIKE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2318) for the relief of Mrs. Mirtie Pike.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to (1) Mrs. Mirtie Pike, of Murfreesboro, Tenn., the sum of $5,000, (2) the legally qualified representative of the estate of Mrs. Bernice Smotherman, deceased, of Murfreesboro, Tenn., the sum of $10,000. The payment of said sums shall be in addition to any sums paid to Mrs. Mirtie Pike for medical and hospital expenses, and to the estate of Mrs. Bernice Smotherman, deceased, for funeral and burial expenses, and shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of (1) the personal injuries sustained by the said Mrs. Mirtie Pike, and (2) the death of the said Mrs. Bernice Smotherman. The said Mrs. Mirtie Pike was severely injured, and the said Mrs. Bernice Smotherman was instantly killed, on October 15, 1943, when they were struck by a United States Army truck, on Tennessee Highway No. 10, near Murfreesboro, in Rutherford County, Tenn.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "to", strike out the balance of page 1 and all of page 2, down to and including the word "Tennessee" in line 10, and insert "Mrs. Mertie Pike, of Murfreesboro, Tenn., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for pain and suffering and personal injuries sustained, and to pay to the estate of Mrs. Burnice Smotherman, deceased, of Murfreesboro, Tenn., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of the said Mrs. Burnice Smotherman, as the result of the said Mrs. Mertie Pike and Mrs. Burnice Smotherman being struck by an Army vehicle on Tennessee State Highway No. 10, near Murfreesboro, Tenn., on October 15, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 11, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,500."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mertie Pike and the estate of Mrs. Burnice Smotherman, deceased."

ELSIE PETER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2393) for the relief of Elsie Peter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Elsie Peter, the sum of $10,000, as compensation for and in full settlement of all claims for damages against the United States for injuries sustained by her and expenses incident thereto, as a result of her being struck and injured by a Government vehicle which was driven by an employee of the War Department: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of any services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Peter", strike out the balance of page 1, and insert "of Skokie, Ill., the sum of $5,730.74, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage and personal injuries sustained and for medical, hospital, and dental expenses incurred and required as the result of her being struck by an Army truck in Skokie, Ill., on January 12, 1944."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

W. D. JONES AND ETHEL S. JONES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2661) for the relief of W. D. Jones and Ethel S. Jones.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to W. D. Jones and Ethel S. Jones, of Lake Waccamaw, N. C., the sum of $8,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of damage to real and personal property, to wit: Hotel building and fixtures, owned by them and caused by a United States Army plane on July 5, 1943, when it crashed into their building: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$8,500" and insert "$3,904.74."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

GEORGE STILES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2837) for the relief of George Stiles.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,107.34, to George Stiles, of San Francisco, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as compensation for damages sustained as the result of guests being evacuated from the Soda Springs Hotel, Nevada, Calif., on January 21, 1943, by an officer of the United States Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The 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.

WILLIAM PHILLIPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2963) for the relief of William Phillips.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for the employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of William Phillips, who is alleged to have sustained injuries from the explosion of dynamite while working for the Works Progress Administration in a rock quarry at Garland, Tex., on or about April 11, 1938, and his claim for compensation is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he filed such claim with the United States Employees Compensation Commission not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, after the words "as amended," insert "and as extended to employees engaged in emergency relief employment."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

MRS. KATIE SANDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3277) for the relief of Mrs. Katie Sanders.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to

pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropropriated, to Mrs. Katie Sanders, Stella, Mo., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Katie Sanders against the United States on account of the death of her husband, Walter Crave Sanders, who died on October 1, 1944, as the result of personal injuries sustained on September 27, 1944, when the truck which he was driving on the McNatt Mill Road in Camp Crowder, Mo., was in collision with a United States Army truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

PAUL STANIK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3514) for the relief of Paul Stanik.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul Stanik, Carrollville, Wis., the sum of $2,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Paul Stanik against the United States on account of injuries and partial permanent disability therefrom sustained by his minor daughter, Olga Stanik, on September 24, 1938, when she fell into an excavation on a project of the Works Progress Administration at the Otjen School, Carrollville, Wis.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 5, strike out the name "Paul Stanik" and insert in lieu thereof "the legal guardian of Olga Stanik, a minor."

Line 6, after the figures "$2,500", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by the said Olga Stanik, on September 22, 1938, when she fell into an excavation on a project of the Works Progress Administration at the Otjen School, Carrollville, Wis.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

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

RAYMOND C. CAMPBELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3904) for the relief of Raymond C. Campbell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and dirtected to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Raymond C. Campbell, Alexandria, Va., the sum of $15,000. The payment of such rum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Raymond C. Campbell against the United States on account of injuries sustained by him, on December 12, 1944, on United States Highway No. 1, about 2 miles south of Alexandria, Va., when he was struck by an ambulance in the service of the Army of the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwitstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$15,000" and insert "$7,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

FRANK E. WILMOT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4240) for the relief of Frank E. Wilmot.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank E. Wilmot, Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $340.30. Such sum represents the cost of a resurvey by Frank E. Wilmot of section 32, township 11 north, range 7 west, San Bernardino meridian, California, made necessary when original survey data and plats made under his direction proved inaccurate, without fault of his own, because they had been based on certain corner monuments reestablished erroneously through the negligence of an employee of the Glendale, Calif., office of the United States General Land Office of the Department of the Interior.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, after the figures "340.30" strike out ". Such sum represents" and insert in lieu thereof "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of."

At the end of the bill add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

AGNES J. ALBERRY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 865) for the relief of the estate of Agnes J. Alberry.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CHARLES BRYAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1122) for the relief of Charles Bryan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles Bryan, of Lincoln, Nebr., the sum of $5,881.40, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him, and for reimbursement of hospital, medical, and other expenses incurred by him, as a result of an accident which occurred when he was struck by a United States Army vehicle while directing traffic, in Lincoln, Nebr., on August 24, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The 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.

VIRGINIA PACKARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 215) for the relief of Virginia Packard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Virginia Packard, 931 Gainsborough Drive, Pasadena, Calif., the sum of $80.33. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of the cost of travel from Pasadena, Calif., to Sweetwater, Tex., while under official orders to report for Women's Airforce Service Pilot training, which training was terminated while the claimant was en route to Sweetwater, Tex., as a result of administrative action based on recommendations by members of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent

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

The 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.

SCHOOL DISTRICT 90, PRATT COUNTY, KANS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 915) for the relief of Fairview School District No. 90, Pratt County, Kans.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Fairview School District No. 90, Pratt County, Kans., the sum of $2,444.40, in full satisfaction of all claims which said school district may have against the Government for the expense involving in removing and relocating the schoolhouse in said district at the request of the War Department, in order that the land previously occupied by such building might be used for an Army air base: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and th same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "involving" and insert in lieu thereof "involved."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

GLADYS ELVIRA MAURER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 919) for the relief of Gladys Elvira Maurer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gladys Elvira Maurer, National City, Calif., the sum of $2,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Gladys Elvira Maurer against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by her on April 18, 1942, in San Diego, Calif., when the automobile in which she was riding was in collision with an Army ambulance.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of bill add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

LEVEE DISTRICT NO. 10, YUBA COUNTY, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 948) conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment, respectively, upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, in Yuba County, Calif., on the easterly side of the Feather River, when the said Feather River breached the district's river levee at a point about 3 miles from the south end of the district on December 11, 1937, which break occurred at a point where the Engineer Department of the War Department in 1934 and 1935 had removed an old unused pipe discovered through the levee near its base and then allegedly replaced that portion of the old, well-compacted original levee by new levee construction with new earth inadequately tamped and leaving a definitely weakened point in the levee, through negligent reconstruction undertaken without authority requested of, or granted by the trustees of levee district No. 10, which damages and losses, if any, it is alleged could have been prevented by the exercise of reasonable care and diligence on the part of the Engineer Department of the War Department.

SEC. 2. Suits upon such claims, respectively, may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time of any statutes of limitations, and proceedings for the determination of such claims, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment shall be in the same manner as in cases in which such court has jurisdiction under the Judicial Code, as amended.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this Act, the word "persons" shall be interpreted to mean any person or persons, individual or individuals, copartnership, firm, or corporation.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "person", strike out the bill down to "SEC. 3," page 3. Insert in lieu thereof "against the United States for damages alleged to have been sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, in Yuba County, Calif., on the easterly side of the Feather River, when the said Feather River breached the district's river levee at a point about 3 miles from the south end of the district on December 11, 1937, which damage, if any, it is alleged could have been prevented by the exercise of reasonable care and diligence on the part of the Engineer Department of the War Department. In the determination of such claims the United States shall be held liable only to the extent to which a private person would be liable under such circumstances.

"SEC. 2. Suits upon which such claims, respectively, may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statutes of limitations, and proceedings for the determination of such claims, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment, shall be in the same manner as in cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph twentieth of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 41 (20))."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

MRS. GERTRUDE VERBARG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1073) for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Verbarg.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

THE IRVINE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1251) for the relief of the Irvine Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Irvine Co., Tustin, Calif., the sum of $2,900. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the Irvine Co. against the United States for the destruction of a small house and several orange trees which resulted from the crash of a United States Navy airplane on December 14, 1943.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of bill add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

MRS. J. W. McMURRAY ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1477) for the relief of Mrs. J. W. McMurray, R. T. Lathan, G. B. Cooper, L. W. Pearson, and Billups Oil Co.

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

Mr. McGREGOR and Mr. SPRINGER objected; and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

REV. NEAL DEWEESE ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1879) for the relief of Rev. Neal Deweese, Mrs. Minnie Deweese, Raymond Deweese, Ralph Demert, and the estate of Lon Thurman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $8,000 to Rev. Neal Deweese; to pay the sum of $1,500 to Mrs. Minnie Deweese; to pay the sum of $1,500 to Raymond Deweese; to pay the sum of $1,000 to Ralph Demert; to pay the sum of $5,500 to the estate of Lon Thurman, all of Farmington, Mo., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and the death of Lon Thurman as a result of being struck by a United States Army truck on United States Highway No. 21, near Pilot Knob, Mo., on July 4, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary, notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$8,000" and insert "$6,000."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,500" and insert "$750."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$1,500" and insert "$500."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the words "to pay the sum of $1,000 to Ralph Demert."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "$5,500" and insert "$5,000."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "Pilot Knob" and insert "Ironton."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendments:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendments offered by Mr. SPRINGER:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$6,000" and insert "$5,000."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$750" and insert "$500."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "$500" and insert "$250."

The amendment to the committee amendments was agreed to.

The committee amendments as amended were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Rev. Neal Deweese, Mrs. Minnie Deweese, Raymond Deweese, and the estate of Lon Thurman, deceased."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELEANOR PARKINSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1918) for the relief of Eleanor Parkinson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Eleanor Parkinson, of Mount Carmel, Ill., the sum of $5,000 for damages to her property, which was caused by the Wabash River overflowing, due to the Brevoort levee maintained by the United States Government in the State of Indiana: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,637.50 in full settlement of all claims against the United States."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER to the committee amendment: Page 1, line 6, strike out "$4,637.50" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,200."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

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.

ORVIS WELCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2167) to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Orvis Welch.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

CHARLES ZUCKER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2168) for the relief of Charles Zucker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles Zucker, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained when a United States Army plane crashed at the Montefiore Cemetery, Suffolk County, Long Island, N. Y., on December 4, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

HARRY C. WESTOVER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2270) for the relief of Harry C. Westover.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to allow credit in the account of Harry C. Westover, collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of California, in the sum of $2,160, representing the value of certain wine stamps erroneously issued to the Rubidoux Winery, Riverside, Calif., in the wrong denomination, affixed to barrels, and mutilated in accordance with provisions of the Internal Revenue Code prior to discovery of the error, no loss of tax having been incurred by the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF KATHLEEN LAWTON McGUIRE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2670) for the relief of the legal guardian of Kathleen Lawton McGuire.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Kathleen Lawton McGuire, a minor child, of 941 Eighth Street, Boulder, Colo., the sum of $3,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for compensation for injuries sustained as a result of being wounded by a bullet fired by Gino Morello, while a passenger on a train of the Denver & Fort Worth Railroad near Memphis, Tex., on May 7, 1944, the said Gino Morello being a military prisoner in the custody of military police at the time said shot was fired: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$3,000" and insert "$1,657.25."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

B. H. SPANN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2884) for the relief of B. H. Spann.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to B. H. Spann, of Claxton, Ga., the sum of $5,000,

in full satisfaction of all claims of said B. H. Spann for damages for personal injuries sustained by him when struck by a vehicle of the United States Army near Reidsville, Ga., on May 19, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,500."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "claims", insert "against the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

MRS. JANET McKILIP

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2901) for the relief of Mrs. Janet McKilip.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000, to Mrs. Janet McKilip, West Albany, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical, and hospital expenses sustained as the result of an accident involving an Army vehicle at approximately stop 31½ in front of No. 1520 Central Avenue, town of Colonie, Albany County, N. Y., on April 20, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$1,438.52."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "McKilip" and insert "McKillip."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Janet McKillip."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOBBY MESSICK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2974) for the relief of Bobby Messick.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legally qualified representative of the estate of Bobby Messick, deceased, of Murfreesboro, Tenn., the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of the said Bobby Messick who was instantly killed on September 18, 1943, when struck by a United States Army truck on United States Highway No. 41, 6 miles south of Murfreesboro, Tenn.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$3,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

GEORGE W. AND KIRBY MURRELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3012) for the relief of George W. Murrell and Kirby Murrell, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $15,437.60, to George W. Murrell and Kirby Murrell, a minor, of Elizabeth, La., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses incident thereto, and as compensation for the death of their wife and mother, Mrs. Mamie Murrell, as the result of a collision with a United States Army vehicle about 5 miles south of Alexandria, La., on United States Highway No. 165, on June 4, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the words "George W. Murrell", strike out the balance of the line and all of lines 7 to 11, inclusive, and on page 2, strike out lines 1 and 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following: ", the sum of $2,045 to George W. Murrell as natural tutor of Kirby Murrell, a minor, and the sum of $5,407.95 to the estate of Mamie W. Murrell, deceased, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage and personal injuries sustained, for medical, hospital, burial, and dental expenses incurred and required, and for the death of Mamie W. Murrell, as a result of the collision of an Army vehicle with an automobile operated by George W. Murrell, near Alexandria, La., on June 4, 1944;."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

MARY ELIZABETH MONTAGUE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3052) for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Montague.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mary Elizabeth Montague, New London, Conn., the sum of $52.74, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of the cost of travel from New London, Conn., to Sweetwater, Tex., while under official orders to report for Women's Airforce Service Pilot training, which training was terminated while the claimant was en route to Sweetwater, Tex., as a result of administrative action based on recommendations by Members of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The 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.

WILLIAM CLYDE McKINNEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3454) for the relief of the legal guardian of William Clyde McKinney, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to the legal guardian of William Clyde McKinney, a minor, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained as the result of a collision with a Government truck on Frio City Road, San Antonio, Tex., on February 20, 1944.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,709.64."

Page 1, line 6, after the word "to", strike out "the legal guardian of."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "a minor" and insert "of San Antonio, Tex."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "Government" and insert "United States Army."

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of William Clyde McKinney."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRED C. LITER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3554) for the relief of Fred C. Liter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,500 to Fred C. Liter, of Harrisonville, Mo., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained as a result of being struck by a United States Army vehicle, on February 22, 1945, near Neosho, Mo.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$1,500" and insert "$1,141.80."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "Neosho" and insert "Harrisonville."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

M. MARTIN TURPANJIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3641) for the relief of M. Martin Turpanjian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,500, to M. Martin Turpanjian, of Allendale, N. J., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle at the intersection of Liberty Road and Tenafly Road, Englewood, N. J., on February 13, 1945: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike "$2,500" and insert "$1,186."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

J. TOM STEPHENSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3677) for the relief of J. Tom Stephenson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. Tom Stephenson, Marianna, Fla., the sum of $152.40. Such sum represents the amount of fees earned by the said J. Tom Stephenson for services rendered as United States commissioner, Northern District of Florida, during the quarter ending October 31, 1943, and quarter ending January 31, 1944, but not paid because the account covering such services was not rendered within the time prescribed by law.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the period, strike out the balance of the line to and including the word "Stephenson" on line 7 and insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States."

At the end of the bill insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

MISS JACQUELINE FRIEDRICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3725) for the relief of Miss Jacqueline Friedrich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Miss Jacqueline Friedrich, San Jacinto, Calif., the sum of $27.80. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Miss Jacqueline Friedrich against the United States for reimbursement of the cost of travel from San Jacinto, Calif., to Sweetwater, Tex., while under official orders to report for Women's Airforce Service Pilot training, which training was terminated while the claimant was en route to Sweetwater, Tex.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The 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.

C. FRANK JAMES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2769) for the relief of C. Frank James.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. Frank James, the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of his claim against the United States arising out of the death of his minor son, John Ronald James, resulting from an accident involving a United States Army truck on the Goldsboro-Kenly Highway, near Goldsboro, N. C., on Oct. 13, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,364."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "his claim" and insert "all claims."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

MRS. FLORENCE MERSMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3791) for the relief of Mrs. Florence Mersman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Florence Mersman the sum of $3,833, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical, hospital, and other expenses, and losses sustained by her as a result of an Army truck striking the automobile in which she was riding at the intersection of Western Avenue and Marathon Street in the city of Los Angeles, Calif., on April 16, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,833" and insert "$2,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

WILLIAM N. THERRIAULT AND MILLICENT THERRIAULT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3808) for the relief of the estate of William N. Thierriault and Millicent Therriault.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of William N. Therriault and Millicent Therriault, of Fall River, Mass., the sum of $11,425, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of the said William N. Therriault and Millicent Therriault, as the result of being struck by a United States Post Office vehicle on Union Street near Columbia Street in Fall River, Mass., on October 1, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The 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.

IDA BARGER ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4269) for the relief of Ida Barger, Hazel A. Beecher, Etta Clark, Jesse Ruth France, John W. Nolan, Anna Palubicki, and Frank J. Schrom.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each of the following-named persons the amount specified in the case of such person, in full satisfaction of his or her claim against the United States for the injury indicated in each case resulting from the explosions which occurred at the naval ammunition depot, Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944:

Ida Barger, for the loss of an eye and lacerations of the forehead, the sum of $6,113.34;

Hazel A. Beecher, for the loss of an eye, $7,351.41;

Etta Clark, for the loss of an eye and permanent facial scars, $5,000;

Jesse Ruth France, for the loss of an eye, $6,465.51;

John W. Nolan, for the loss of both eyes and partial paralysis of the right arm, resulting in total disability, the sum of $28,008.16;

Anna Palubicki, for the loss of vision of left eye, $3,812.05;

Frank J. Schrom, for the loss of vision of right eye, $6,971.55.

No part of any sum appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim satisfied by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The 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.

