

(Rept. No. 1462). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 113. Concurrent resolution relative to the opening of Palestine for free entry of Jews; without amendment (Rept. No. 1463). 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. HOWELL (by request):

H. R. 5040. A bill to amend section 9 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act, with respect to the determination of bargaining units; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 5041. A bill to provide domiciliary care and medical and hospital treatment for members of selective service local boards; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 5042. A bill to grant pensions to certain disabled women veterans of World War I and World War II; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 5043. A bill to grant first preference to servicemen and veterans in the purchase of surplus property useful in the establishment and maintenance of their own small business, professional, or agricultural enterprises; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 5044. A bill for the relief of officers of the Army who were members of the first two classes at civil affairs training school, University of Chicago; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSPECK (by request):

H. R. 5045. A bill to provide eligibility for annuity at age 70 after at least 5 years of service in lieu of 15 years of such service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 293. Joint resolution to prohibit the exportation from the United States of lumber and other building material; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 5046. A bill for the relief of J. B. Robinson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 5047. A bill for the relief of Edna Rita Saffron Fidone; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 5048. A bill to carry out the decision of the Secretary of War (November 30, 1920), directing payment of compensation due certain employees for work performed in the execution of contracts for the manufacture of war materials; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 5049. A bill for the relief of the estate of Obaldino Francis Dias; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 5050. A bill for the relief of Minnie P. Shorey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 5051. A bill for the relief of Lt. Mary L. Barrett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 5052. A bill for the relief of the estate of George Grittendon and others; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 5053. A bill for the relief of the estate of Jasper A. Mealer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRAYNOR:

H. R. 5054. A bill for the relief of Jacob Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WASIELEWSKI:

H. R. 5055. A bill for the relief of the estate of Carl F. Schwab; 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:

1421. By Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Petition of Willetta A. Chapman and other citizens of Ohio, for the adoption of H. R. 752, H. R. 2082, and House Resolution 354; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1422. By Mr. HAGEN: Petition of 310 residents in and around Thief River Falls, Minn., urging the passage of an adequate old-age-pension law, unhampered by liens and other charges against the residents thereof; to the Committee on Pensions.

1423. By Mr. PFELFER: Petition of Peter V. Cacchione, chairman, Kings County Committee Communist Party, Brooklyn, N. Y., regarding our policy in China and urging withdrawal of American troops; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1424. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Local 568, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the recall of all United States troops from China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1425. Also, petition of the board of directors of the Child Welfare League of America petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the creation of a Federal Department of Welfare, and strengthening of services to children; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1426. Also, petition of the national council of administration, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their request for legislation to speed up the settlement of existing differences between labor and management; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1945

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

God our Father, in the midst of the caroling joy of this happy season, when universal good will bathes even frigid zones with the warm breezes of the heavenly tropics, may we see with new eyes, as again the Christ Child comes to a world where ill will has wrought such horror, that He is set for the falling and rising of nations—that He does not stay in the manger—He walks in our world of pretense and greed and self-seeking—and that where He goes the judgment of God goes with him. Who shall stand when He appeareth? For he is like a refiner's fire. As He is truth, so His presence floodlights our falseness; as He is wisdom, so His presence uncovers our selfish follies; as He is love, so His presence bares the smoldering hate that we try to hide from one another.

O Thou whose eternal love is refining fire, Christmas tells us that we men and

all our works are in the furnace. Cleanse our hearts to abide this day of Thy coming. In the dear Redeemer's name. 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 18, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 122) to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and for other purposes, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to 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, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BLOOM, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, and Mr. EATON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 294) fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—UNIFICATION OF THE ARMED FORCES (H. DOC. NO. 392)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, and the Chair suggests that it might be advisable to have a quorum call.

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

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

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Chavez	Hayden
Ball	Connally	Hickenlooper
Barkley	Downey	Hill
Bilbo	Ellender	Hoey
Brewster	Ferguson	Huffman
Brooks	Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.
Bushfield	Gossett	Johnston, S. C.
Byrd	Green	Kilgore
Capehart	Gurney	Knowland
Capper	Hart	La Follette
Carville	Hatch	Langer

Lucas	O'Mahoney	Tobey
McCarran	Pepper	Tunnell
McClellan	Radcliffe	Tydings
McKellar	Revercomb	Vandenberg
McMahon	Russell	Wagner
Maybank	Saltonstall	Walsh
Mead	Shipstead	Wherry
Millikin	Smith	White
Mitchell	Stanfill	Wiley
Moore	Stewart	Willis
Morse	Taft	Wilson
Murdock	Taylor	Young
O'Daniel	Thomas, Utah	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on official business.

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], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] has been excused.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is necessarily absent on important business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The message from the President of the United States will now be read.

The message was read by the Chief Clerk.

[For President's message, see p. 12398 of House proceedings in today's RECORD.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The message will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and will be printed.

PROHIBITION AGAINST DRAFTING MEN HAVING CHILDREN

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, at this time I desire to call up for consideration the written motion which I filed yesterday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Consideration of the motion would not be in order at this time. We are under the head of Petitions and Memorials in the morning business of the Senate, and the motion to which the Senator has referred must be postponed for a few minutes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I was advised that the motion could be taken up only during the morning hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will be laid before the Senate by the Chair immediately following the call for introduction of concurrent and other resolutions.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then I shall ask for recognition by the Chair at that time.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on December 18, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 862. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers in the town site of Ketchum, Idaho," approved July 11, 1940, so as to extend for 3 years the time for making application for benefits thereunder; and

S. 1366. An act to authorize the State of Tennessee to convey a railroad right-of-way through Montgomery Bell Park.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE — FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 131)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency, amounting to \$5,575,000, fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH FACT-FINDING COMMISSION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the North Dakota Committee of One Hundred and Six for a Missouri Valley Authority on December 1, 1945, at Jamestown, N. Dak., relating to the appointment of a fact-finding commission for scientific research.

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

Whereas

1. Control of the forces of nature should be a permanent and everlasting objective and which is an ever-challenging problem to man.

2. That such attempts to control the forces and resources of nature must of necessity be feasible and economical and done in such a manner that the benefits to be derived from such a project shall benefit the greatest number of people.

3. That before construction on a project of this kind be started our every resource of scientific research be bent to the task of investigating and fact finding to determine the objectives and benefits that may be derived from such a project, especially as they will affect the social and economic well-being of our people.

4. It appears to this committee that there has been insufficient research work proposed or done in connection with the proposed Army Engineers-Reclamation Bureau construction plan, particularly as to what will be its effect upon the welfare of the people throughout the river basin.

5. That in the development of any Missouri River plan, consideration must of necessity be given the following objectives:

- (a) Development of soil conservation practices on a broad scale.

- (b) Development of rural and industrial electrification to the extent that potential power can be made available.

- (c) Development of economically feasible irrigation.

- (d) Development of economically feasible navigation.

- (e) Development of parks and broad recreational facilities.

- (f) Development of wild life values.

- (g) Development of higher ground-water levels.

- (h) Development of a river basin plan that will inundate the minimum economically valuable land areas.

- (i) Development of flood control.

6. That in the course of research as referred to above which must precede any extensive construction, a study must be made of the natural resources that will be affected, both physical and biological, and the probable destruction we will have of such resources as:

- (a) Coal deposits.

- (b) Grasslands.

- (c) Timberland.

- (d) Productive cultivated agricultural lands.

- (e) Oil deposits.

- (f) Agricultural and business properties and improvements.

- (g) Wildlife.

7. It appears to this committee that all of the Federal research agencies who must study and carry out research programs in the Missouri Basin to determine the above-outlined objectives have as yet not been given an opportunity to do so.

8. It further appears that no such comprehensive research work is even contemplated by the Army Engineers-Reclamation Bureau before they plan beginning their construction work.

9. According to the report made by Warren J. Meade, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and internationally reputable geologist, when employed by the Army engineers in 1932 to make findings as to the feasibility of constructing a dam at Garrison such proposed construction was reported impractical from an engineering standpoint and unsafe for residents of the basin.

10. It appears from the testimony of the Solicitor General of the Department of Interior that an act of Congress will be necessary to permit the taking and using of Indian lands of the Fort Berthold Reservation, and that no such act of Congress modifying the Indian Lands Treaty has been introduced or enacted: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urgently and respectfully request:

1. That the President of the United States immediately appoint a fact-finding commission supplied with adequate resources for scientific research.

2. That this commission study all existing proposals in the light of their economic and sociological impact upon the various resources we have enumerated and their relation to a coordinated over-all plan and report such finding and recommendations to the President.

3. That such commission specifically investigate the engineering feasibility of the proposed Garrison Dam project and that such investigation be made by independent technicians, engineers, and geologists who have had no prior connection with either the Army Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, or the T. V. A. in view of the findings reported by Warren J. Meade that the proposed Garrison Dam was unsafe.