PERMISSION TO ACCEPT BRITISH EMPIRE MEDALS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) granting permission to Charles Rex Marchant, Lorne E. Sasseen, and Jack Veniss Bassett to accept certain medals tendered them by the Government of Canada in the name of His Britannic Majesty, King George VI.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That Charles Rex Marchant, Lorne E. Sasseen, and Jack Veniss Bassett, employees of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce, be authorized to accept and wear British Empire medals, civilian division, tendered by the Government of Canada in the name of His Britannic Majesty, King George VI, in recognition of their gallant services in rescuing four crew members from a crashed and burning Canadian bomber in September 1942, and that the Department of State is hereby authorized and permitted to deliver the above medals to Charles Rex Marchant, Lorne E. Sasseen, and Jack Veniss Bassett.

The joint resolution 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.

MRS. EVELYN MERRITT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2927) for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Merritt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000, to Mrs. Evelyn Merritt, of route 1, New Augusta, Miss., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, property damage, and loss of earning sustained as a result of a collision between the automobile in which she was riding and a United States Army truck in Camp Shelby, Miss., on December 15, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

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

Line 8 strike out "medical and hospital expenses, property damage,".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

ELI RICHMOND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2644) for the relief of Eli Richmond.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Eli Richmond, of Oakdale, La., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Eli Richmond against the United States for personal injuries, sustained as the result of a collision on January 26, 1944, on United States highway No. 165, near Kinder, La., involving the truck in which he was a passenger and a United States Army truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$6,672."

Line 8, after "injuries", insert a comma and the following: "medical, hospital, nursing expenses, and loss of earnings."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

HAMSAH OMAR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 233) for the relief of Hamsah Omar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proceedings and orders requiring the deportation of Hamsah Omar, of Detroit, Mich., who entered the United States of America from Mexico at El Paso, Tex., on March 10, 1940, be canceled and set aside, and that said entry be considered a legal entry.

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.

THEODORE MAUDRAME

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2809) for the relief of Theodore Maudrame.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission into the United States for permanent residence of Theodore Maudrame as of December 9, 1924, the date on which he last entered the United States: *Provided*, That he is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws other than those relating to inadmissibility because of racial ineligibility.

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.

JOSEPH MRAK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2887) for the relief of Joseph Mrak.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the immigration laws, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to permit Joseph Mrak, of Johnstown, Pa., to remain permanently in the United States if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than quotas.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That in the adminis-

tration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel the warrant of arrest against Joseph Mrak, of Johnstown, Pa., heretofore issued on the grounds that admission to the United States had been fraudulently gained and that he shall hereafter be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on October 20, 1939. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Yugoslavian quota for the first year that the said Yugoslavian quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

HERMAN TRAHN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3765) for the relief of Herman Trahn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 885; 50 U. S. C. 303), Herman Trahn, of 65 Park Terrace East, New York, N. Y., may be permitted to become a naturalized citizen of the United States if he can otherwise meet all the requirements of existing law relating to naturalization.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, before "Herman", insert "and the provisions of Public Law 205, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved October 29, 1945."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

SALVADOR LORENZ FERNANDEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2546) for the relief of Salvador Lorenz Fernandez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is directed to cancel forthwith the outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond, if any, in the case of the alien Salvador Lorenz Fernandez, 117 West One Hundred and Sixteenth Street, New York City, N. Y., (file number 560019/657), who has resided continuously in the United States since 1925 and whose wife and six children are citizens and residents of the United States, and is directed not to issue any further such warrants or orders in the case of such alien, insofar as such further warrants or orders are based on any unlawful entry of such alien into the United States prior to the enactment of this act, or are based on the fact that such alien was not entitled to have been admitted to the United States, as a quota or nonquota immigrant, for permanent residence.

EDGAR KAIGLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 207) for the relief of Edgar Kaigler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edgar Kaigler, of Daytona Beach, Fla., the sum of $5,213.79, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for the death of Lela Morris, the mother of Edgar Kaigler, the said Lela Morris having been killed on September 10, 1943, when a United States Navy airplane, SBD-4, bureau number 10371, crashed into the home of Lela Morris, on 425 Maple Street, Daytona Beach, Fla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,213.79" and insert "$2,713.79."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

MRS. BESSIE S. EDMONDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 873) for the relief of Mrs. Bessie S. Edmonds.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Bessie S. Edmonds, widow of the late Lt. Comdr. Samuel P. Edmonds, United States Coast Guard, retired, of Pass Christian, Miss., the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the use of certain life-saving-equipment patents, which have been, and are now being, used by the United States Government: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilt of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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.

B. PENDINO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1315) for the relief of B. Pendino.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to B. Pendino the sum of $3,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injury to said B. Pendino, on November 1, 1943, as a result of negligence in the operation of an Army vehicle in the city of Tampa, Fla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$3,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$1,641.92."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "for", strike out the bill down to the word ": *Provided*," and insert in lieu thereof "personal injuries and loss of wages sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army truck in Tampa, Fla., on November 1, 1943."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

GORDON T. GORHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1348) for the relief of estate of Gordon T. Gorham, and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated—

To the estate of Gordon T. Gorham, deceased, late of Portland, Maine;

To the estate of Florence M. Gorham, deceased, late of Portland, Maine;

To the estate of Rita M. Robertson, deceased, late of Portland, Maine;

To the estate of George J. Robertson, Jr., deceased, late of Portland, Maine;

To the estate of Edna May Hume, deceased, late of South Portland, Maine;

To the estate of John William Hume, dedeceased, late of South Portland, Maine;

To the estate of Clarence S. Hume, Jr., deceased, late of South Portland, Maine;

To the estate of Virginia Mae Gerrish, deceased, late of South Portland, Maine;

To the estate of Edward Alfred Gerrish, deceased, late of South Portland, Maine;

To the estate of Roberta Mae Gerrish, deceased, late of South Portland, Maine;

To the estate of Rose M. Gerrish, deceased, late of South Portland, Maine;

To the estate of Virginia Warren, deceased, late of South Portland, Maine;

To the estate of Jennie C. Allen, deceased, late of Windham, Maine;

To the estate of Shirley M. Brown, deceased, late of South Portland, Maine;

To the estate of Hazel M. Little, deceased, late of South Portland, Maine;

To the estate of Nancy Lee Little, deceased, late of South Portland, Maine;

To the estate of James McGuire, also known as James Little, deceased, late of South Portland, Maine;

the sum of $10,000 to each of the aforesaid estates respectively, in full satisfaction and settlement of all claims against the United States for the deaths and injuries of each of the aforestated decedents, caused by the crash of a United States Army bomber into and onto the dwellings occupied by the aforesaid persons on the date of July 11, 1944, at South Portland, Maine; and that the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated—

To George J. Robertson, Sr., of Portland, Maine, $5,000 for personal injuries and loss of wages;

To guardian of John E. Gerrish, of Orono, Maine, $10,000 for personal injuries;

To guardian of Marian Rose Gerrish, of Orono, Maine, $10,000 for personal injuries;

To Jennie Bassett, of Pittsfield, Vt., $10,000 for personal injuries; and for expenses incurred as result of injuries, not including medical expenses;

To guardian of Vina J. Hannan, of South Portland, Maine, the sum of $25,000 for personal injuries, loss of wages, and hospital bills,

said sums to be in full satisfaction and settlement of all of their respective claims against the United States not otherwise claimed of or paid by the War Department under statutory claims resulting from and caused by the crash of a United States Army bomber into and onto the dwellings of aforesaid persons on the date of July 11, 1944, at South Portland, Maine: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $5,000."

Page 1, line 9, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $5,000."

Page 1, line 11, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $5,000."

Page 2, line 2, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $1,500."

Page 2, line 4, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $5,000."

Page 2, line 6, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $1,500."

Page 2, line 8, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $7,500."

Page 2, line 10, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $5,000."

Page 2, line 12, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $5,000."

Page 2, line 14, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $2,000."

Page 2, line 16, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $1,500."

Page 2, line 18, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $5,000."

Page 2, line 20, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $5,000."

Page 2, line 22, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $7,500."

Page 2, line 24, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $7,000."

Page 3, line 2, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $1,500."

Page 3, line 4, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $1,500."

Page 3, line 5, strike out "the sum of $10,000", insert in lieu thereof "the sums."

Page 3, line 5, after the word "to", strike out "each of."

Page 3, line 15, strike out the figures "$5,000", insert in lieu thereof the figures "$3,000."

Page 3, line 17, strike out the figures "$10,000", insert in lieu thereof the figures "$4,000."

Page 3, line 19, strike out the figures "$10,000", insert in lieu thereof the figures "$4,000."

Page 3, line 20, strike out the figures "$10,000", insert in lieu thereof the figures "$4,000."

Page 4, line 1, strike out the figures "$25,000", insert in lieu thereof the figures "$7,500."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER to the committee amendment:

On page 2, line 9, strike out the sum "$7,500" and insert "$5,000."

Page 2, line 23, strike out the sum "$7,500" and insert "$5,000."

Page 2, line 25, strike out the sum "$7,000" and insert "$5,000."

The amendment to the committee amendments was agreed to.

The committee amendments as amended were agreed to.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: On page 3, line 21, strike out the name "Rose" and insert in lieu thereof the name of "Anne."

The amendment was agreed to.

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.

JOHN BUCHAN AND LAWRENCE GILLINGHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1615) for the relief of the legal guardians of John Buchan and Lawrence Gillingham, minors.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to the legal guardian of John Buchan and to pay the sum of $10,000 to the legal guardian of Lawrence Gillingham, all of 337 Forty-fourth Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., for personal injuries sustained by the minors when they were struck by an automobile driven by an employee of the United States Department of Justice, on January 27, 1942, at Fourth Avenue near Thirty-seventh Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$4,300."

Line 7, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$1,034."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

CATHERINE V. SWEENEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2251) for the relief of Catherine V. Sweeney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Catherine V. Sweeney, of Utica, N. Y., the sum of $1,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Catherine V. Sweeney against the United States on account of the serious and permanent personal injury sustained by her on October 1, 1943, in the town of Cicero, N. Y., when an automobile in which she was a passenger was struck by an Army truck of the Syracuse Army Air Base, bearing license No. 3152053 and operated by Pfc. Joseph J. George: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The 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.

M. F. DILLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2596) for the relief of M. F. Diller.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CHARLIE POWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2724) for the relief of Charlie Powell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charlie Powell, Castalian Springs, Tenn., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained on March 3, 1944, by Forest Eldon Powell, minor son of the said Charlie Powell, as a result of the explosion of a fuse for a tank mine which had been left near the school attended by the said Forest Eldon Powell by United States Army forces on maneuvers.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the word "Charlie" and insert "the legal guardian of Forest Eldon."

Line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$1,500."

Line 9, strike out "son of the said Charlie Powell."

Page 2, line 2, insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Forest Eldon Powell."

R. H. SINDLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2728) for the relief of R. H. Sindle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to R. H. Sindle, Gallatin, Tenn., the sum of $101.54. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said R. H. Sindle against the United States for the loss of, and damage to, certain personal property owned by him as the result of acts of depredation committed by members of the United States Army on March 22, 1944.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill add "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

MRS. GISELLA SANTE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3124) for the relief of Mrs. Gisella Sante.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Gisella Sante, South Bend, Ind., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Gisella Sante against the United States on account of the death of her husband, Ignace Sante, who died on March 30, 1945, as the result of injuries sustained on March 29, 1945, when he was struck by a United States mail truck in the driveway of his home in South Bend, Ind.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

LEONARD J. FOX AND MILFORD G. FOX

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3158) for the relief of Leonard J. Fox and Milford G. Fox, a partnership, doing business as Fox Co.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MRS. LESLIE PRICE ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3229) for the relief of Mrs. Leslie Price, Philip C. Price, Mrs. Louise Keyton, Annie Curry, and James Curry.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Leslie Price the sum of $1,557.50; to Philip C. Price, the sum of $1,309.50; to Annie Curry, the sum of $1,000; to James Curry, the sum of $1,150.20; all of Donovan, Ga.; and to Mrs. Louise Keyton, of Wrightsville, Ga., the sum of $1,090, in full settlement of all claims for personal injuries, medical expenses, property damage, and loss of earnings as the result of a collision of a car belonging to Mrs. Leslie Price and an Army vehicle on April 4, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the figures "$1,557.50" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$1,007.50."

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$1,307.50" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$807.50."

Page 1, line 7, strike out the figures "$1,000" and "$1,150.20", respectively, and insert "$567.19" and "$656.26", respectively.

Page 1, line 9, strike out the figures "$1,090" and insert figures "$590."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

CAPT. WAYNE E. MEISENHEIMER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3285) for the relief of Capt. Wayne E. Meisenheimer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $177.50 to Capt. Wayne E. Meisenheimer, of Wingate ordnance depot, Gallup, N Mex., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of travel expense from Aruba, Netherlands West Indies, to Miami, Fla., in November 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The 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.

C. H. BRUMFIELD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3784) for the relief of C. H. Brumfield.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. H. Brumfield, Chicago, Ill., the sum of $25,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said C. H. Brumfield against the United States on account of personal injuries and property damage sustained on August 31, 1943, when an automobile owned and driven by him was in collision with a United States Army vehicle on United States Highway No. 2, near Devils Lake, N. Dak. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$25,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$6,790."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "injuries," insert "hospital and medical expenses, and loss of earnings."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

MRS. EUNICE C. HARDAGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3834) for the relief of Mrs. Eunice C. Hardage.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of Eunice C. Hardage, widow of Newton G. Hardage, former rural mail carrier, at Dallas, Ga., whose death occurred on January 8, 1936, and her claim for compensation is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if she files such claim with the United States Compensation Commission not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, or within that time renews her claim heretofore filed which has been denied because of failure to comply with said provisions of said act: *Provided*, That no benefits hereunder shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "death" insert "of pneumonia."

Page 1, line 11, after the figure "1936", insert "alleged to have been caused by exposure."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

M. R. STONE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4116) for the relief of M. R. Stone.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limitations of time in sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled, "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of M. R. Stone, of Huntington, W. Va., and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider under the remaining provisions of said Act his claim on account of injury and disability alleged to have been sustained in February or March 1938, while performing his duties at Huntington Veterans' Hospital, West Virginia: *Provided*, That claim hereunder shall be filed within 6 months from the approval of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "injury", strike out the words "and disability" and insert "to his hip and leg."

Page 2, line 6, after the word "act:", insert "*Provided*, That no benefits shall accrue hereunder prior to the approval of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

FRANKLIN P. RADCLIFFE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4117) for the relief of Franklin P. Radcliffe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limitations of time in sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled, "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Franklin P. Radcliffe, of Huntington, W. Va., and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider under the remaining provisions of said act his claim on account of injury and disability alleged to have been sustained on or about March 19, 1938, while performing his duties as fireman at the United States Veterans' Hospital, West Virginia: *Provided*, That claim hereunder shall be filed within 6 months from the approval of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "disability", insert "caused from a hernia."

Page 2, line 6, after the word "Act", insert ": *Provided*, That no benefits hereunder shall accrue prior to the approval of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

LUCY DELGADO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4249) for the relief of Lucy Delgado.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,570 to Lucy Delgado, who was seriously injured on June 11, 1944, when a United States Army truck overturned on Insular Highway No. 25, between Cataño and Santurce, P. R. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Delgado", strike out all down to and including the word "accident" in line 11, and insert "and to pay the sum of $750 to Irma M. Delgado, both of Puerto Rico, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained as the result of an accident which occurred on June 11, 1944, on Insular Highway No. 25 between Cataño and Santurce, P. R., and which involved a United States Army truck in which they were riding:".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Lucy Delgado and Irma M. Delgado."

IDA F. BRAUN ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1782) for the relief of Ida F. Braun, Alice Braun Menges, and Carl J. Braun, individually and as executors of the estate of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as legatees and beneficiaries of the will of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as the sole parties in interest by succession under the last will and testament of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and under the last will and testament of Herman W. Braun, deceased.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MRS. LUCILLE SCARLETT AND CHARLES SCARLETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3698) for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Scarlett and Charles Scarlett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Lucille Scarlett, Cookeville, Tenn., the sum of $5,000, and to Charles Scarlett, Cookeville, Tenn., the sum of $175. The payment of such sum of $5,000 shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Lucille Scarlett against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by her on October 18, 1943, when the automobile in which she was a passenger was in collision with a United States Army truck at the intersection of United States Highway No. 70-N, Scott Street, and Buffalo Valley Road in Cookeville, Tenn. The payment of such sum of $175 shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Charles Scarlett against the United States for damage to his automobile as the result of such collision: *Provided*, That no part of either of the sums appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim settled by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The 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.

HONOLULU PLANTATION CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2688) to provide compensation to Honolulu Plantation Co., a California corporation, as compensation for damages sustained.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Honolulu Plantation Co., a California corporation, having its principal properties and operations in the Territory of Hawaii, the sum of $3,250,000, as compensation for the damages to and the loss of property sustained by said company to its mill, water system, and other properties of its enterprise by reason of the expropriation by the United States of America of divers lands held under leases owned and operated by this company as an integral part of its enterprise, in full and complete satisfaction of all claims of said company against the United States of America: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection herewith, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims, notwithstanding any prior determination, statute, or decision, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Honolulu Plantation Co., a California corporation, for damages to its real property, mill, water system, remaining leasehold, and other enterprise properties not expropriated by the United States Government, and located on the island of Oahu, in the Territory of Hawaii, for the depreciation in the market value thereof arising out of the expropriations by the United States of divers lands upon which said claimant held leases, in proceedings wherein said lands were condemned in the United States District Court in and for the Territory of Hawaii; and

designated as civil Nos. 416, 430, 434, 436, 442, 452, 514, 525, 529, 533, 535, 544, and 548.

"SEC. 2. The damage to be ascertained and adjudged shall be the difference in the fair market value of the fee lands, mill, and other enterprise properties of said claimant as the same existed in 1936, prior to the filing of the aforesaid condemnation suits, and as the same remained in 1945 after the severance and loss of the beneficial use of said leased lands of said claimant condemned and expropriated by the United States as aforesaid.

"SEC. 3. Any suit brought under the provisions of this act shall be instituted within 1 year after the date of approval of this act; and from any decision or judgment rendered in any suit commenced under authority of this act, a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States may be applied for by either party thereto as provided by law in other cases. All testimony adduced before and all documents and evidence received by the subcommittee of the Committee on Claims of the House of Representatives shall be competent evidence of said damages and shall be received upon the record thereof made before said committee, as fully and to the same extent as though the witnesses were present and without further proof and certification."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Honolulu Plantation Co."

FRANTISEK JIRI BOVELEK OR GEORG BOVELEK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4381) for the relief of Frantisek Jiri Bovelek or Georg Bovelek.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Frantisek Jiri Bovelek or Georg Bovelek, who arrived at the port of Boston on September 21, 1945, as a stowaway, shall, upon the payment of the required head tax, be considered, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, to have been lawfully admitted to the United States notwithstanding the fact that he was found to be inadmissible on the sole grounds that he arrived as a stowaway and was without proper immigration documentation. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Czechoslovakian quota of the first year that the same Czechoslovakian quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "Bovelek" and insert "Pavlik."

Page 1, line 3, strike out the word "Bovelek" and insert "Pavlik."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Frantisek Jiri Pavlik or Georg Pavlik."

NATALE PIAVALLO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3787) for the relief of Natale Piavallo, also known as Natale Kiecieck.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Secretary of Labor is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the warrant of arrest and the order of deportation against Natale Piavallo, heretofore issued on the grounds that on July 11, 1945, admission to the United States had been illegally obtained, and thereupon Natale Kiecieck shall hereafter be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence at Boston, Mass., on July 11, 1945.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the alien Bozic Kisic, also known as Natale Piavallo, and other names, at Boston, Massachusets, on July 11, 1945, on the Navy Transport *General T. H. Bliss*, notwithstanding the provisions of the immigration laws of the United States. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota of the appropriate nation when such quota number becomes available. Nothing in this act shall prevent the deportation of the said alien for any cause under the immigration laws arising subsequent to his admission for permanent residence on July 11, 1945."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR UNRRA

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 444, Rept. No. 1332), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4649) to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed one day, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, an amendment prohibiting the use of funds involved in the bill H. R. 4649 in countries that refuse free access to examination of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration operations by representatives of the United States press and radio. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

INCREASE OF PERSONNEL IN NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 393 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

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. 4421) to increase the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, to increase the permanent authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, and to authorize permanent appointments in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the comprehensive bill reported by the Committee on Naval Affairs by a unanimous vote. The House, and the country, too, are indeed fortunate that the Committee on Naval Affairs has such an able chairman who seems to be—not only seems to be but I believe is—one of the best posted men in the United States. The House, therefore, has always shown real confidence—and I know I have—in any legislation he reports. The gentleman from Georiga [Mr. VINSON] is present, and is ready to explain the need for the increase of Navy personnel. I presume we have a great many splendid vessels that the Navy cannot man because of the lack of personnel. That is the underlying reason for bringing this legislation before the House today. I know it is not intended as a threat to any other nation. I hope the people of this country, and people the world over will realize that it is not intended for the purpose of having the greatest Navy in the world, although we have it anyway, for purposes of war but that it will be used by our Nation for purposes of peace. I know the aim of the President, and the American people and its leaders, is to provide cooperation, harmony, and peace to the troubled world.

There have been those who have been trying to create the impression in the United States that we have a chip on our shoulder and are ready to fight. They are using every pretext for the purpose of creating this impression, which is unfortunate. These same men and organizations have precluded us from preparing in order to avoid the last World War. They are the same people who opposed preparedness; in fact, in my opinion, their activities were responsible for our

being forced into the recent war because they led Hitler and Japan to believe that we would not be in position to defend ourselves or to protect our democratic form of government.

The people of the world must recognize that our form of government is the best in the world. We have a great country and a great people and we do not desire to take advantage of any nation or peoples at any time. All we ask is that fair play and justice prevail.

I do not think there will be any opposition to this rule, which will be further explained by my distinguished friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]. I will conclude with the statement that the rule provides for 2 hours' general debate, it is an open rule and I hope that it will be adopted by unanimous vote and that the bill will also be adopted by unanimous vote.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, there is no explanation of the rule necessary further than the last sentence of the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee. This is an open rule. The bill will be read under the 5-minute rule. All germane amendments will be in order. There is no gag to it, there is no nauseation in connection with the rule. I know of no reason why we should not proceed at once to the consideration of the bill.

The only difference between this bill and the average bill is that the first section suggests a policy only. That section has no vitality. It bears about the same relation to the rest of the bill that the "whereas" clause has to a resolution which it precedes. Possibly the remainder of the bill implements the speech in the first section.

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

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the chairman of Naval Affairs, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I do not think I am violating any confidence when I say the first section of the bill was read to the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy at the other end of the Avenue, and he said it was the best language in the bill.

Mr. MICHENER. I am not surprised at that. If the Army and Navy can get Congress to state a policy in a bill without binding provisions, but with authority to act, that is more satisfactory because it has more flexibility; therefore, I am not surprised to hear that the best part of the bill, so far as the Army and Navy are concerned, is the part which binds no one, where there is an opportunity to exercise discretion.

Mr. VINSON. I differ with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, because this is a fixed policy and the policy is binding and the policy is so positive that it is going to be followed literally by the department.

Mr. MICHENER. I am sure that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs will see that that is done, as long as he is chairman. The uncertainty lies in the fact that the Congress changes, the heads of the departments change, the heads of the Army and Navy change, and unless there is language in the law which speaks specifically, the next administrator does not always interpret the law as it was intended to be interpreted, and as it can be interpreted if discretion is lodged in an administrative office. As usual, the persuasiveness of the gentleman from Georgia prevails.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4421) to increase the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, to increase the permanent authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, and to authorize permanent appointments in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4421, with Mr. WORLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, during the discussion on the floor of House Concurrent Resolution 80, the question was raised as to why that resolution which set forth the sense of Congress as to the number of ships for the postwar Navy did not also set forth the number of personnel to man the postwar Navy. H. R. 4421 is the answer to that question, as it blueprints the permanent authorized enlisted and officer strength of the Regular postwar Navy. It is a proposed statutory basis for meeting the postwar personnel requirements of the Navy.

To accomplish this objective, provision is made—

First. For an increase in the permanent authorized strength of the Regular Navy to 500,000 and of the Marine Corps to 100,000;

Second. For an increase in the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the Navy and the Marine Corps from 5½ to 8 percent of the authorized enlisted strength; and

Third. For the appointment of officers in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps from the enlisted ranks and the temporary and Reserve officers.

Manning of the postwar Navy raises three basic questions: First, how many men does the Navy need? Second, what kind of men does the Navy need? And, third, how can the Navy get these men?

HOW MANY MEN DOES THE NAVY NEED?

The present authorized strength of the Regular Navy, as set by the act of April 22, 1941, Public Law 39, Seventy-seventh Congress, is 232,000. This strength must be more than doubled if the Navy is to be able to fulfill its function of national security and its proper participation in the global responsibility of this country to keep the peace. The Navy needs 500,000 enlisted men and 58,000 officers. The Marine Corps needs 100,000 enlisted men and 8,000 officers.

These totals are not mere guesses. They are based upon detailed analyses by the men of the fleet, the men who have to do the job, the men who know what the job requires.

These analyses have been prepared and set forth on pages 1367 to 1415 of the hearings of the Committee on Naval Affairs on the postwar Navy. They give the proposed personnel distribution ship-by-ship and station-by-station. They lay the cards of the Navy on the table face up.

I also call your attention to page 29 of the committee's report on House Concurrent Resolution 80, which gives total personnel requirement statistics according to types of ships and the three components of the postwar fleet.

For the fleet, the Navy will need 27,560 officers and 314,000 enlisted men. This need is on the basis of a ship complement of only 70 percent of wartime strength in the active fleet, as compared to 90 percent wartime complement of the pre-Pearl Harbor Fleet.

For the shore establishments, the Navy will need 23,934 officers and 151,000 enlisted men. Of these numbers, 4,047 officers and 43,890 enlisted men will be stationed outside of the continental United States; 19,887 officers and 107,110 enlisted men will be stationed in this country.

The training program will require 3,500 officers and 30,000 enlisted men. As this is the key to the desired quality of naval personnel, the training establishments must be adequately manned.

As between the floating Navy and the flying Navy, 22,000 line officers will be required to man the ships and 17,000 officers to man the planes. Naval aviation will also require 120,000 enlisted men.

WHAT KIND OF MEN DOES THE NAVY NEED?

What kind of men does the Navy need? The answer is not the obvious and easy one—the very best men—because we must know what constitutes the "very best."

The Navy needs not only men of the best capabilities but also men of the best attitudes. This means men who want to make the Navy a career.

Our great technical development has placed growing emphasis on mental capacity rather than physical prowess. It has increased the need for men with aptitudes to fight with machines rather than with their fists. It has resulted in greater mental demands upon the enlisted men of the Navy. And it has given the enlisted men a better chance to be commissioned as officers.

The increased ratio of officer strength from 5½ to 8 percent is due partly to the wide use in modern warfare of technical equipment which must be operated by personnel possessing higher skills, and partly to the development of aviation and the consequent demand for flying officers.

In other words, it is "brains" rather than "brawn" which will operate the postwar Navy.

HOW CAN THE NAVY GET THESE MEN?

In the first place, the Navy cannot get the necessary number of men unless the Congress passes this bill. But then the practical question arises.

Enlisted men can be obtained by either, first, voluntary enlistments or, second, the draft. The Navy prefers the recruiting by voluntary enlistment and has no desire to use the draft. At the present time the Navy recruiting program is proceeding most satisfactorily and enlistments are ahead of the schedule which calls for full strength of 500,000 by September 1, 1946.

This encouraging progress is being made because the Navy has adopted measures which make the naval service attractive. Security and opportunity for technical training and advancement have given the Navy definite career aspects.

However, such is not quite the case as to the meeting of requirements for naval officers. The Navy now has 12,000 Regular officers. It will need 28,000 Reserve officers to transfer to the Regular Navy. The present immediate need is 17,000 Reserve officers.

The long-term permanent staffing of the Regular Navy with officers will be through three principal sources: First, the Naval Academy; second, NROTC colleges; and third, promotion from the enlisted ranks.

It is of the utmost importance that the need for additional officers from sources other than the Naval Academy be clearly realized, and that every effort be made to convince those contemplating transfer from the Reserve to the Regular Navy that there will be equality of opportunity regardless of the source from which such persons entered the Regular Navy.

The required officer strength for the postwar Navy can be met only by the transfer of a sufficient number of Reserve and temporary officers to a permanent status in the Regular Navy.

The Navy and the Marine Corps at the present time have a supply of seasoned Reserve and temporary officers who are excellent material for appointment to the Regular Navy and Marine Corps. It is realized that everything possible must be accomplished toward preventing unfairness and partiality in the matter of promotions, positions, and assignments, including proportionate representation on selection boards and attendance at the Naval War College and other such institutions.

What is of interest to you and the public is that this bill assures a square deal for Reserve and temporary officers who go into the Regular service.

The committee has attempted, by everything humanly possible, to eliminate the possibility of discrimination and to make a career in the Regular Navy a proposition which will attract these men.

In deciding whether or not to transfer to the Regular Navy, these men have three things uppermost in their minds:

First. They want to go home to think it over—to discuss it with their wives or parents;

Second. They want a trial period during which time, if they decide that they do not want to stay in the Regular Navy after having transferred to it, they can resign from the Regular Navy; and

Third. They want concrete assurances of equal opportunities for advancement and assignments.

With respect to the first desire, the Navy has provided that the men will be given 6 months after release to inactive duty within which to make their application to transfer to the Regular Navy. This provides ample time to think it over and to talk it over with the folks.

With respect to the second desire, the Navy has provided that any reservist or temporary officer who transfers to the Regular Navy may offer his resignation which will be automatically accepted before January 1, 1947.

This bill attempts to satisfy the third desire for assurances of equal opportunities and treatment with the Regulars. You cannot legislate for promotions—but you can legislate for the basis of promotions. In the hearings on this bill the committee demanded and received assurances from the Navy Department that satisfaction of this third desire of those contemplating transfer to the Regular Navy would be guaranteed.

The key to this very matter, which asserts itself at the meetings of the selection board, is the education and training of the men being considered for selection to higher grades. In order that the Reserve and temporary officers who become Regulars can compete with the old Regulars, the committee has obtained the commitment of the Navy Department to give these men all the training that is necessary to put them on a par with the Regulars. In other words, so that the selection board could not justify its failure to promote the transferees because they had not had the training that the Regulars had.

H. R. 4421 makes the following additional provisions which I have not discussed:

First. Any higher temporary rank held by Reserve or temporary officers transferring to the Regular Navy or Marine Corps would be preserved in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps as long as temporary appointments are continued under existing law;

Second. The fixing of standards and qualifications for appointment to the several grades and ranks by regulations prescribed by the President;

Third. Each person appointed to officer rank, who had accrued leave to his credit, would be granted such leave subsequent to his appointment, without loss of pay or allowances; and

Fourth. The clarification of several existing laws relating to the authorized strength of the Navy, thus removing confusion resulting from the multiplicity of statutes on the same subject matter.

This bill is timely legislation. It will assure a well-planned and orderly transfer program. It is a recognition of the admirable performance of the temporary and Reserve officers during the war as well as the Nation's continued need for the services of these persons.

Mr. Chairman, this bill unanimously reported by the Committee on Naval Affairs after a great many days of hearings was reported to the House by direction of the committee by the distinguished member of our committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC]. I yield the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC] 30 minutes for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, this bill has two primary purposes. First it will authorize the personnel strength of the Regular Navy adequate to man the postwar Navy which we provided for under House Concurrent Resolution 80 which we passed a few weeks ago. Second, it will authorize appointments to commissioned rank in the Regular Navy in order to provide officers necessary to man that postwar fleet. As you know, at the present time we have the temporary officers, the Reserve officers, and the Regular officers. We propose in this bill to do away with the temporary officers and the Reserve officers, and have but one officer group, the line of the Regular Navy. Under existing law the size of the Navy is held to 232,000 men. Under this bill we provide for 500,000 men. The commitments that we have made I think are well known to the members of the committee. We have provided in our composition of the postwar Navy for the placing in reserve of all those ships that we do not need, and we have conscientiously gone through the list and figured out the number of ships which we must keep in use and which will require a postwar navy enlisted personnel of 500,000 men. The officers for the fleet have heretofore been based on 5½ percent of the enlisted strength, but owing to the fact that we need a great number of naval aviators and a great number of highly technical men to man radar fire control and the latest equipment, we have found it necessary to increase the proportionate strength to 8 percent, so we will require a strength of about 58,000 officers and 500,000 men. Incidentally, this is over and above the number required for the Marine Corps which is, as it formerly was, based on 20 percent of the strength of the Navy. That will mean 100,000 men in the Marine Corps. As I say, the 500,000 is the number required to man the postwar fleet at 70 percent of wartime complement in the active fleet, 20 to 30 percent of the wartime complement in the ready fleet, and with just sufficient personnel for the preservation of the ships of the reserve fleet.

We will require about 17,000 Reserve officers and temporary officers to be blended into the Regular Navy. This is the first time any such effort was made to have the officer personnel of the Navy supplied from other sources than the Naval Academy. I think it is worthy of note that the postwar Navy will be manned by almost 50 percent Reserve and temporary officers and 50 percent regulars. As a continuing program, it is our hope and intention that we shall be able to work out an educational program

whereby we shall have about 50 percent of the officer strength of the Navy supplied by the Naval Academy and 50 percent by the naval ROTC, and other sources.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that he intended that this bill provide for the medium through which the Navy will obtain eventually 50 percent of the regular officer personnel from the Academy and 50 percent from other sources?

Mr. IZAC. No; not in this bill.

Mr. COLE of New York. I wanted to make sure that this bill does not cover that.

Mr. IZAC. This bill does not, but I want to point out that we will perhaps in the future never depart from that policy of approximately 50 percent Reserves, or those who were formerly Reserves and temporaries, and 50 percent regulars.

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

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. The bill that is pending does provide, however, that you will take 17,000 Reserve officers and temporary officers now in the service and put them into the Regular Navy?

Mr. IZAC. That is correct.

Mr. SHORT. You make them regular officers of the Navy?

Mr. IZAC. Of the line of the Navy.

Mr. SHORT. Would the gentleman take time to explain to the Members just how these officers are to be chosen and what rank they shall be given? What standard or criterion will be used in order to determine the rank?

Mr. IZAC. I will be very glad to do that, because that is the crux of this whole bill.

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

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Before the gentleman makes his explanation to the gentleman from Missouri, may I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that under the law today no officer in the Naval Reserve can be transferred to the Regular Navy unless he first is a graduate of a Naval ROTC or the Navy V-12 program. Therefore, a large number of Reserve officers in the United States Navy today could not become members of the Regular Navy without legislation.

Mr. IZAC. That is correct.

Mr. SHORT. It is also true, is it not, from the experience of the recent war that some of our best and most efficient officers were Reserve and temporary officers?

Mr. IZAC. I think the Reserves gave a very creditable performance in this war. While I think comparisons are odious, for we hate to say that this officer is as good as that one or is better than this one, I think, generally speaking, the Reserve officers did do an excellent job. While you had to have that leaven of Regulars in command posts and for training purposes, the young officers who came in from civil life did give an excellent accounting of themselves.

Mr. SHORT. But as the able chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs has stated, in order to get the required number of officers to man the 70 to 80 percent of the ships in our postwar period it will be necessary to enact this legislation.

Mr. IZAC. That is correct.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I feel that the gentleman's knowledge of this bill is probably equal to that of anyone on the committee or in the House. I hope that when he gives the explanation the distinguished gentleman from Missouri has asked for he will go into detail with respect to the opportunities which are being afforded to warrant and chief warrant officers in the Regular Navy to retain permanent commissioned rank in the postwar Navy.

Mr. SHORT. That is what we want to know.

Mr. IZAC. I will go into the matter of the temporary officers, the enlisted men who have been graded up and given promotions, the warrant officers, and of course the V-5, the V-12, and the other young men who came in from civil life.

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

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. I was quite interested to hear the gentleman speak concerning the commissioned personnel of the Navy who were either of the enlisted rank or of the chief petty officer rank who have been promoted temporarily during the period of the war. I am quite eager to have the gentleman, if he will, explain just what is going to happen to those individuals.

Mr. IZAC. I shall be glad to go into that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that 90 percent of the men on the ships in the Pacific were the Reserves? I was given those figures by the Navy Department in the past.

Mr. IZAC. The commissioned officers?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; and the men also.

Mr. IZAC. I think it was about 87 percent or 90 percent of the officers.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman know how many of the Reserve officers want to stay in the Navy?

Mr. IZAC. There is no indication. I understand the opinion in the Navy Department is that most of the Reserve officers are waiting for the passage of this legislation before they determine whether they want to stay in the Navy and make it a career.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Referring to the gentleman's statement that in the future it is planned that half of the Regular officers of the Navy will come from the Academy and the other half from other sources, I hope the gentleman will emphasize that that is the present recommendation of the Navy Department and does not reflect the opinion of the committee.

Mr. IZAC. That is correct. It has been proposed by the Navy Department. In fact, there is a board which has been set up in the Navy Department on several occasions. The recommendations of the last board were to that effect, that we would have about half of our commissioned personnel from the Naval Academy and the other half from civil life, that is, from the colleges and ROTC.