Respectfully yours,

O. W. ZETTER,

Secretary, North Dakota Committee for MVA, Bismarck, N. Dak.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. HUFFMAN, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 991. A bill for the relief of Marion M. Hill; with amendments (Rept. No. 863);

S. 1400. A bill for the relief of Robert R. Rowe, Jr.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 864);

H. R. 873. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie S. Edmonds; without amendment (Rept. No. 865); and

H. R. 1251. A bill for the relief of the Irvine Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 866).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 207. A bill for the relief of Edgar Kaigler; without amendment (Rept. No. 867);

H. R. 919. A bill for the relief of Gladys Elvira Maurer; without amendment (Rept. No. 868);

H. R. 1250. A bill for the relief of Roy S. Councilman; without amendment (Rept. No. 869);

H. R. 1796. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Lamb; without amendment (Rept. No. 870); and

H. R. 2644. A bill for the relief of Eli Richmond; without amendment (Rept. No. 871).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 323. A bill for the relief of Thomas F. Gray; without amendment (Rept. No. 872);

S. 1423. A bill for the relief of Charles L. Phillips; without amendment (Rept. No. 873);

S. 1588. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lona Wilson; without amendment (Rept. No. 874);

H. R. 915. A bill for the relief of Fairview School District No. 90, Pratt County, Kans.; without amendment (Rept. No. 876).

H. R. 1348. A bill for the relief of estate of Gordon T. Gorham and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 885);

H. R. 1836. A bill for the relief of Viola Theriaque; without amendment (Rept. No. 875);

H. R. 1879. A bill for the relief of Rev. Neal Dewese, Mrs. Minnie Dewese, Raymond Dewese, and the estate of Lon Thurman, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 877);

H. R. 3124. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gisella Sante; without amendment (Rept. No. 882); and

H. R. 3277. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katie Sanders; without amendment (Rept. No. 879).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 400. A bill for the relief of Elisabeth Andersen; without amendment (Rept. No. 886);

H. R. 2666. A bill for the relief of Oscar N. McLean; without amendment (Rept. No. 881); and

H. R. 3303. A bill for the relief of A. M. Strauss; without amendment (Rept. No. 878).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2332. A bill for the relief of Henry P. King and G. B. Morgan, Sr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 884).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1234. A bill for the relief of Percy Allen; without amendment (Rept. No. 883); and

H. R. 2267. A bill for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley; with an amendment (Rept. No. 880).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 4117. A bill for the relief of Franklin P. Radcliffe; without amendment (Rept. No. 887).

INCREASE IN CAPACITY OF PANAMA CANAL—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTEROCEANIC CANALS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, I report favorably with an amendment the bill (H. R. 4480) to authorize an investigation of means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama

Canal, and I submit a report (No. 862) thereon. This bill passed the House of Representatives on November 26 last.

In connection with the report, I wish to say briefly that House bill 4480 simply authorizes the Governor of the Panama Canal, under the supervision of the Secretary of War, to make a study and survey, and to report as a result thereof, with respect to the possibility of improving and increasing the capacity of the present Panama Canal in order to meet future needs of interoceanic commerce and national defense. The bill contemplates reporting to the Congress concerning the building of a sea-level canal or the completion of a third lock, the construction of which was authorized by the Congress in 1939, I believe. Work on that lock was discontinued after we became involved in the war, of course, when we needed to turn our attention to more important matters.

The amendment which the Committee on Interoceanic Canals reports merely directs the Governor of the Panama Canal, following the survey, to report concerning the building of canals at other locations. The committee felt that the possibility of building other canals should be considered in connection with consideration of the question whether a sea-level canal should be built at Panama.

The Governor of the Panama Canal, who appeared before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which has charge of the legislative affairs of the Canal, testified, I believe, that the estimated cost probably would be in excess of \$1,000,000. However, the bill merely provides an authorization, and the funds will have to be appropriated later. It will require about 2 years to complete the survey, and so it is important that the bill be promptly considered, and passed at an early date. I should like to have the Members of the Senate give some attention to the report today, for I hope to be able to call up the bill tomorrow. I believe that only brief discussion of it will be necessary.

I may say further that we hope the bill will be passed promptly by the Senate. On November 25 the House of Representatives passed the bill unanimously, as I recall.

It was unanimously approved by our committee yesterday, with but a slight amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1710. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant and convey to the Virginia Electric & Power Co. a perpetual easement in two strips of land comprising portions of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1711. A bill for the relief of Luiz C. Paiva; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 1712. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to hear, de-

termine, and render judgment upon the claim of Robert Ross; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1713. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Helma Ester Alfred; to the Committee on Pensions.