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

Mr. IZAC. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I compliment the committee for bringing this bill out at this time, particularly in view of the provisions of the bill which is proposed for passage. I sincerely trust it will pass the House and the other branch of the Congress. My subcommittee is going to have an opportunity to consider appropriations for the Navy Department and we feel very grateful for having a chance to consider such legislation.

Mr. IZAC. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The Naval Affairs Committee has been working on this bill and several complementary bills ever since we came back in September, knowing that the men of the Navy and the officers of the Navy cannot make any decision until they know what they can expect through legislation. That is the reason we have tried so hard to bring this up as early as possible.

Mr. SHORT. Unless the legislation is quickly enacted, many of these very able officers who are now being discharged and leaving the naval service will go into private business or industry and they will be lost to the service of their country.

Mr. IZAC. That is right. But after the passage of this act, we provide for 6 months during which they may come back and retain the same rank that they held when they were placed on inactive duty.

Mr. SHORT. That is, the men who have already been discharged from the naval service?

Mr. IZAC. They will have 6 months.

Mr. SHORT. They will be given equal opportunity and the same consideration?

Mr. IZAC. That is right.

Mr. SHORT. They will be given the same consideration as the other Reserve and temporary officers who have stayed on?

Mr. IZAC. That is right.

Mr. SHORT. I think that is a very fair provision. I want to congratulate the gentleman and the other members of his committee.

Mr. IZAC. I am sure the gentleman will be glad to hear that when those men, whether they are now out or are still in the Navy, are placed in the lineal list of the Navy they go in exactly where they

stand today. Even though they go from the Reserves into the Regular Navy, they retain their same place on the lineal list and they do not suffer in loss of rank. Eventually, all may suffer, but if they do it will be Regulars as well as the Reservists. In other words, we are making one lineal list and one line of promotion in the Navy. Men who are now lieutenants, junior grade, commanders, or whatever they may be, take their place alongside of the Regulars of the same date of commission. The commissions, as everyone knows, have been temporary all during the war.

Mr. SHORT. Has your committee given credit on the basis of age or length of service?

Mr. IZAC. The rank that they attain, regardless of the age. However, when it comes time to make a decision in the case of temporary officers, such as warrants, who had a good many more years of service and were therefore older, they provided for 5 years beyond the normal period for those men to be eligible to be retained in the Regular Navy.

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

Mr. IZAC. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. VINSON. In response to the thought in the mind of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] the law now dealing with the question of age and credit, unless that is changed, will apply to all those who come in. In other words, an officer from the Reserves who transfers to the Regular Navy with the rank of lieutenant commander, if he is of a certain age he will be automatically kept in that rank, but there will also be the law of the age and credit which will apply to every officer who comes in. But the objective here is to try to keep as many in the present grade, when the transfer comes, as possible.

Mr. IZAC. That is correct, with the exception of the fact that the warrant officers do have the advantage of the 5 years.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In case of a Reserve officer who has not yet had recognition and yet has been doing important work, will an increase in rank be in order for him when he comes into the Regular Navy? Some officers have had hard luck. They have been doing very important work but have not received promotions. They have not been passed over, yet they have not received the recognition due them.

Mr. IZAC. Of course, I cannot say what is going to happen in the case of an individual officer, but I do not see how they can go down and pick up an officer who has not received a promotion at the same time his running mates did.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But I mean, through hard luck sometimes an officer does not go up, yet he has not been passed over by any selection board.

Mr. IZAC. Of course, we have had no promotions of that type during the war. Everything has been temporary promotions. While it is true it was by selection, and they do have panels sitting here in Washington to go over the records of the officers, they were supposed to pick up everybody except those who did not have a good record.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman will find there are a good many who have not, but who had good records.

Mr. IZAC. On the other hand, I do not know how we could correct that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know the gentleman wants to correct all injustices, especially to the Reserve men who have gone into the service and given up fine positions in the outside world. It is pretty difficult sometimes to get back to them.

Mr. IZAC. But I still think we must adhere to some such plan as is incorporated in this bill where, if an officer is a lieutenant, he goes in as a lieutenant. He is not placed in a group of commanders. I do not think it would be fair.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I think the gentleman might just as well inform the Committee that, while we provide for transfer, we do not provide for promotions after the man is transferred. But we do give him equal opportunity by postgraduate work and by proportionate representation on the Selection Board as the Regular officer has. But he must meet the competition if he goes in after an opportunity has been given him to qualify.

Mr. IZAC. That is correct.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. What will happen to a warrant officer who has been holding a temporary commissioned rank, and whose age is such that he does not come within the provisions of that 5-year latitude that is accorded him over an officer who held a permanent regular commission? What will happen to such a man?

Mr. IZAC. My colleague will remember that when we raised that point in the Naval Affairs Committee, the committee took action, asking the Navy Department to bring in a bill specifically for the warrant officers because it was felt that we could not diverge more than 5 years from the regular plan of promotion in the Navy, since those officers then would be too old to do the duty that would be assigned to them; so in order to take care of all of those who were beyond the 5-year age limit we must have special legislation.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman agrees with me that these officers certainly are entitled to some consideration to retain the rank in which they served so well during the war.

Mr. IZAC. Absolutely.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. If they were fitted for those ranks during time of war which, after all, is the major test of any military organization, they certainly are competent to hold those ranks in peacetime.

Mr. IZAC. Yes; and therefore I hope that the Navy Department will bring to our committee a bill that will do justice to those men. So far no such bill has been introduced, I understand.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. We all realize, of course, that unless there is sufficient inducement to these Reserve and temporary officers, we simply will not get the officers. Let us take a concrete case. Take a civilian, perhaps a former banker or businessman, who has been given a commission as lieutenant commander during the recent war. In order to get him, if he is competent and capable, to enlist and become a Regular officer, although he may be several years older and has served only 3 or 4 years during the conflict that has just closed, what rank will he have in comparison to, say, a graduate of Annapolis or a Regular naval officer who might be 3 or 4 years his junior but who held the same rank. Which one of those, the Regular officer or the temporary officer, will stand the best chance for promotion in the future?

Mr. IZAC. I would say, of course, the Regular officer, because he has had probably 20 years' experience against the other man's 3 or 4.

Mr. SHORT. That is the point I want brought out.

Mr. IZAC. There is a provision that we will be fair when he comes up for promotion.

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

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. In order to clear up the point raised by the gentleman from Missouri, this is the policy that Congress has laid down, and I want to take time enough to read it:

> That in order to remove any apprehension on the part of Naval Reserve officers regarding their opportunities for advancement in event of their transfer to the Regular Navy, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that in all matters relating to commissioned officers in the Regular Navy there shall be no discrimination whatsoever against officers because of the source from which they entered the Regular Navy, and that no preference shall be given officers by reason of the fact that they entered the Regular Navy from any particular source; and, among other things, that all commissioned officers in the Regular Navy, regardless of the source from which they entered the Regular Navy, shall receive the same treatment with respect to opportunities for (1) promotion or advancement to all grades in the Navy, (2) holding any positions or assignments in the Navy including proportionate representation on selection boards, and (3) attending the Naval War College, postgraduate schools, or other schools, or otherwise receiving advanced or technical training.

In view of that language I believe the answer to the question asked by the gentleman from Missouri is that the officer coming from the Reserves has equal opportunity with the officer from the Naval Academy for advancement, because that is the principle set forth in the policy that we wrote into the law.

Mr. IZAC. However, Mr. Chairman, the premise of the gentleman from Missouri was that he had had only 3 years of experience, let us say. Now it is true that in 3 years no one can expect to get the experience the other man got in 20; but we are going to endeavor to see that

the first officer is given the same opportunity as the second officer to have that postgraduate course which will fit him for the duty of his grade and rank. When that officer then comes up for selection or to pass his examination he will be just as well fitted as the Naval Academy man.

Mr. SHORT. I think that it is a fine statement of general policy which the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs has read, but I was concerned with whether or not any civilian who served 2 or 3 years in the Navy could become a Regular officer and have under him men who have spent 20 years in the Navy and who are graduates of the Naval Academy at the expense of the American taxpayers.

Mr. IZAC. They are not likely to have such a situation because the only Reserve officers in the higher grades are those who have been in the Reserves for a good many years.

Mr. SHORT. I realize that you will have only a few cases. I think we should bring out here that we are facing the same problem in our Committee on Military Affairs, which is the only reason I am intruding into this debate. We might as well recognize it is almost an utter impossibility to write a hard and fixed rule without doing some of these men an injustice.

Mr. VINSON. As a matter of fact, flag ranks have been given to some 33 reservists. Some of them have the rank of admiral and some of them have the rank of commodore. In a great many instances you will have regular graduates of the Naval Academy serving under some of these civilian commodores who justified their promotion during the war.

Mr. SHORT. We have many people in industry serving under young executives because of their outstanding, extraordinary ability.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I would like to make it clear to the House the point I raised is an entirely different question from the one brought to the attention of the House by the gentleman from Missouri. I am speaking about the men who are chief boatswains, chief gunners in the line of the Navy, who had learned through practical experience the fundamental principles of navigation and the other operations of the Navy, whereas the graduates of Annapolis had acquired their knowledge through academic study. These gentlemen during the war were advanced to lieutenants and lieutenant commanders. They commanded destroyers and they are preeminently qualified to hold commissioned rank in the Navy in peacetime if they were qualified to go out as a commander of a destroyer or as the executive officer of a cruiser during the war; but because their age is more than 5 years above that of a graduate of Annapolis of similar rank, those men will have to go back to chief boatswains and chief gunners or whatever their rank might have been. It is not fair to them, and this bill does nothing to help them except to give them a latitude of 5 years. The gentleman agrees with me that the bill does not help them, although the Navy Department did promise us it would bring legislation before us. I want the House to know that those men are not being fairly treated, in my opinion.

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

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. Following the thoughts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, they will either have to revert back to their former rank or retire from the Navy.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. That is not quite fair.

Mr. IZAC. We have a saving clause in this bill to take care of temporary officers. Any officer has a revocable commission up to 7 years. Anytime within 7 years the President of the United States can dismiss him; therefore, there is not any more security for the Naval Academy man than there is for anybody else. But for the enlisted man and the warrant officer we have placed in this bill a saving clause which states in so many words that if they fail of selection in competition with Regulars they will be placed back in the same position they held before in their old warrant grade. I am going to offer an amendment so that this will apply to the chief petty officers as well.

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

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

Mr. DOYLE. I want to congratulate the distinguished author of this bill and the Committee on Naval Affairs for the fine job they have done in bringing this bill to the floor at the present time. I think the House owes them a debt of gratitude.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. As I understand this bill, it increases the Navy personnel by more than 100 percent; is that correct?

Mr. IZAC. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I wonder if we might have, for the purpose of the RECORD, a statement as to the necessity for that increase at this time.

Mr. IZAC. Yes. We have just passed by House Concurrent Resolution 80 a bill called a bill for the composition of the postwar Navy. It provides for a certain number of battleships, aircraft carriers, all combatant types, and that a certain number of them shall be manned at 70 to 80 percent of wartime complement, a certain amount in reserve, and a certain amount in ready reserve. Breaking that down, we have found that the very least we can man this postwar Navy with is 500,000 men and 58,000 officers, and that is the basis on which we worked when we drew up this bill.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I have heard so many conflicting statements as to what will be the probable cost of this expanded Regular Navy. Would the gentleman mind stating what the estimated cost will be?

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

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the distinguished chairman to answer that question.

Mr. VINSON. It was estimated in House Concurrent Resolution 80—and I call the gentleman's attention to the committee report which is the justification for the bill—that to maintain the postwar Navy in accordance with the Concurrent Resolution 80 which this bill implements, it would be $3,500,000,000.

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, if you will just permit me for a moment I will try to explain exactly how we propose to blend the Reserve officers into the regular line of the Navy. There will be a screening board established in each naval district. Any naval reserve officer who feels that he wants to make the Navy a career can apply to the commandant of the district and ask for a hearing. His record is gone over by a board of officers. They question him. There is no mental examination but there is a physical examination. If, in the opinion of the board, the officer is qualified, they send his name to a board in the Bureau of Naval Personnel here in Washington. There these officers' records are again gone into and the Navy Department determines whether or not this particular officer is to be offered a commission. After—and this is what so many of the Reserve officers fear—after they have joined the Regular Navy and the period of temporary promotions is passed, and they are forced to compete for advancement or promotion with old-time regular officers, what assurance have they that they will be chosen? Let us say it is in the rank of commander. There are now 400 commanders; 200 of them Regulars and 200 former Reserves.

In the selection board appointed to select the officers for advancement, there will be 50 percent Regulars and 50 percent Reserves, so that the Reserve cannot be discriminated against; I mean that we try to eliminate all chance of discrimination and make it as fair as we can.

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

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does this provision give the same consideration to the peacetime enlisted man who has risen to a commissioned grade, or does it only give consideration to the peacetime Reserve officer, the man who came in from civilian life?

Mr. IZAC. No; it gives it to every temporary officer and to every Reserve officer. As the gentleman knows, the temporary officer is the man who might have been a first-class petty officer or a chief petty officer and who was advanced to perhaps as high as lieutenant or lieutenant commander. Those men will retain the highest rank they held on active duty and will have their same place in the lineal list. If at some later date they

are unable to compete, if they fail of selection, and they do not have 7 years of commissioned service so that the President can discharge them without anything, I am going to offer an amendment that will protect them so that they can go back to chief petty officer.

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

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Do I correctly understand that by July 1946 the Navy will be comprised entirely of Regulars; that all the Reserves, both enlisted and commissioned, will be out; and the Navy will in fact be the Regular Navy?

Mr. IZAC. No; I do not think it can be by that date, I am sorry to say.

Mr. STEFAN. When the chairman of the gentleman's committee was before us some time ago, I understood from him, when the question was propounded to him as to the discharges and the demobilization of the men, that eventually the Navy hoped to have all its enlisted men and all its commissioned force in the Regular service rather than having some in the Reserves.

Mr. IZAC. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. It is the gentleman's opinion that by July 1946 all will have been demobilized except those who have reenlisted or been recommissioned?

Mr. IZAC. I would say it depends on two things, first, this bill, and second, the fleet reserve bill, which is the incentive bill for the men of the Navy, and which we hope to pass within a couple of weeks.

Mr. STEFAN. Will this help speed up demobilization?

Mr. IZAC. Undoubtedly it will, because instead of these officers now asking, "Have I enough points and can I get home?" they will be saying, "Do I want to stay in the Regular Navy or do I want to get out?"

Mr. STEFAN. I understood from the chairman of the committee, Mr. VINSON, that by July 1946 every enlisted man and every commissioned officer would have to say whether or not he wanted to stay in the Regular Navy, and the rest would be demobilized.

Mr. IZAC. We passed the voluntary enlistment bill a few weeks ago, and the results in enlistments are very favorable, but at this date I would not be willing to venture a guess as to whether or not we would be down to our 500,000 permanent personnel; in fact, I know we could not by July 1946, because we will have to tie up a great many of the ships that are now bringing the men back from overseas, and that takes time.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman confirm the report that the Navy is securing sufficient volunteers to fill their ranks?

Mr. IZAC. I do not believe it is, but I venture to guess that it will as soon as we pass the fleet reserve bill and this bill.

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

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. I was interested in the date of July 1, 1946, which the gentleman from Nebraska used. I thought the Navy had stated that they expected to demobilize all the men who wanted to get out of the Navy by September 1, 1946.

Mr. IZAC. That is what they were aiming for. Whether they will be able to meet that or not depends in large measure on the number of ships we will be unable to tie up because of their being engaged in bringing the men back from across the seas.

Mr. KUNKEL. Where does this date of July 1 come in?

Mr. IZAC. I suppose because we have provided for a 6-month period in this bill during which time any of these reserve officers and temporary officers may apply for a commission in the permanent Navy.

Mr. KUNKEL. This bill really enables the Navy to carry out their demobilization program as announced, aiming at September 1, 1946, at that time having a Navy of 500,000 men and 58,000 officers. Is that substantially correct?

Mr. IZAC. That is exactly correct. That is exactly what we are aiming for.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I want to compliment the gentleman on the bill and on his clear exposition of it. We are going to have a Navy of 500,000 men and 58,000 officers, and it is planned to have about 50 percent of the officers from those having Naval Academy training and 50 percent from the temporary and Reserve officers. We know how we are going to get the officers from the Naval Academy, but how is it contemplated we are going to get the officers to fill the other 50 percent?

Mr. IZAC. All I can say to the gentleman is that the Navy Department board that has been studying this has suggested that we enroll a number of Naval ROTC colleges each with a sizable unit. From the graduates we would get about 50 percent of our officer personnel.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Therefore, we would get men who would have training comparable to that of the Naval Academy and college training?

Mr. IZAC. That is right.

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Can the gentleman tell us approximately how many voluntary enlistments are being made each day since we passed the voluntary recruitment bill here a short time ago; that is, with reference to voluntary enlistments in the Navy?

Mr. IZAC. It was something like 2,000 a week, but I understand they are doing better now. I cannot give the gentleman any exact figures. I feel sure that with the passage of this legislation and the fleet reserve bill we will have all the men who are in the Navy today in a position to determine their own course of action: Do they want to make the Navy a career, or do they not? If they do, we have some excellent benefits in the fleet reserve bill as well as in this bill, and you can see in the case of this bill how we endeavor to abolish all discriminations, if there have been any in the past, and put everybody on the same footing in the Regular Navy.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. What success has the Navy had thus far in interesting junior officers of the Naval Reserve in accepting commissions in the Regular Navy?

Mr. IZAC. The Navy has had very good success, but they are all waiting to see if this bill passes. I talked with the officer in charge a couple of days ago in the Navy Department. He assured me they were having a large number of inquiries—not applications, but inquiries.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does the gentleman feel that the inducement provided in this bill will encourage these younger men to make application for Regular Navy commissions?

Mr. IZAC. I really do. It may not for the older officers with little service, I will say to the gentleman, because you can see that they may be up in the forties or fifties and they will probably say, "Well, we cannot hope to make a career of it at this late date." But I am sure it will encourage the younger men.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I understand that. I understand that this puts the Navy Reserve officers on the same basis as the men who graduate from Annapolis.

Mr. IZAC. Exactly.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. And they have the same opportunity. That will do more in recruiting these young junior officers than anything else.

Mr. IZAC. That is right. It does more than that. It states in this bill as a policy that they must be given a postgraduate course, a war-college course, promotions, and choice of duty on exactly the same basis as the Regular officers.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. And they have not had that in the past. I think that is a splendid program.

Mr. VINSON. I think the gentleman from California might point out to the committee the advantages this bill gives to seamen who enlist in the Navy insofar as their opportunity to become officers is concerned.

Mr. IZAC. It used to be very limited, and now we make provision for that. Let us say a college man joins the Regular Navy. There is nothing to prevent his going right straight up to the commissioned ranks of the Navy whereas before there used to be a limitation as to the number.

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

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Will there be carried after the name of those men who are not graduates of the Naval Academy the letters "USNR" instead of the letters "USN"?

Mr. IZAC. I assure the gentleman it will be "USN" for all of them.

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

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Can the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs inform the House what the status of the Naval ROTC legislation is?

Mr. VINSON. It is contemplated in the very near future that we will lay before the House a complete educational program with reference to the Naval ROTC. We already have selected the 52 universities. Therefore, that matter is behind us. Now, we have to work out some details as to how those units will be brought into the Naval ROTC and how they will then go into the Navy, whether they will go directly or whether they will go through the Naval Academy. Within a short time that will be before the House.

Mr. STEFAN. I have received numerous letters from heads of universities and colleges and schools and they are tremendously interested.

Mr. VINSON. We know they are.

Mr. STEFAN. They are tremendously interested in the proposed Naval ROTC program. I assume other Members of the House have the same inquiries for information.

Mr. IZAC. The Committee on Naval Affairs is working on several of these bills. We are hoping within 2 months to have them all on the floor.

Mr. STEFAN. When can we expect legislation in the House seeking some authority to bring this about? Do you need any additional legislative authority?

Mr. IZAC. Oh, yes.

Mr. STEFAN. When do you suppose you will bring that legislation before the House?

Mr. VINSON. The Board has already made a report to the Navy Department. It has not yet been submitted to the committee. The committee has had a conference with the Board, and we are not very far apart on certain phases of the legislation. I would say at least by the middle of January or the 1st of February the Committee on Naval Affairs will be able to submit a complete educational program to the Congress. Involved in that is the question as to whether or not we shall expand the Naval Academy at Annapolis.

Mr. STEFAN. Did the gentleman refer to 52 colleges?

Mr. VINSON. Fifty-two colleges.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Do I understand a man who is today a seaman will have an opportunity to become an officer in the Regular Navy? I mean the Reserve seaman can become an officer through this bill?

Mr. IZAC. That is right. Of course, there will be no more Reserve seamen. They will be Regular Navy seamen. They will have the right to compete for commissions, regardless of numbers.

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

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. Having given the Reserve officers this opportunity, you have written an emancipation proclamation as far as the Navy is concerned.

Mr. IZAC. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to bring before you today a war story. I wish to tell it for the information of this body and for the RECORD, so that the history of World War II, as it was brought before the Congress, will not be found lacking, and so that the heroes of this story will long be remembered by our legislators and by this Nation.

The men of whom I speak are a group of officers, all of them volunteers, who served in the United States Navy. They ran and crawled up bloody assault beaches with the marines at Guadalcanal, Saipan, Iwo Jima, Okinawa, the Philippines. They were aboard our gallant fighting ships at Pearl Harbor, the Coral Sea, in all major naval engagements, and some of them, but not all, were at Tokyo Bay.

They are not tough—they were not trained to kill. They went into battle unarmed, although they fought a deadly enemy. Their battle stations were clearings in the midst of bitter battlegrounds, crowded compartments of Navy vessels, little offices where they shared the simple joys of the men, counseling them in their trouble, or in the sick bays and medical aid stations, comforting them in their pain.

These officers wore the Christian cross or the Jewish Tablet and Star of David. They serve God, and when war came, they decided they could serve Him best by serving their country as it defended His ideals. They are the men of the United States Navy Chaplain Corps.

When the President declared this Nation to be "in a state of emergency" on September 8, 1939, there were only 91 Navy chaplains in uniform, with 63 others standing by in the Naval Reserve. Faced with the prospect of a Navy which must be more than tripled in size, the Chief of Chaplains and the Bureau of Naval Personnel were confronted with the problem of challenging over 2,000 priests, rabbis, and ministers to give their services to the men who would comprise our wartime Navy. The case was presented to church bodies of every faith, to the clergymen themselves, and to their congregations. By August 1, 1943, over 1,300 clergymen had taken leave of their civilian parishes, had gone to the Navy procurement offices to offer their services to the chaplaincy. They were draft exempt, but they saw the challenge and knew that they were needed to keep the young men of this Nation aware of the comfort and strength of God as they went to war. By August 15, 1945, there were 2,811 Navy chaplains, or one to approximately 1,250 men.

Qualifications for the Navy Chaplain Corps were high. A candidate must have completed 4 years of college or university work, and have completed three additional years of theological work in an accredited institution. He must pass the rigid physical requirements set up for all naval officers, he must be a fully ordained clergyman in the church he represents and must be nominated and endorsed by the official authorities of his denomination. He must not have passed his forty-fifth birthday. During one of the most critical periods of the war, chaplains were appointed up to the age of 50, but it soon became necessary to again reduce the age limit to 45.

Chaplains were trained at the Naval Training Schools—Chaplains—first set up at the Naval Operating Base, Norfolk, Va., and later moved to the College of William and Mary at Williamsburg. For 2 months these student chaplains, who were commissioned lieutenants and lieutenants, junior grade, were under the tutelage of chaplain veterans. They learned naval regulations, procedure, customs, and history. They were instructed in warfare duties, first aid, and counseling. They got toughening-up training, too. They worked out in the gymnasium, ran the obstacle course, and at the climax of the training dived through burning oil in the swimming pool, pushed ahead under water, came up with arms thrashing, finally made it into flame-free water and clambered out. For men who had just left school or pastorate, it was a rugged business. They learned to work closely with clergymen of other faiths. At the close of the course, some of the chaplains went aboard ships; and others to shore stations for periods of "field training."

Young candidates for the ministry were accepted in the Navy's V-12 program. They continued their seminary training in uniform, and upon graduation and ordination, were commissioned in the Chaplain Corps.

Navy chaplains were assigned to duty with the Marines, and the Coast Guard, as well as with the fleet. They went to training stations with the men, then into battle.

War was a wretched setting for the sacred ideals of religion, but through the smoke of battle and the ugliness of war, chaplains kept their mission clear. "I am most humble when I consider the great personal responsibility that is mine," said one Navy chaplain, "a responsibility that is every chaplain's, to preserve in these young people a supreme faith in their religious convictions, to help them find clear-cut and spiritually satisfying answers to disturbing questions which may crowd or jumble their thinking during these troubled times."

But there was more than that. Chaplains did not content themselves with regular Sunday services and office hours during which they were available for counseling. Army and Navy chaplains and chaplains of all faiths worked long hours together, planning their schedules so that every man in their area would have an opportunity to worship God according to his own faith. They exchanged pulpits and traveled from unit to unit bringing divine services to men stationed in isolated places. They traveled many miles over difficult terrain by outrigger canoe, by jeep, rowboat, and on foot to reach their men.

During battle, chaplains worked as assistants to medical parties, performed heroics large and small as they carried

out rescue work, brought men through fire and strafing to the aid stations where doctors could take over. And often the chaplain stayed—"Say a prayer for me, padre," or "what's that one about 'for God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten son'?" The strong, comforting voice of the chaplain would join with the wounded, "that whosoever believeth in Him shall not perish, but have everlasting life."

A bluejacket wrote:

If you have ever seen a chaplain trying to comfort men who have had their eyes burned out, or whose skin is hanging in shreds, you understand that it is not an easy task. When the excitement of battle is over and the morphine wears off, the pain comes again to the wounded. Then the chaplain lives with the men, bathing them, helping to feed them—always ready, because a man may die at any time. I never figured out just when our chaplain slept. Maybe he didn't. But I remember him because he was weeping for the wounded. Several of the fellows remarked that it seemed strange for a man to cry—after all the danger is over. But when we saw our chaplain in the sick bay, caring for the broken bodies of the men he loved, I think a lot of us realized for the first time what it meant to be wholly consecrated to God's work.

Eleven Navy chaplains have been killed in action; three who had been detained by the enemy for nearly 3 years died aboard the Japanese prison ship which was torpedoed in Subic Bay last December. Stories of their courage and service to their comrades during their imprisonment have been brought back by men who were fellow prisoners. Two chaplains, declining to carry out Japanese orders to go with other chaplains to the hospital on Corregidor, chose instead to go to a concentration center where 15,000 Americans were being held. They found the men without benefit of shelter or sanitary facilities. They lived with them, and at the risk of their lives held religious services, worked on details searching for food, ministered to the sick, and in countless ways bolstered the morale of these men who were discouraged in defeat. One of the chaplains was severely beaten several times for interfering when Japanese guards were beating Americans.

Ninety-two chaplains have been decorated for heroism and outstanding service. Citations read like this:

When an armor-piercing bomb exploded in the vicinity of the after magazine, crushing or exploding 70 rounds of ammunition, killing 6 men and wounding 6 others, and starting fires in adjacent compartments, Chaplain ———, with complete disregard for his own safety, entered the smoke- and steam-filled engine room, assisted in removing the wounded, and administered last rites to the dying. His courageous action beyond the call of duty and in the face of grave danger is in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States naval service.

Or—

During the period that he—

The chaplain—

was on these beaches, they were constantly bombed, strafed and shelled. On July 11, 1943, while digging a grave for the burial of a man who had been killed in action, Chaplain ——— was wounded. Despite his wound and with utmost fortitude, he continued to complete the grave and conducted the services for the deceased man. Upon returning to his ship he declined medical aid until those more seriously wounded were cared for.

And—

He—

The chaplain—

also, while under heavy enemy fire, walked about among the troops, encouraging and reassuring them. On the following day, while conducting burial services for the dead, he was selected as a target by a Japanese sniper, who fired five shots at him during the services. His heroic disregard for personal danger and his firm faith in God, which inspired the officers and men of the battalion, were in keeping with the highest traditions of the naval service.

With marines or naval construction battalions at advanced bases, chaplains had a hard time finding places of worship for their men. One chaplain built his own chapel, hewing logs for benches, dragging stones to build paths to the little sanctuary he set up in the jungle. Many altar appointments were fashioned by the men from shell cases, altars were ammunition boxes, religious paintings were made with ordinary house paint on coarse tent canvas.

In some places there were natives, eager to show their gratitude for the Christianity which had returned to their midst in the form of the Navy chaplains. These dark-skinned Christians could now worship their God for the first time since the Japanese had occupied their homes, and they turned out to construct chapels of nipa grass, palm fronds, and native lumber, which they spent long hours carving with religious designs.

When the Navy went into the Mediterranean, the countries of the Middle East were starving and impoverished. Navy chaplains organized help for them, gave parties for their children at Christmastime, and played Santa with gifts of clothes and good things to eat. Chaplains made friends for the Navy and for the United States wherever they went in the world.

Morale problems were always a particular concern of the chaplains. When men found time heavy on their hands, as they waited for their turn to go to battle, chaplains helped welfare officers to organize sports events, entertainment of all kinds. Bible classes were also held by chaplains, and they played an important part in life aboard many ships and in many units. Young men whose training for the ministry had been interrupted by war continued their studies with their chaplains. On small vessels, where there was no chaplain, a member of the crew or an officer was given materials to aid him in leading divine services on his ship. Chaplains gave generously of their time and effort to these ships when they were in port or near larger ships, helping the men organize a religious program with lay leaders.

The horror and awfulness of war were particularly difficult for the chaplains, who had dedicated themselves to the doctrines of love and the brotherhood of man. One young chaplain, just out of the training school at Williamsburg, wrote from Iwo Jima of his dangerous, heart-breaking task, that of assisting burial crews in the sorting and keeping of the personal effects of the marines who died there. He knows the last resting place of every man at whose rites he officiated.

Most jobs you can get used to—.

He wrote—

but this one is different. Every man you bury is a fresh tragedy.

Since the signing of the surrender papers in Tokyo Bay, chaplains have found that in many ways their responsibilities have increased. Men anxious to get home present a perplexing morale problem, and chaplains have an active role in the Navy's civil readjustment program.

Chaplains, remembering the faces of their fighting-men congregations, recall the grips of their hands as they filed out of makeshift chapels. They will never forget their friends whom they prayed for and buried in some far-off corner of the world. One chaplain expressed the thoughts and prayers of all his comrades when he said at the dedication of the Fifth Marine Division cemetery on Iwo Jima:

We dedicate ourselves, first, to live together in peace the way our comrades fought and are buried in this war. Here lie men who loved America * * * with equal passion because they themselves or their own fathers escaped from oppression to her blessed shores. Here lie officers and men, Negroes and white, rich men and poor—together. Here are Catholics, Protestants, and Jews—together. Here no man prefers another because of his faith or despises him because of his color. Here there are no quotas of how many from each group are admitted or allowed. Among these men there is no discrimination, no prejudice, no hatred. Theirs is the highest and purest democracy."

We promise—

He continued—

by all that is sacred and holy, that your sons, the sons of millers and miners, the sons of farmers and workers, will inherit from your death the right to a living that is decent and secure * * * we shall remember how you looked when we place you reverently, lovingly, in the ground.

Navy chaplains have spoken this promise to men in a thousand ways, in a thousand places. They have talked long and reassuringly to men who found it difficult to reconcile the holy teachings of their homes to the unholy ways of war. We owe the chaplains a deep debt for the spiritual strength they have supplied to our men when physical endurance was exhausted. We are beholden to them for the many times they have brought into battle the only softness, the only reminders of Divinity and love which could be found in the rigid discipline, the rough ways of military life.

The powers of darkness which these chaplains sought out as their enemy were gallantly attacked by example; were beaten away with dogged perseverance and consecrated determination.

The Navy Chaplain Corps is spendidly organized, and has functioned brilliantly in helping to bring victory to this Nation. Many of the men who compose the corps are returning to civilian church life and are bringing home with them a faith immeasurably deepened by the experiences they have shared with other

veterans, a hope kindled and inspired by the men they saw die for our future. These clergymen veterans will continue to enrich the religious life, and therefore the social life, of our Nation. I propose that we salute them with the Navy's traditional "Well done!"

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House today is for the purpose of providing a satisfactory basis for meeting the postwar personnel requirements of the Navy Department. Only a short time ago, the Committee on Naval Affairs brought a bill into the House providing for the composition of the size of the fleet in the postwar Navy. That bill passed the House by unanimous vote and is now on the statute books.

The bill before us today is implementing the bill of a few weeks ago by providing the personnel that is to operate the so-called postwar fleet.

As the original composition bill provided, approximately 300 ships will be in the active fleet in the postwar days. We will also have a ready fleet of about 104 combat ships. We will have, also, in reserve approximately 681 ships. That 681 ships, which will be laid up in reserve, comprises about 60 percent of the total of 1,082 ships. We can all look back over a period of only a few years when the strength of the Navy was about 325 ships. That was only 5 years ago. The personnel total at that time was only about 160,000 officers and men. This bill provides for a postwar personnel force of 500,000 enlisted men and 50,000 officers. Forty thousand of the officers will be in the Regular Navy and 10,000 in the Marine Corps. The Marine Corps, under the act of 1941, comprises about 20 percent of the total strength of the Navy.

This bill therefore provides for about 100,000 men in the Marine Corps.

The question has been asked from the floor of the House what the cost of the postwar Navy would be. In the bill we reported some 3 or 4 weeks ago, when we considered the composition of the postwar Navy, we gave the estimate of cost of the operation of the postwar fleet, and that includes personnel and all other cost, as approximately $3,525,000,000 annually, of which the active fleet would be $3,275,000,000. The ready fleet would cost approximately $170,000,000, and the Reserve, comprising 60 percent of the total number of ships that would be laid up in reserve, would be about $80,000,000, making the grand total $3,525,000,000. We can appreciate what a staggering amount this is, but we can also appreciate as the result of the sad experience we have had in the past how vital it is to our own security to have our first line of defense on the highest possible level of efficiency.

The question of the education of our officers is a matter which will be considered by the Naval Affairs Committee as time goes on. The Navy Department has already made a very thorough study of the educational program that will be necessary for the education and training of these officers who later shall be available in the service of the fleet. Those of us who have followed the affairs of our Navy down through the last decade can well appreciate the urgency of early action, and I know the Members of the House can appreciate it likewise. Early action on this bill is necessary so that those in authority in the Navy Department may lay their plans in the development of the postwar Navy and also plans to lay up the vessels of the so-called reserve fleets which are fast coming back from all the waters of the world.

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

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CLASON. I have understood that if the universal military training program went through it would be possible to reduce the size of the peacetime Army. What would the gentleman say with reference to the effect of the passage of the universal military training bill upon the peacetime Navy program as outlined in this bill?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman asks the very same question I asked the Chief of Naval Personnel when he came before the Committee on Naval Affairs a couple of weeks ago, as to whether or not we could get by way of volunteers a sufficient number of men to compose the personnel of the so-called postwar Navy. His answer at that time was that he thought we could in his opinion get sufficient personnel through the volunteer system for the Regular Navy.

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

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. As a matter of fact, the Navy is now up with its monthly quota on voluntary enlistments.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. In fact, we are running ahead.

Mr. VINSON. I understand they feel it is not necessary to have a universal military training program in order to enable the peacetime Navy to carry on in accordance with its program.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Insofar as the active service now is concerned, according to word I get from Admiral Denfeld, the volunteer system will provide sufficient personnel to operate the active Navy. But we also have in mind the question of whether or not the volunteers in the Reserves will be sufficient to operate the Reserve Navy. Only time alone will tell.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope the membership may give favorable consideration to this bill. The Naval Affairs Committee has given a great deal of time and attention and study to its many aspects, and we strongly recommend its passage by the House today.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY].

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Naval Affairs, of which I have the honor to be a member, has recently had before it H. R. 4421, a bill to increase the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, to increase the permanent authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, and to authorize permanent appointments in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and for other purposes.

The purpose of this bill is to provide a statutory basis for meeting the postwar personnel requirements of the naval service. To accomplish this purpose, provision is made, first, for an increase in the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy to 500,000, and of the Regular Marine Corps to 100,000; second for an increase in the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of Navy and of the Marine Corps, from 5½ to 8 percent of the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy, with a resultant increase in the authorized number of commissioned officers of the several staff corps of the Navy; third, for the appointment to warrant and commissioned grades and ranks in the Regular Navy, of male officers of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps without permanent appointments therein, commissioned warrant and warrant officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps with temporary appointments in higher grades and ranks, and any person who served in such capacity during World War II who shall have been subsequently discharged from such officer status under honorable conditions. The bill would also require that officers of the naval and Marine Corps Reserve receiving permanent appointments to the Regular Navy and Marine Corps under its provisions be given temporary appointments therein in such higher rank and with the same precedence as that held by them under temporary appointments in the Reserve.

At present, the authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Navy is fixed by the act of April 22, 1941, at 5½ percent of the authorized enlisted strength of the active Navy. The proposed bill would increase that number to 8 percent. The bill would provide for fixing standards and qualifications for appointment to the several grades and ranks for determination of the lineal positions of appointees, by regulations prescribed by the President, and for assignment of running mates to officers appointed to the staff corps. The bill also provides that each person appointed to officer rank pursuant to the authority of its terms, who had accrued leave to his credit, would be granted such leave subsequent to his appointment, without loss of pay or allowances.