OFFICE OF TECHNICAL SERVICES—AMENDMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1248) to establish an Office of Technical Services, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ESTATE OF PETER G. FABIAN, DECEASED—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER (for Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina) submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1890) for the relief of the estate of Peter G. Fabian, deceased, 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 with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by the Senate amendment, insert "\$3,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,

KENNETH S. WHERRY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

DAN R. McGEHEE,

E. H. HEDRICK,

JOHN W. BYRNES,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. JOHNSTON), I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

RETURN AND DEMOBILIZATION OF TROOPS—WAR DEPARTMENT STATEMENT

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a release by the War Department giving the latest figures concerning the return from overseas theaters and the demobilization of United States troops, which appears in the Appendix.]

A PLEA FOR UNRRA HELP FOR HUNGARY

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum entitled "A Plea for UNRRA Help for Hungary," which appears in the Appendix.]

AUTHORSHIP OF PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD certain information concerning the authorship of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CHALLENGE TO AMERICA—ADDRESS BY CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Challenge to America," delivered by Charles A. Lindbergh, at the forty-second aviation anniversary dinner of the Aero Club of Washington, at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., December 17, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUGGESTIONS OF ENLISTED MEN FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ARMY—EDITORIAL FROM YANK

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial dealing with suggestions of enlisted men for improvement of the Army, published in the December 8, 1945, issue of Yank, which appears in the Appendix.]

THAT LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN—EDITORIAL FROM THE ARKANSAS DEMOCRAT

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "That Loan to Great Britain," published in the Arkansas Democrat, of Little Rock, Ark., of December 16, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

LITHUANIA IN ECLIPSE—ARTICLE BY DR. W. ELMER EKBLAW

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Lithuania in Eclipse," by Dr. W. Elmer Ekblaw, of Clark University, published in the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of December 10, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

REFUSAL OF GENERAL VAUGHAN TO USE GOVERNMENT CAR—EXCERPT FROM THE COLUMN, INSIDE WASHINGTON

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the column Inside Washington by Jim H. Brady, in reference to the refusal of Brig. Gen. Harry W. Vaughan, military aide to the President, to use a Government car and driver, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROHIBITION AGAINST DRAFTING MEN HAVING CHILDREN

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business is concluded and the Chair lays before the Senate Senate Resolution 207, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 207), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) 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.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I desire to address myself to the resolution which has just been read. The purpose of the resolution is to discharge the Military Affairs Committee from the further consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116), 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.

I feel that a reading of Senate Joint Resolution 116 would clearly set forth its purpose.

Mr. President, I inquire if promptly at 2 o'clock we must vote on Senate resolution 207? Will the Chair make a ruling?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Tydings in the chair). If the resolution is still under discussion at 2 o'clock it will automatically go to the calendar.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It will automatically go to the calendar if it is still under discussion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, if the Senate has not completed action on the resolution by 2 o'clock it will go to the calendar, and the Senate will proceed to consider the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has stated correctly the parliamentary situation.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, as I understand, if the ruling of the Chair is correct, if the Senator from West Virginia holds the floor until 2 o'clock, his motion carries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is what I understood to be the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the resolution would then go to the calendar.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is all the Senator from West Virginia is asking for. That is equivalent to a discharge of the committee, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will clarify the ruling. Senate Resolution 207 and not Senate Joint Resolution 116 would go to the calendar.

Mr. HILL. In other words, the resolution to discharge the committee would go on the calendar but not Senate Joint Resolution 116? As I understand, that resolution would remain in the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the Chair has now made his ruling so clear that even I can understand it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. So long as he occupies his present point of vantage, the present occupant of the chair desires to make his rulings clear.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, had the understanding of the Senator from Utah been correct that the joint resolution would go on the calendar, I assure him that I would not have consumed the entire morning hour, but would have divided the time equally with him. I hope that in the present situation we may have a disposition of this subject, and that no Senator will take the floor for the purpose of filibustering the matter to an indecision.

I shall speak briefly on the subject and shall first read from the joint resolution:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled—

Allow me to say at this point that it will be noticed that changes were made by me as shown in italics and lined type on the committee print. The joint resolution was voted upon by the Military Affairs Committee in the form in which it now appears, including the italicized language.