The bill further provides:

> That in order to remove any apprehension on the part of Naval Reserve officers regarding their opportunities for advancement in event of their transfer to the Regular Navy, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that in all matters relating to commissioned officers in the Regular Navy there shall be no discrimination whatsoever against officers because of the source from which they entered the Regular Navy, and that no preference shall be given officers by reason of the fact that they entered the Regular Navy from any particular source; and among other things that all commissioned officers in the Regular Navy, regardless of the source from which they entered the Regular Navy, shall receive the same treatment with respect to opportunities for (1) promotion or advancement to

all grades in the Navy, (2) holding any positions or assignments in the Navy including proportionate representation on selective boards, and (3) attending the Naval War College, post-graduate schools, or other schools, or otherwise receiving advanced or technical training.

In my speech of October 29, at the time House Concurrent Resolution No. 80 was under consideration, I stated:

Every American citizen is proud of the magnificent showing made by our Navy in World War II. Our Navy demonstrated beyond the shadow of a doubt that it was the No. 1 Navy of the world, superior by far to the Navy of any other Nation. Since Pearl Harbor, in December of 1941, the Navy of the United States was increased in leaps and bounds until it became the largest, the most powerful and effective Navy that the world has ever known. It is interesting to note that on September 8, 1939, at the time of the declaration of the limited emergency by the President, the personnel strength of the Navy and Navy Reserve, active and inactive, was 23,596 officers and 152,181 men. By October 14, 1945, the Navy had expanded to 3,004,811 enlisted men and 323,755 officers. This great Navy, naturally, was the result of the tremendous efforts then being put forth by the Congress and the Navy Department to see that the United States was adequately prepared for naval warfare.

While it is definitely certain that the postwar Navy must be the largest peacetime Navy that our country has ever seen, yet it is equally definite that even the most ardent advocates of a large Navy would not contend that our postwar Navy should be equal in size and strength to our war Navy. Of course, that would be entirely prohibitive because of the tremendous cost incident thereto and for the further fact that it would be unnecessary to maintain such a vast Navy.

Various naval officers and naval experts testified that the postwar national security of our country would be attained by a Navy of 500,000 men and a Regular Marine Corps consisting of 100,000 men with 40,000 officers of the line of the Navy and 8,000 officers of the Marine Corps. A naval personnel of this size could maintain our post-war Navy consisting of, first, an active fleet of 297 major combatant ships and 1,375 ships of other types; second, a ready fleet of 104 major combatant ships and 2,209 ships of other types; and, third, a reserve fleet of 681 major combatant ships and 1,418 ships of other types; making a grand total in the active fleet, the ready fleet, and the reserve fleet of more than 6,000 ships.

The responsibilities resting upon the United States, as the result of World War II, is very apparent. No longer can the United States delude itself with the fact that the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans are natural boundaries of protection. It will be necessary for our country to maintain and protect many strategic islands and bases scattered throughout the world. We will do this, naturally, for our own protection; we will also do it in order to maintain our leadership and hold our proper place in the United Nations Organization. The United States Navy is fully cognizant of this fact and has proposed 27 postwar bases in the Pacific and 13 in the Atlantic—part of which will be for regular operation, part of them under a reduced status, and the balance designated as caretaker emergency.

H. R. 4421 comes before the Congress at the logical time, having followed the passage of House Concurrent Resolution No. 80. This bill is all the more important in view of the position that the United States finds itself in as the original father of constitutional government and the world's most intelligent leader in those efforts which will make world peace a possibility instead of a theory.

I am, therefore, heartily in favor of H. R. 4421 and sincerely hope that it will receive the unanimous vote of the House.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from California has outlined the salient features of H. R. 4421 in his customary clear-cut manner. He has covered the details. It is my desire to speak to you on the broad objectives and aspects of this bill.

H. R. 4421 is tailored to the proposed postwar Navy—to a Navy with enough personnel to man the ships, planes, and facilities called for by House Concurrent Resolution 80, which this House unanimously passed a few weeks ago.

The approach is twofold: First, an increase in the authorized personnel strength; and, second, the staffing of the Navy and Marine Corps with officers of the desired quality and in the desired quantity. Because of what I feel to be the more difficult of attainment, I will address my remarks for the greater part to the objective of getting the best officers in the required numbers for the Navy.

It is my view that we should be interested in getting the best men to be officers in the best Navy that we can have for the United States. This is an obligation of the Congress. It is an obligation which the Naval Affairs Committee believes that it has at least initially discharged in unanimously reporting out H. R. 4421. I say initially because the committee will have a continuing obligation to see that the Navy Department complies with the spirit, as well as the letter, of H. R. 4421, in actual practice, rather than lip service, if it is enacted.

The Navy needs 58,000 officers for its postwar establishment. It now has 12,000 Regular officers. It is obvious that the Naval Academy cannot provide the necessary number for this is an immediate need. The preponderant number of the 46,000 officers that must be added to the present 12,000 Regulars must come from the temporary and Reserve officers and the enlisted ranks. The principal procurement must come through the transfer of Reserve officers into the Regular Navy.

Until recently, less than 1 percent of the 265,000 Reserve officers expressed any interest in transferring to the Regular Navy. This is a serious condition whether it stems from alleged discrimination or not. When we realize that less than 1 percent of the Reserves who have been the backbone of the Navy during the war, to the extent that the wartime officer complement was 92 percent "civilians in uniform," and have had a taste of Navy life—that less than 1 percent of them wanted to go into the Navy, indicates that there is something seriously wrong with the system.

I do not blame this reluctance on the part of the Reserves solely on fear of discrimination. It is broader than past records of promotions and decorations. It is uncertainty in the selection of the Navy as a profession. And uncertainty is a far more foreboding and compelling mental factor to one subject to military orders. The answer is that so far the Navy has not been sufficiently attractive, whether it be pay, prestige, or security, to compete with civilian professions and occupations.

The principal attack of the Navy on this problem began with the appointment of a board headed by Rear Adm. L. T. DuBose composed of 7 or 8 Regular officers and 14 or 15 Reserve officers. This board made a study and inquiry of the problem over an extended period of time. It concluded this study and inquiry with a report recommending regulations for the transfer of Reserve officers into the Regular Navy.

H. R. 4421 is a result of that study. However, it is more liberal to the reservists than was the report of the DuBose board. In general, the Reserve officers are very much in favor of this legislation. They feel that the bill is a recognition of the past mistakes and evidence that the Regular Navy officers are making a sincere effort to avoid the discrimination that existed against Reserve officers who transferred to the Regular Navy after the First World War. Partial evidence of this is reflected in the encouraging increase in the number of Reserve officers indicating their desire to transfer to the Regular Navy since the introduction of this bill.

The greatest asset and advantage of the Regular officer is his specialized naval training. His knowledge in naval tactics and strategy are, and should be, eminently superior to that of the Reserve officer. This is fully respected by the Reserve officers but they also recognize their disadvantage in that respect when it comes to promotion and recognition—the necessary attributes of a career whether it be naval or civilian.

Both Regulars and Reserves possess the most important military requirement of leadership. It is no criticism of the Regulars to say that reservists as civilians have a better grasp of civilian psychology and enjoy superior ability in handling civilians. The importance of this is that the professional Regulars lead a civilian army and navy in time of war with very little training for such leadership.

Because officers must be leaders—because officers should possess both leadership and skill in naval tactics and strategy, in its hearings the committee demanded and received assurances from the Navy Department that Reserve transferees would receive all of the specialized training that is necessary to put them on an equal basis with the Regulars when going before the selection board. This was putting teeth into the provisions of the bill assuring against discrimination of the Reserves. It is hoped and expected that the training program of the future will permit a firm grasp of civilian psychology.

H. R. 4421 is not omnipotent. It is not a touchstone for the procurement of the desired Reserve officers in the needed numbers for the postwar Navy. It will not sell the Navy as a career as much as the deeds, the actions, and the attitudes of those in charge of the Navy will. It is human to judge a tree by the fruit it bears.

But H. R. 4421, if enacted into law, can be the seedling for that tree. As far as action by Congress is concerned, H. R. 4421 can be a most practical encouragement to the reservists to transfer to the Navy in Regular status. It has already stimulated transfers even before it reached the floor of the House.

It is of the utmost importance that the need for additional officers from sources other than the United States Naval Academy be clearly realized, and that every effort be made to convince those contemplating transfer from the Reserve to the Regular Navy that there will be equality of opportunity regardless of the source from which such persons entered the Regular Navy.

H. R. 4421 is a clear manifestation of that realization. Within the bounds of human limitations it goes as far as can be expected of legislation to assure career opportunities on an equal basis for all in the Navy. I urge its passage by the House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman apparently feels that this bill was almost a necessity because the men did not want to go on with the Navy as a career and also because it was an intelligent thing to do because the Navy in peacetime is dependent upon its popularity.

Mr. COLE of New York. This bill was necessary for many reasons, principally that the law does not now permit a Reserve to become a Regular, and the need of the Navy was such that it was imperative that it have additional personnel above the existing supply of Regular officers, so we had to make available additional Regular officers from some source. It seemed the best source was from the Reserves already in the service.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Those who have already given their time and service.

Mr. COLE of New York. Yes; and have proved themselves qualified to be Regular officers. This bill was intended to make it as appealing to the reservists to transfer to a Regular status as possible.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know the gentleman's great interest in building up the Navy in peace as well as in war.

Mr. COLE of New York. I am especially interested in seeing that these men who have done such fine work in wartime will be given favorable consideration for service with the Navy in peacetime.

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

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLASON. As I read this bill, a man who has been commissioned in the Marines during the war, but not in the regular Marines, in the rank of colonel and lieutenant colonel, and those who have had commissions as captains and commanders in the Navy, will be entitled to secure permanent commissions in the Marine Corps and in the Regular Navy by virtue of this bill if it becomes law.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is correct.

Mr. CLASON. To the extent that that is possible it will be in direct conflict with a bill reported out of the Committee on Military Affairs today under which apparently the highest commission a man can get will be a major, so that it would appear that a person who was serving in the air branch of the Navy or in the Marine Corps and gets one of these higher commissions will outrank a man who has been serving in the Army of the United States and later gets a lower commission in the Regular Army.

Mr. COLE of New York. Of course, I am not familiar with the bill to which the gentleman refers. But as I understand this bill it provides for the transfer from the Reserve to a regular status in the same rank, even though it might be temporary, that was held by the reserve at the time he made the transfer. That does not mean, however, that after he becomes a regular that he will retain that higher rank. He will be put on the same basis as a regular who is now in the service with a higher temporary rank. It may be necessary for them all to be reduced in rank, but he will be treated the same as a regular.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, there is no request for any additional time on this side.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to discuss the unauthorized wearing of honorable-discharge buttons provided for veterans from all branches of the armed services. This button that you see on my lapel is what is known as an honorable-discharge lapel button. Every man who has served in the armed forces of the United States and who is honorably discharged is entitled to wear it. I am not so entitled, and I wear it today merely to bring out the point I am trying to make. This is the first time and the last time I shall ever have one in my lapel.

I find, however, that these buttons are extremely easy to obtain. Through the help of some of my friends who have served in the various branches of the armed forces, I find that I can obtain service buttons without any trouble whatever. I have never been noted for sleight-of-hand or legerdemain, but I want you to notice that I can reach into my pockets and bring out honorable-discharge buttons from almost any source. Here, for instance, are five more to which I am not entitled.

Some time ago, Mr. Chairman, I wrote to the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War, at the suggestion of some friends of mine, and suggested that one service button for men who have served in both World War I and World War II would be a good idea. I asked the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to give me their opinions. They wrote back expressing the opinion that because of the different type of discharge buttons that had been authorized after the last war the idea would not be a good one, so I abandoned it.

However, I developed some very interesting observations on the wearing of the honorable discharge service button provided for veterans of this war. I received several telephone calls from folks downtown who said, "Do you know that it is very easy to come down here to some of these haberdashery stores and walk in and obtain an honorable discharge service button? They are even shown on window display dummies."

I assume many Members of the House have noted in the various news periodicals of Washington advertisements stating that all you have to do is show your honorable discharge papers to receive another service button. I have no objection to any man in the service having as many of these buttons as he feels he is entitled to—one for every suit, one for the Monday suit and one for the Sunday suit—but any man who wears this button and who is not authorized to wear it certainly ought to be subjected to heavy penalties.

The strange part of it, Mr. Chairman, is that there are not any heavy penalties for the unauthorized wearing of this particular button. I wrote again to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy in order to ascertain what penalties were imposed for the unauthorized wearing of discharge buttons. I received replies from both Secretary Patterson and Secretary Forrestal, which I wish to quote. Secretary Patterson wrote me as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., November 12, 1945.

Hon. JACK Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: I have read with interest your letter of October 24, concerning the issuance and wearing of the lapel button indicating honorable service in the Army, and penalties for the unauthorized wearing of this button, service ribbons, and other awards.

The statute which prohibits the unauthorized wearing, manufacture, or sale of medals and badges is the act of February 24, 1923 (42 Stat. 1286), as amended by the act of April 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 347). The penalty provided for a violation of this act is a fine of not to exceed $250 or imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, or both such fine and imprisonment. The Department of Justice is charged with the enforcement of this law.

War Department regulations provide for the issue of honorable service lapel buttons to authorized personnel by designated officers at each Army installation. Our regulations also permit the sale of buttons to ex-military personnel by various commercial concerns engaging in the sale of insignia under a procedure established by the War Department.

Under this procedure lapel buttons, as well as service ribbons, etc., are manufactured and sold commercially by holders of certificates of authority issued by the War Department pursuant to the act first mentioned above. In order to preclude the possibility of these items falling into the hands of unauthorized persons, agreements entered into

prior to the issuance of a certificate of authority to sell insignia require the dealer to demand and receive proof of the eligibility of the purchaser to wear the insignia before the sale is made, and to keep a record of each sale made to include the date of sale, name, grade, and Army serial number of the purchaser, and name of the article sold.

I should like to point out that there is now pending before the Congress, H. R. 3842, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the unauthorized wearing, manufacture, or sale of medals and badges awarded by the War Department," as amended. This bill specifically provides protection for the veterans' discharge button. The War Department now has under consideration H. R. 3842, and when its study is complete the Department will submit a report on this bill to the House Military Affairs Committee. I am confident that the chairman of this committee will make the report available to you when it is received.

Your interest in this matter and your consideration in bringing it to my attention are sincerely appreciated.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

Here, let me call attention to that portion of Secretary Patterson's letter which deals with the sale of discharge buttons by commercial firms.

If these regulations were complied with, the unauthorized obtaining and wearing of a button of this kind would be much more difficult. Several of my friends who obtained these buttons for me were able to go downtown into the local haberdashery stores and simply present their discharge papers and receive the button. That is how I obtained the buttons I have here. I maintain that if it is that easy to obtain them, it will not be very long before somebody finds that out and it becomes a racket throughout the country. When any of us meet a man on the street wearing these particular emblems, we want to know that he is an honorably discharged serviceman and entitled by the laws and rules and regulations of the War and Navy Departments and other branches of the armed services to wear them. We do not want to find them on fakers and slackers.

Let me call your attention now to the communication from Secretary of the Navy Forrestal. It is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, November 5, 1945.

Hon. JACK ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ANDERSON: I am pleased to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 24 October relative to the issuance of honorable-discharge buttons to discharged members of the armed services.

Early in 1944 it became evident that some token of service should be given to those persons who had served in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard during the present war and who had been separated from those services under honorable conditions—something they could wear on their civilian clothing and which would readily identify them as having served in the armed forces. The matter was investigated and it was found that the War Department was giving persons who had performed military service a lapel button similar in design to the United States Army discharge button.

Inasmuch as the button was already in production for the Army, it was decided that the Navy Department should adopt it rather than originate a distinctive and different design of its own. Arrangements were, therefore, made to obtain a supply of these buttons from the War Department, and a recommendation was made to the Secretary of the Navy that he approve the issue of this button to all persons who had served honorably in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard during the war. The Secretary approved this recommendation on 2 September 1943 and instructions, as contained in the enclosure, were published to the service.

Due to the scarcity of metals at that time, the button was manufactured of a plastic material and gold plated, which was not entirely satisfactory from the standpoint of durability and appearance but which could not be helped then. It is understood that the button is now being manufactured with a metal base. The War Department's policy was to present an official button to each person upon separation from the Army and to authorize civilian insignia manufacturers to make the button in a more expensive form to be sold by civilian agencies to former military personnel who could prove that they were entitled to the button and wished to purchase it.

The Navy, on the other hand, decided to issue one button to each person as provided in the attached copy of instructions from the Bureau of Naval Personnel Manual, and not to authorize its sale or gift by civilian agencies. As more veterans left the service and the restrictions on precious metals were eased, the Navy Department received a constantly increasing amount of mail from civilian insignia manufacturers requesting permission to manufacture the button in various forms and from retail stores requesting permission to give or sell the button. Taking the above into consideration, together with the fact that the button originally presented was made of very inexpensive materials, and that there is no law which permits the Navy Department to control the manufacture and sale of these buttons, it was finally decided to permit retail stores to give or sell the button to personnel who were entitled to receive one if they had been officially authorized by the War Department to manufacture, give, or sell the button to Army personnel. Each company has been requested to give or sell the button only to persons who prove that they have already received an official button from the Government.

In addition to the honorable service lapel button covered in previous paragraphs, the Navy Department also issues two honorable discharge buttons—one for Regular Navy personnel and one for Naval Reserve personnel who are discharged upon completion of a normally contracted term of enlistment. These latter buttons are issued only by the Department, one button being given to each individual at the same time he is given his discharge certificate.

To the best of my knowledge there is no law which prohibits unauthorized persons from wearing the honorable service lapel button or any other distinctive device presented by the services to persons for wear on civilian clothing. Section 125 of the National Defense Act makes it unlawful for any person not an officer or enlisted man of the United States armed forces to wear the duly prescribed uniform of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or any distinctive part of such uniform or a uniform any part of which is similar to such uniforms, except that the National Guard and certain other specified organizations may do so under certain regulations. Inasmuch as the honorable service lapel button and the honorable discharge buttons are not items of uniform insignia, within the meaning of the act, their wear is not covered by this act and consequently it is entirely possible that a person could obtain an honorable service lapel button through misrepresentation and wear it if they wished to do so.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

Mr. Chairman, you will note from the last sentence in Secretary Forrestal's letter that it is entirely possible for any person to obtain and wear an honorable discharge button if he so desired. I maintain that this is wrong and that it is the duty and the responsibility of Congress to provide for heavy penalties to safeguard our veterans who should wear their discharge emblems proudly.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. I am glad to hear the gentleman read both of those communications from the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the penal statutes of the United States that apply only to the wearing, manufacturing, and issuance of discharge buttons, which statutes cover only World War I service. Some months ago, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] and I introduced a bill making it unlawful to wear, manufacture, or issue discharge buttons with reference to World War No. II without authority and provided for a penalty in the sum of not more than $500 or imprisonment for 6 months, or both. But at the present time there are no laws on the statute books to prevent the issuance or wearing of the discharge button of World War II.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The gentleman is entirely correct. I join him in hoping that some such legislation will pass. However, I should like to point out that I have introduced a similar piece of legislation, and have made the penalty a good deal stiffer. I want to be sure, as I said before, that when I meet a man on the street wearing that discharge button that he is an honorably discharged member of some branch of the armed services of the United States. I have today introduced a bill which will make the penalty a fine of $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both. I sincerely trust that either the measure which the gentleman's colleague from New York and he have introduced, or my measure, will receive favorable consideration within the very near future.

Mr. KEARNEY. It does not make any difference so far as the authorship of the bill is concerned so long as there are laws on the statute books that cover the situation.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is exactly what we want, I am sure.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that it will be necessary to consume the entire time, but I did want an opportunity to make a few remarks on this subject of the situation of the Reserves in the services. In doing so I do not detract for one moment from the credit due the Regulars for the job they have done in this war. The condition I want to discuss is, I think equally true of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps.

The declaration that is contained in this bill that is before us, while a very pious hope, is, to me, no assurance whatsoever that the mistakes of the past, the handicaps which a man who does not happen to be a graduate of Annapolis or West Point carries with him through his service in the Military or Naval Establishments, will be corrected. We say in this bill "that in order to remove any apprehension on the part of Naval Reserve officers regarding their opportunities for advancement, in the event of their transfer to the Regular Navy, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that in all matters relating to commissioned officers in the Regular Navy there shall be no discrimination whatsoever," and so on, against such officers because of the fact that they may not have come from Annapolis.

Mr. Chairman, you can write the most perfect law in the world, but so long as you have the officer personnel of the Navy flowing out into the Regular service, part of them from Annapolis, and part of them not from Annapolis, it is inevitable that you will have the bias, the distinction, and the cleavage that we find in our services today.

To me, one of the most disturbing elements of this whole cleavage is the fact that so many of the officers of the Regular Navy have come before our committee and have denied that such a situation exists. So long as those people are not able to see and will not admit that that feeling has grown up in the service, there is no immediate hope that we will cure it. Certainly, you are not going to cure it by the mere enactment into law of a pious hope such as is contained in the preamble of the bill that is before us.

We have had before our committee for many weeks, in fact for many months, a bill proposing to grant authority to the Navy Department to take over a small site of 32 acres that now accommodates little St. John's College, an institution of learning that is older than the Naval Academy itself, but which had the misfortune of having its grounds adjoin the Naval Academy at Annapolis. Mr. Chairman, that matter has been before our committee for months and months, but up to this date a final vote has never been taken on the question of the acquisition of the site of St. John's campus. We have, by our failure to take action, regardless of the merits or demerits of the controversy, cast a cloud over that little institution of learning that must work irreparable harm and injury to the future of that little college. What is to be the situation of any prospective student who weighs in his mind the advisability of going to St. John's, not knowing whether next week or next month or next year the all-powerful Navy of Uncle Sam is going to take over that 32-acre site and put that institution out of business? All of that is tied up with the question that must be answered sooner or later, that is, Where are we going to train the 58,000 officers who will be required for Uncle Sam's postwar Navy, and for which provision is made in the pending bill? It is a question of how large Annapolis shall be and what shall be its part in the production of officers for Uncle Sam's Navy.

It was my understanding, and I hope I am correct, from the hearings we had on the pending bill, that this bill will not be used by the Navy Department as a means for procurement of officers in the postwar Navy, but rather that the question of where these officers shall be trained, and how, is to be the subject of future legislation. For the sake of the record may I ask my able chairman if that is correct?

Mr. VINSON. I understand the gentleman has stated the position exactly correct. The question of training is not involved in this bill at all. It merely relates to the question of transfer; and may I say that since the gentleman from Indiana has mentioned St. John's, of course, I am hoping that a full, complete educational program may be worked out in the very near future whereby a final decision can be reached by the Naval Affairs Committee in regard to St. John's and thus dispel any cloud that may be hanging over that institution at as early a date as possible.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for that statement because I hope there may be some final disposition of the long controversy that has been going on in our committee. I think it ought to be determined and determined soon.

I appreciate, too, for the sake of the record, the statement that the chairman has made about the future training for officers of the Navy. Many plans have been submitted by the Navy Department as to how we are going to train our officers. We have had almost every kind of report come back, the last of which in effect is this: We will use the 52 NROTC schools that we have in the colleges of the country. From these schools will come roughly one-half of the officers for Uncle Sam's Navy. The other half therefore are going to come from the Naval Academy at Annapolis. We will have a 50-50 division. We are going to be confronted with the same ills, the same problems we have been confronted with in the past; and I say again, Mr. Chairman, we may write the most perfect law in the world but as long as there is a division in the service as between those who come from the Navy's school and those who come from the outside it is inevitable that we are going to have this feeling that has grown up in the Navy, and the Army as well. I have on several occasions before our committee—and others before me—have made a suggestion that I think merits a lot of consideration and we are going to urge our case vigorously when the legislation reaches our committee and the floor, which the chairman has just told us will follow. It is expected that the requirements of the Navy in the postwar era will be some 3,000 or perhaps 4,000 new officers every year. That happens to be just about the present size of the Naval Academy. Why cannot we send all of Uncle Sam's prospective naval officers to the engineering schools of the country that have come into and are a part of the Naval ROTC program, have them turn out the 3,000 or 4,000 officers a year that the Navy is going to require, and then send all of them to the Naval Academy for a year's postgraduate work. They would then all go to the fleet on the same footing and we would have done away with this division in the ranks that we have and that we are going to continue to have so long as a part of our officers come from Annapolis and the rest come from the outside, and do not happen to belong to the Annapolis club that is on the inside and writes the rules and calls the plays.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I should just like to say that I feel the same as does the gentleman from Indiana. Also may I point out that to send these prospective officers to existing colleges throughout the country for their training would cost $1,000 per man per year. To send them to Annapolis to acquire their naval training would cost $3,000 per man per year. So if the Navy's plan is adopted the one man who is trained in the outside educational system will cost the public $1,000 a year, and the other one, his counterpart, his balance wheel, who comes from the Naval Academy, will cost the public $3,000 a year. So we have not only the question of morale to consider in the problem of the procurement of regular officers, but we might also give some attention to the question of cost.

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

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. It is very important to note that great difference in cost and it might be further pointed out in connection with what the gentleman, my very able leader on the committee, has just said: The experience of this war has certainly shown that the Reserve officers who had their training in civilian life, in the colleges and universities of the country, brought to the service an understanding and an ability to lead our civilian soldiers and sailors and a breadth of vision that can never possibly come from the sequestered life that you lead within the four walls of the Naval Academy.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I certainly agree with the gentleman from Indiana as to his views, and there is another reason also. From the viewpoint of a democratic country it would be a whole lot happier situation if we had the men going to Annapolis, and let me say this would apply also to West Point as well, from the ROTC or from the training courses in the colleges of the country, taking a postgraduate course at Annapolis and West Point, than under the present system where there are so many allotted to the Congress, so many to the President, and so many to the War and Navy Departments. In my opinion it would work out a whole lot better and the boys would be a lot more democratic. If I got one thing out of this war it is that the big chasm between the commissioned officers and the enlisted men is too much and there is

going to be some very bad reaction in this country if we do not have the Army and Navy run upon a more democratic system than it has been in this war and prior thereto.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. May I say to the gentleman that I refer to his remarks with respect to training of naval officers. The gentleman has made a commendable suggestion, and one which I hope both the committee and the Navy Department will give consideration to.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I thank the gentleman. I always appreciate the gentleman's good judgment. I wish I had at hand at the present moment figures to give you in reference to the promotions in the officer grades in the Navy and in the Marine Corps and how they break down as between the Regulars and the reservists. Where, on the one hand, you have probably 98 percent of the personnel coming from the Reserves, you find the bulk of the promotions going to the Regulars. That same thing is true in the matter of decorations and awards.

I recall that in the total officer personnel of the Marine Corps the reservists outnumber the Regulars about 15 to 1; that is, there are 15 Reserve officers for every Regular officer. At the same time there were 81 general officers in the Marine Corps, of whom only 1 is a Reserve officer. There were 378 colonels, of whom 345 were Regulars and only 33 were Reserve officers.

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

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. Does the gentleman have any idea as to the figures on the promotions in the commissioned Reserve of men who have either graduated from Annapolis or who have attended the Naval Academy?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I regret I do not have such figures at hand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

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

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I am happy to yield to the very able member of the naval subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman and I were in the Pacific about a year ago, in the forward areas, and talked to many officers. I am sure he recalls a great many Reserve officers being rather down in the mouth about the promotion lists that came out in which they were almost entirely ignored in some grades. I observed, and I think the gentleman did, too, that it was tending to break down the morale right out in the fighting areas.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I thank the gentleman. There is not the slightest doubt about the truth of that statement and the effect it has on morale in the service.

I have said many times that the Navy Department has done itself great injury by sending a lot of our reservists back to civilian life, back to the jobs of being businessmen, Congressmen, mayors, local officials—yes; the taxpayers—to whom the Navy is going to have to look for its support in the postwar years, and sending them back with the bad feeling that has developed.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion may I say this: When the time comes that this matter of procurement and assignment of officers in the postwar Navy is before us the most important thing that we can do for the permanence of this Navy is to take the "R" out of "USNR" and all that it stands for.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to say to the gentleman from Indiana that if his argument and his reasoning prevails, one of the greatest services has been done for the armed forces of America.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I hope we can succeed. I know that we can count on the able gentleman from Missouri to assist.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. For the information of those who might be interested in the treatment accorded reservists as against the regulars, as far as promotion and decoration is concerned, I would call their attention to a discussion on this subject and the tabulations that are contained in the hearings, which are available to the Members, on pages 1730 and 1780.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, not being a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I cannot speak with the knowledge and the background and with the facts and figures that the members of this committee are able to command during this discussion. But if what the gentleman who just preceded me has said has any bearing on the future personnel of the Navy, if the sequestered and cloistered life of Annapolis is to be broken down and the differential between the Reserve officer and the trained officer at Annapolis is to be opened up so that there will be more democracy, it seems to me that in considering this question in the next bill to come before the House that there should be recommendations for expanding the educational facilities of the Naval Academy beyond that of the present Academy at Annapolis. It has been one of the particular things that I have been interested in just the short time I have been here, to advocate that such an academy be built on the west coast, so far as that is concerned, to remove any possibility of provincialism. I am not concerned about where it is built on the west coast, or whether it is built in some other location than within the borders of the State of California, although I must admit that I would prefer to have it in the State of California, and especially in southern California where the all-year-round climate is desirable for training facilities.

But there is more to this question than merely building an academy. The gentleman from Indiana indicated a very serious situation that exists between the Naval Reserve officers and the Regular officers educated in the Academy. Your bill and the report of the committee indicates that you went so far as to say there would be no discrimination. I do not think you can put that in a bill and have it mean that in so many words. You cannot legislate the attitude of one man against another; who may believe that he is superior because he was trained at Annapolis, over the man who comes in from a business office during a temporary situation like the war we just fought. One of my sons is a Reserve officer in the Navy. He has never complained about the situation, but I do know from what the gentleman from Indiana said that there is a division there that should be broken down. The expansion at Annapolis is also limited as indicated by the reports up to now. We cannot expand by the acquisition of St. John's College. Is there any reason why the west coast, with its all-year-round training on the sea, in the air, on land, and under the sea, for naval officers is not a desirable location for an academy? I would like to ask a question and be contradicted if anyone chooses to.

Is there any better location for the training of naval officers than on the Pacific coast? In setting up naval bases we consider the best geographic and strategic locations. The Roosevelt base built at Wilmington, Calif., was started before this war. It is one of the finest naval bases in the United States. We did not come here and ask for it, the Navy decided that is the best place for it, because they wanted a base for the fleet on the Pacific Ocean.

I am sure we from California do not have to ask you to put an academy on the coast. I think your judgment and wisdom will direct it to be placed there, when the time comes for such an extension of the Navy's educational facilities. So, Mr. Chairman, I ask that when the bill comes before the House the committee in preparing it give consideration to the Pacific coast as a desirable location for the expansion of the Naval Academy.

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

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I wonder what the gentleman might think of the Great Lakes as a suitable place.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I think the Great Lakes is very desirable and a very fine place for the training of naval officers. You have a great base up there now. You have trained a great number of men at the Great Lakes Training Station.

Mr. DONDERO. It is especially suitable in the summer months when we are at peace for the training of the men who take to the sea for their livelihood.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Unfortunately, it is confined to the summer months only. We can train men all the year round in California.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise more for the purpose of obtaining information. As I understand, the Navy program is to cost $3,500,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. That is what the postwar Navy, in accordance with Concurrent Resolution No. 80, submitted to the House the other day and unanimously passed by the House, is estimated to cost.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does that take into consideration the training program?

Mr. VINSON. That takes into consideration everything that relates to the postwar Navy, including the pay of the personnel of 500,000 referred to in this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. And all training programs?

Mr. VINSON. The whole thing—lock, stock, and barrel.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not have any definite figure on the Army, but I understand it is estimated that the cost of maintaining it in peacetime will be about $4,000,000,000.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I understand it is $4,200,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I made it a little bit low. I want to be conservative.

The interest on the Federal debt will be about $6,000,000,000. I just telephoned to General Bradley a few minutes ago and asked him for an estimate of the cost of the Veterans' Administration, and he gave me a figure of $3,600,000,000 for 1946, and said that would increase in the next several years.

We have a total here of $17,100,000,000 for these four items. Of course, I do not know what the remainder of the cost of the Government is going to be, but in accordance with the authorizations and appropriations that are being voted and the spending psychology that exists in the Congress, if we were to add to the above figure anywhere from $6,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000, I do not believe we would be very far out of the way. This means we are going to have a cost running somewhere between $24,000,000,000 and $30,000,000,000 annually.

I doubt the wisdom of legislating in this piecemeal fashion. The day is coming when this Congress will have to look to the matter of financing these costs. Do not misunderstand me; I voted for the Navy bill a few days ago. I want our armed forces to be fully adequate, but I believe this Congress is running into a danger. I question whether we are going to be able to finance the costs for which we are obligating ourselves.

The proper procedure would be to have a concrete estimate of the over-all cost of all the services and functions before definitely committing the Nation to any specified program. There could be nothing more unfortunate for the Navy itself than to discover in the future that we had committed ourselves for more than we were able to pay.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is not the question of the postwar Navy as provided in the bill we passed a few weeks ago together with the personnel bill today a flexible matter in which we can consider all phases of our financial structure in the days to come when the appropriations are made for them? But for the purpose of demobilization, we have to know now what we consider to be the needs of the postwar period. Certainly, this is no time for us to cuddle up and go to sleep as we did after 1922 as the result of the disarmament conference which certainly all will agree brought us much more expense during the intervening period than what this bill would entail.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not believe the gentleman wishes to infer that I take the attitude we should not be prepared. I have not indicated that at all. I merely made the statement that sooner or later this Congress will have to set itself to the task of finding the money to pay for these costs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I gladly speak in support of H. R. 4421 as so ably authored by my distinguished colleague from my native State of California and as unanimously reported to this legislative body by our tireless and far-seeing Committee on Naval Affairs, under the leadership of its distinguished chairman, who has rendered such lasting and long service to the cause of the progress of our great Navy.

This bill is one of those for which I expect a unanimous vote of approval. This I say because a few weeks ago this Congress unanimously declared its policy for a postwar Navy under the terms of House Resolution 80. Having so declared our intention indelibly as to what we then knew to be a wise policy, we now begin implementing the purpose of that resolution. This bill before us today begins to put lifeblood into the policies already declared by us as reasonable and sound.

Having heard the clear and adequate reasoning of committee members in explanation of this bill, I feel their reasons given impel us to follow their unanimous lead and vote the bill as asked.

This bill, amongst other features, should be attractive to us all as Americans for the reason that it admittedly aims to help correct a condition which has needed correction for some years. It also looks forward and prepares the way up the trail toward the top of the hill where we will see our Navy even better and stronger in its democratic functioning than it now is.

It will make of 52 already designated American universities pretraining schools. This will make these benefits more available to more of our fine, ambitious, qualified youth. This is as it should be.

Hailing from Long Beach, Calif., as I do, I know you will understand—yes, expect me to remind you of the great naval installations there situate. And, within these last 30 days the Secretary of the Navy has designated these permanent facilities and installations as the Long Beach Navy Yard.

There rides at home anchor, and in the most beautiful and available harbor on the continent, the Third Fleet of the United States Navy. This harbor of Long Beach and all its more than 300,000 citizens cordially consider it a high privilege to have the Navy come and go and to count among its happy population, many thousands of Navy personnel.

This bill should have unanimous approval this day.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests on this side, and if the gentleman from New York does not have any requests for additional time, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment.

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

There was no objection.

(The bill is as follows:)

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to remove any apprehension on the part of Naval Reserve officers regarding their opportunities for advancement in event of their transfer to the Regular Navy, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that in all matters relating to commissioned officers in the Regular Navy there shall be no discrimination whatsoever against officers because of the source from which they entered the Regular Navy, and that no preference shall be given officers by reason of the fact that they entered the Regular Navy from any particular source; and, among other things, that all commissioned officers in the Regular Navy, regardless of the source from which they entered the Regular Navy, shall receive the same treatment with respect to opportunities for (1) promotion or advancement to all grades in the Navy, (2) holding any positions or assignments in the Navy including proportionate representation on selection boards, and (3) attending the Naval War College, postgraduate schools, or other schools, or otherwise receiving advanced or technical training.

SEC. 2. (a) The permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy shall hereafter be 500,000.

(b) Hereafter the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Marine Corps shall be 20 percent of the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy.

SEC. 3. The number of enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps provided for shall be construed to mean the daily average number of enlisted men in the naval service during the fiscal year.

SEC. 4. The permanent authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, exclusive of commissioned warrant officers, shall hereafter be equal to 8 percent of the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy.

SEC. 5. (a) The President may appoint male officers of the Naval Reserve and of the Marine Corps Reserve, officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps without permanent appointments therein, commissioned warrant and warrant officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps with temporary appointments in higher grades and ranks, and any person who served on active duty in any such capacity during World War II and shall have been separated from such officer status under honorable conditions, to permanent warrant grades or, with the advice and consent of the

Senate, to permanent commissioned grades and ranks in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, respectively, but no such person shall be appointed to a grade or rank higher than the highest grade or rank in which he served on active duty. Appointments pursuant to this subsection to commissioned warrant and warrant grades shall be in such numbers as the President may determine, and to other grades and ranks in such numbers that, exclusive of commissioned warrant and warrant officers, the total number of officers of the line and of each of the Staff Corps of the Navy, and of the Marine Corps, will not exceed the authorized numbers of such officers.

(b) (1) Each appointee who is serving on active duty in a higher grade or rank than that in which appointed under subsection (a) of this section shall also be appointed for temporary service pursuant to, and subject to the limitations of, the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as now or hereafter amended, to such higher grade or rank and with the precedence held by him at the time of acceptance of permanent appointment; each appointee not serving on active duty in an officer grade or rank who is appointed under subsection (a) of this section to a grade or rank lower than the highest grade or rank held while on active duty in World War II other than by virtue of a temporary appointment which by its terms was of limited duration, may be similarly appointed to such higher rank or grade and with precedence determined in accordance with regulations promulgated under subsection (c) of this section.

(2) During such period as the Secretary of the Navy may determine, but not later than 6 months after June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which the present wars shall terminate, notwithstanding date of rank and lineal position assigned upon permanent appointment under subsection (a) of this section, (A) each officer who receives a permanent appointment in the same grade or rank in which he is then serving on active duty in the Naval or Marine Corps Reserve shall retain the precedence held by him at the time of such appointment; (B) each person not serving on active duty in an officer grade or rank or serving on active duty in his permanent commissioned warrant or warrant grade who is appointed under subsection (a) of this section to the highest grade or rank held while on active duty in World War II other than by virtue of a temporary appointment which by its terms was of limited duration, shall have precedence determined in accordance with regulations promulgated under subsection (c) of this section.

(c) (1) Appointments under subsection (a) of this section shall be made pursuant to regulations prescribed by the President for the administration of this section.

(2) Such regulations shall include, among other provisions, (A) provisions establishing standards and qualifications for appointment thereunder to the several grades and ranks and for the determination of the lineal position and precedence of appointees; and (B) provisions for the assignment of running mates to officers appointed thereunder to the Staff Corps of the Regular Navy.

(3) Such regulations may provide for (A) readjustment of the lineal position and precedence of persons heretofore or hereafter appointed under other provisions of law to commissioned grades or ranks in the Regular Navy subsequent to September 8, 1939, and in the Regular Marine Corps subsequent to June 30, 1939, and (B) reassignment of running mates to persons so appointed to commissioned grades or ranks in the Staff Corps of the Regular Navy.

(d) Except as provided in subsection (b) the authority granted by this section shall expire 6 months after June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which the present war shall terminate or 2 years after the effective date of this act, whichever shall be the later.

SEC. 6. (a) The commission of any appointee under subsection (a) of section 5 may be revoked by the Secretary of the Navy until the latest date on which the commission of any officer (or in the case of officers of the Staff Corps of the Navy, an officer in his corps) senior in lineal position to that assigned such appointee pursuant to regulations established under subsection (c) of section 5 of this act is revocable.

(b) Each officer (other than officers appointed or reappointed pursuant to subsection (c)) whose commission is so revoked shall thereupon be discharged from the naval service without advanced pay or allowances.

(c) Each officer above the grade of commissioned warrant officer whose commission is so revoked and who (1) at the time of his appointment under subsection (a) of section 5, held permanent status as a commissioned warrant officer may be reappointed by the President to such permanent status without examination, with the lineal position and precedence to which his seniority would have entitled him had his service subsequent to reappointment under such subsection (a) been rendered in such permanent status, or (2) at the time of his appointment under such subsection (a) held permanent status as a warrant or petty officer may be appointed by the President without examination to the permanent commissioned warrant or warrant grade and with the same lineal position and precedence which he normally would have attained in due course had he not been appointed pursuant to such subsection (a).

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each officer of the Naval Reserve and of the Marine Corps Reserve and each officer of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps without permanent appointments therein, appointed to officer rank in the United States Navy or United States Marine Corps pursuant to this act, who at the time of such appointment had to his credit leave accrued but not taken, may, subsequent to appointment, be granted such leave without loss of pay or allowances.

SEC. 8. All laws or parts of laws inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed, and the provisions of this act shall be in effect in lieu thereof and such repeal shall include but shall not be limited to the following acts and parts of acts:

(a) That portion of the first sentence after the subheading: "International naval rendezvous and review;" in chapter 212, Twenty-seventh Statutes at Large, page 715, which appears at page 730 and which reads as follows: "; and the number of persons who may at one time be enlisted into the Navy of the United States, including seamen, ordinary seamen, landsmen, mechanics, firemen, and coal heavers, and including 1,500 apprentices and boys, hereby authorized to be enlisted annually, shall not exceed 9,000."

(b) That portion of the sentence after the heading "Pay of the Navy" in chapter 186, Twenty-eighth Statutes at Large, page 825, which appears at page 826 and which reads as follows: "and the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to enlist as many additional seamen as in his discretion he may deem necessary, not to exceed 1,000;".

(c) Section 2 of chapter 120, Twenty-ninth Statutes at Large, page 96, at page 97.

(d) That portion of the sentence after the heading "Pay of the Navy" in chapter 399, Twenty-ninth Statutes at Large, page 361, which appears at page 361 and which reads as follows: "and the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to enlist at any time after the passage of this act as many additional men as in his discretion he may deem necessary, not to exceed 1,000,".

(e) That proviso at the end of the first sentence after the heading "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts. Pay of the Navy:" in chapter 130, Thirty-eighth Statutes at Large, page 392, which appears at page 403 and which reads as follows: ": *Provided*, That hereafter the number of enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps provided for shall be construed to mean the daily average number of enlisted men in the naval service during the fiscal year."

(f) The following portions of chapter 417, Thirty-ninth Statutes at Large, page 556:

(1) That portion of the first sentence after the heading "Hospital Corps" in such chapter, which appears at page 572 and which reads as follows: "and shall be in addition thereto."

(2) That portion of the first sentence after the heading "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts. Pay of the Navy:" in such chapter, which appears at page 575 and which reads as follows: ", and the President is hereafter authorized, whenever in his judgment a sufficient national emergency exists, to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy to 87,000 men," and that portion of such sentence which reads as follows: ", and hereafter the number of enlisted men of the Navy shall be exclusive of those sentenced by court martial to discharge."

(3) That portion of the first sentence after the heading "Commissioned Personnel" in such chapter, which appears at page 576, as amended by the first section of chapter 402, Forty-ninth Statutes at Large, page 487, and which, so amended, reads as follows: "Hereafter the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Navy, exclusive of commissioned warrant officers, shall be equal to 4¾ percent of the total authorized enlisted strength of the active list, exclusive of the Hospital Corps, prisoners undergoing sentence of discharge, enlisted men detailed for duty with the Naval Militia, and the Flying Corps."

(4) That portion of the first sentence after the subheading "Pay of enlisted men, active list," in such chapter, which appears at page 612 and which reads as follows: "and hereafter the number of enlisted men of the Marine Corps shall be exclusive of those sentenced by court martial to discharge.".

(5) The third sentence after the subheading "Pay of enlisted men, active list:" in such chapter, which appears at page 612 and which reads as follows: "The President is authorized, when, in his judgment, it becomes necessary to place the country in a complete state of preparedness, to further increase the enlisted strength of the Marine Corps to 17,400: *And provided further*, That the distribution in the various grades shall be in the same proportion as that authorized at the time when the President avails himself of the authority herein granted,".

(g) The first and second sections of chapter 20, Fortieth Statutes at Large, page 84, as amended.

(h) That portion of the second sentence after the heading "Maintenance" in chapter 9, Forty-first Statutes at Large, page 131, which appears at page 137 and which reads as follows: "and the President is hereby authorized, whenever in his judgment a sufficient national emergency exists, to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy to 191,000 men."

(i) That portion of the fourth sentence after the heading "Marine Corps. Pay, Marine Corps;" in chapter 228, Forty-first Statutes at Large, page 812, which appears at page 830 and which reads as follows: "The authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Marine Corps is hereby permanently established at 27,400, distribution in the various grades to be made in the same proportion as provided under existing law: *Provided*, That."

(j) Section 2 and subsection (d) of section 15 of chapter 598, Fifty-second Statutes at Large, page 944, at pages 944 and 952, respectively.

(k) Chapter 74, Fifty-fifth Statutes at Large, page 145, as amended by chapter 1, Fifty-sixth Statutes at Large, page 3.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. IZAC: Page 7, line 9, after the word "warrant", strike out the word "or"; insert a comma, and after "grade" insert "or chief petty officer permanent grade."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, there is no objection to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WORLEY, Chairman of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4421) to increase the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, to increase the permanent authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, and to authorize permanent appointments in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 393, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RANK OF CHIEFS OF BUREAUS IN THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1862) relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1862) relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

CARL VINSON,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON
W. STERLING COLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DAVID I. WALSH,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1862) relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

The Senate amendment provides that the terms "chief of bureau" and "assistant to chief of bureau" shall include the Director of Budget and Reports and the Assistant Director of Budget and Reports, respectively.

The conferees on the part of the House accepted the Senate amendment so that the Director of Budget and Reports and the Assistant Director of Budget and Reports will receive the same consideration as a chief of bureau and an assistant to chief of bureau, respectively.

CARL VINSON,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
W. STERLING COLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, in explanation of the conference report, when the bill was passed some weeks ago it only related to the chiefs of bureaus. There are some nine different bureaus in the Navy Department, including the Judge Advocate General's Office. The Senate amended it to make it applicable also to the Director of Budget and Reports, and Assistant Director of Budget and Reports, which was agreed to by the House conferees.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. What rank would the Director of Budget and Reports have?

Mr. VINSON. The Director of Budget and Reports would be a vice admiral at the discretion of the President after 1 year's service as such. The Assistant Director of Budget and Reports would have the rank of a rear admiral. It carries that rank.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISCHARGE OF MIDSHIPMEN BECAUSE OF UNSATISFACTORY CONDUCT OR APTITUDE

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1064) to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1064) to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the House amendment insert the following: "or whenever it is determined by a unanimous decision of the Academic Board that any midshipman possesses insufficient aptitude for becoming a commissioned officer in the naval service"; and the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

CARL VINSON,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
W. STERLING COLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DAVID I. WALSH,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 1064) to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

In authorizing the discharge of midshipmen from the Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy the House amended the Senate bill by striking out the words "or that any midshipman has demonstrated that he possesses insufficient aptitude for becoming a commissioned officer in the naval service". The conferees on the part of the House receded from the House amendment and accepted in lieu thereof a modification of the Senate version which requires unanimous decision of the Academic Board before a midshipman can be discharged for insufficient aptitude.

CARL VINSON,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
W. STERLING COLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, as the House will observe from the statement just read, when the bill was passed some weeks ago, the House struck out the words "or that any midshipman has demonstrated that he possesses insufficient aptitude for becoming a commissioned officer in the naval service."

When this bill was before the committee there was grave doubt in our minds as to whether any one person should be given the responsibility of determining whether or not a student lacked aptitude for becoming an officer. So we struck that out. In the conference it was suggested that oftentimes it develops in the Naval Academy that students do not have sufficient aptitude for becoming officers, and therefore, if the unanimous decision is reached by the academic board, then the student should be dropped. So the House conferees agreed to leave the aptitude provision in the bill provided it required the unanimous vote of the academic board that he should be dropped for insufficient aptitude. However, we want it distinctly understood that it must be done by the unanimous decision of the academic board before any student can be dropped for lack of aptitude. It might be that in my mind some student might not have sufficient aptitude. In the decision of someone else he might have. So it is such a debatable question that we were unwilling to confer that authority upon anyone unless it was by the unanimous voice of the academic board.

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

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure.

Mr. MICHENER. That word "aptitude" is all-inclusive, and so comprehensive that it has caused literally days of debate in this Congress since I have been here.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. I have been told by members of various committees that in the olden days in certain departments aptitude was measured sometimes by social accomplishments.

Mr. VINSON. That is right; in the minds of some that might be true.

Mr. MICHENER. If in the mind of the admiral and those in charge a young man whom the chairman of the great Naval Affairs Committee sent to Annapolis, even though he should be A-1 in all the grades, yet according to the standards of the admirals he never would shine at a tea table or a cocktail party, he would be summarily dismissed from the institution without any right of appeal.

Mr. VINSON. No; no.

Mr. MICHENER. I know the gentleman does not want to see anything like that happen. I have tried in selecting my boys to select boys who had some of all the accomplishments.

Mr. VINSON. When you use the word "aptitude" you enter a large field. Therefore when it was before the House Committee and before the House we struck it out. But we have it safeguarded by saying that before any boy can be dropped from the Academy for lack of sufficient aptitude it must be by the unanimous vote of the academic board and not of the admirals.

Mr. MICHENER. I think that is good. I wish the gentleman would interpret the law and tell the House just what he could consider "aptitude" if he were to judge.

Mr. VINSON. Yes. What I have in mind and what in my judgment the individual officer should have in mind is something serious. One of the requirements of a naval officer, for instance, is leadership. If he fails in leadership then I would say he would fail in aptitude and therefore should not be educated at public expense and given a commission because he fails to possess the necessary qualifications that will enable him to lead other men.

Mr. MICHENER. Assuming that this does become the law, and it undoubtedly will, and another policy should be adopted by this academic board, I want the record to show, and I hope the gentleman whom I am now interrogating will join in the expression, that if there are cases that are questionable there is likely to be a congressional investigation as to the specific case.

Mr. VINSON. I grant the gentleman that. If I thought for one moment that after this bill becomes a law they would misinterpret what the Naval Affairs Committee thinks is a proper interpretation of "aptitude" there would promptly be an investigation.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure.

Mr. COLE of New York. Further than that, is it not correct that if a student at Annapolis graduates and is commissioned in the Navy he can be summarily dismissed during a 7-year period of time for no reason?

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and include certain letters.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include therein a copy of a letter he had just addressed to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower concerning the priority of shipping.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include certain data.

Mr. DE LACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a document sent to him by the War Department on the subject of Negroes in the armed forces.

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include a statement on behalf of H. R. 3940, amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act by the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an analysis of the President's labor message prepared by the legislative representative of the United Electrical Workers of America, CIO.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1493. An act to authorize the head of the postgraduate school of the United States Navy to confer masters and doctors degrees in engineering and related fields.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 5, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Wednesday, December 5, 1945.

Business to be considered: Resumption of hearings on H. R. 2764, the freight forwarders bill, to hear opposition.

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

The Committee on the Census will hold a hearing at 10 o'clock a. m. on Thursday, December 6, 1945, on H. R. 4781, in room 1414, New House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will have an executive meeting on Thursday, December 6, 1945, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., in room 446, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled a hearing to begin at 10 a. m. on Friday, December 7, 1945, on the bill, H. R. 4779, to enable debtor railroad corporations, whose properties during a period of 7 years have provided sufficient earnings to pay fixed charges, to effect a readjustment of their financial structure without further proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act as amended. The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will have an executive meeting on Tuesday, December 11, 1945, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., in room 247, Old House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

852. A letter from the President, Commission on Licensure, District of Columbia, transmitting its report showing the activities of the Commission for the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

853. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of its newly issued report entitled "The Financial Record of the Electric Utility Industry"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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. SABATH. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 444. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4649, a bill to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, without amendment (Rept. No. 1332). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 4893. A bill to grant to enlisted personnel of the armed forces certain benefits in lieu of accumulated leave; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4894. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and to suspend all inductions thereunder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4895. A bill to provide for the payment on a commuted basis of the costs of transportation of dependents of certain persons entitled to such transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4896. A bill to provide for payment of travel allowances and transportation, and for transportation of dependents and shipment of household effects, of members of the naval forces upon separation from active service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 4897. A bill to amend Public Law 712, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended, to provide for operation of its provisions (except title 1) in time of peace as well as in time of war; to eliminate the provisions relating to Federal ballots; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 4898. A bill relating to the unauthorized wearing of the discharge button awarded by the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 4899. A bill to establish a national housing policy and provide for its execution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROE of New York:

H. R. 4900. A bill to clarify the terms "compensation" and "pension" under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 4901. A bill to facilitate filing and settlement of claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 4902. A bill to facilitate settlement of claims and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ELLIS:

H. J. Res. 281. Joint resolution to direct and require the discharge of certain members of the armed forces, to prohibit the drafting of certain persons into the Army or Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. J. Res. 282. Joint resolution to suspend further inductions under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution to control and reduce world armaments and weapons designed for mass destruction of human life; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. Res. 455. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 1205, current session, entitled "Economic Reconstruction in Europe," for the use of the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. Res. 466. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate lend-lease operations; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BURGIN:

H. R. 4903. A bill for the relief of Capt. Richard Reynolds Shoaf; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 4904. A bill for the relief of Cleo D. Johnson and Jack B. Cherry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 4905. A bill for the relief of Nina E. Schmidt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 4906. A bill for the relief of Alice E. Pearce, Louise D. Tweed, and Mary Frances Hill; 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:

1370. By Mr. RICH: Petition of residents of Lock Haven and Clinton County, Pa., urging immediate release from the military and naval service of all fathers, regardless of age, rank, length of service, or number of children; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1371. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Robert Edward Edmondson for consideration of his resolution with reference to redress of grievances, succor, and relief; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 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:

Our Father God, who amidst all the traffic of our busy ways leadest our steps to this noontide sanctuary of the spirit, take Thou the dimness of our souls away; open our hearts that, facing our tasks with Thee, we may be of a quiet mind. A quenchless desire cries out within us that only Thyself canst satisfy. Without Thee we can find no light, nor rest, nor strength. Like men who turn from dusty toil to crystal streams, like those who raise their eyes from foul and narrow city streets to the snow-clad whiteness of mountain peaks and to the steadfast calm of the friendly stars, so do we lift our gaze to the infinite sky of Thy mercy and to the beckoning hills of Thy help, as we link our hopes for all humankind to Thee who seest our little troubled hour as one to whom a thousand years are but as one day.

We ask it through riches of grace in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, December 4, 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 the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On December 4, 1945:

S. 1308. An act to amend article 6 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy.

On December 5, 1945:

S. 1364. An act to provide for the compromise and settlement by the Secretary of the Navy of certain claims for damage to property under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, to provide for the execution of releases by the Secretary of the Navy upon payment of such claims, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE—AMENDMENT TO UNRRA BILL

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused for the remainder of the session today. I have official business to take care of in committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Nebraska is excused.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I should like to make a statement regarding the consideration of the joint resolution appropriating additional funds for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. I have an amendment which I intended to offer. In the event that consideration of the joint resolution has been concluded before I return to the floor, I should like to say to the Members of the Senate that I shall not offer the amendment, because I have been assured by my esteemed colleague from Tennessee, the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and President pro tempore of the Senate, that the matter covered by the amendment will be discussed in conference and that the conferees will decide whether or not they will submit it to a vote of the Senate.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF FEDERAL PAY BILL

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon completion of action on the UNRRA appropriation measure and the Philippine appropriation bill, Senate bill 1415, the Fed-