I continue reading:

That there shall be discharged from the military and naval forces of the United States, as rapidly as discharge facilities will permit, every member of such force who has on the date of enactment of this joint resolution one or more children to whom he bears, or would maintain, but for his service, a bona fide family relationship in his home: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of

this joint resolution shall not apply to anyone who has volunteered into the Army or the Navy subsequent to October 6, 1945, or to anyone who is a member of the Regular Army or the Regular Navy.

The date October 6, 1945, was fixed because on that date the new voluntary enlistment law went into effect. So the joint resolution is not meant to apply to anyone who volunteered under the new voluntary enlistment act which went into effect on October 6, 1945.

The remainder of the proviso that the provisions of the joint resolution shall not apply to anyone who is a member of the Regular Army or Regular Navy was incorporated because the War Department pointed out that the joint resolution, as originally introduced, would cause the discharge of men who were in the Regular Army and the Regular Navy. That is one of the criticisms which was made of the original joint resolution in a letter from the War Department, and the objection has now been removed.

I have here on my desk a letter from the War Department, a letter from the Navy Department, and a letter from the Director of the Selective Service to which I shall refer later.

Sec. 2. Discharge of any man upon the ground hereinabove described shall be made only after application of the service member himself; and a discharge shall not be granted to any person charged with an offense and awaiting trial by court martial or who shall be serving a sentence under conviction by court martial.

That section was placed in the joint resolution largely because of the point raised in the letters of the War and Navy Departments that it would automatically discharge a man. So now it is provided that in order to obtain a discharge upon the ground of being a father and having a family to support a serviceman must make his own application.

It was further stated as a complaint against the joint resolution that it would require the discharge of persons awaiting trial for offenses or who were serving sentences under court-martial convictions. There was no intention of doing that, but, in order that there may be no question about it, it has been written now in the joint resolution that such persons shall not be affected by the resolution if it is enacted into law.

Sec. 3. That this joint resolution shall not be deemed to affect the existing program of the Army and Navy for the discharge of men in the service on other grounds and for other reasons not named in this joint resolution, but shall be construed as an additional ground and reason in the demobilization and discharge of servicemen from the Army and Navy.

Sec. 4. That any person discharged under the provisions of this joint resolution shall be given and granted an honorable discharge, unless for cause found to be not entitled to honorable discharge.

Sec. 5. That after the date of enactment of this joint resolution no person who has one or more children to whom he bears, or would maintain, but for his service, a bona fide family relationship in his home shall be inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Section 5, of course, stops the drafting of fathers. Let me say to you, Mr. President, that at this time men with children are still being drafted, they are being taken into the Army, and being sent abroad to serve in the armies of occupation. I am making this argument today not so much for the men themselves—

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from West Virginia agree with the Senator from Oregon that not only are men with families being drafted but the allotments the Government provides from the compensation now afforded to the men in the armed services are so meager as to make it impossible in many instances for the families to live a life of health and decency?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I know that is correct, for the statement is corroborated by letters from the men themselves and from their wives, the mothers of their children who are left without their fathers.

Mr. MORSE. While I am on my feet I should like to say that I highly endorse the position the Senator from West Virginia has taken. I think the Congress has an obligation to perform with regard to this particular legislation. We should take action before this session adjourns, but I think the Senator will agree with me that the chances of getting action are very remote. It is merely another one of the failures on the part of this Congress and the Democratic administration to meet some of the crying domestic needs which are confronting the Nation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I heartily agree with the Senator from Oregon, and I am delighted to have him make the statement he has made.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator one question?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Can the Senator tell me how many men would be potentially eligible for release under his resolution?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Army has said in a letter it wrote to the Military Affairs Committee that it would affect at the date the letter was written approximately 23 percent of those then in the armed forces. The statement that today 23 percent of those in the armed forces, in the Army, are men having families to me is startling.

As I have said, the joint resolution does not affect the members of the Regular Army but only those who have been inducted in the service or who volunteered during the fighting days for the duration of the war plus 6 months; it does not affect those who volunteered after October 6, 1945.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon me if I ask another question?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the light of the information he has just given me indicating the extent to which fathers are now in the service, would the Senator think that if this resolution were passed it would require an entire rearrangement

of all the other discharge rules and procedures?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not see why it should any more than the reduction of points or any more than the rule which was issued providing for the discharge of fathers with three children. That rule is in existence, and an order to release a man with one child would not upset the plan any more than an order to discharge a man with three children.

Taking up the idea that I was about to express when interrupted I wish to say that I do not bring this matter up so much because of the men themselves who may be concerned. There is no distinction between them as to whether they have three children or one child or no children; but the purpose of the resolution is to enable the Government to perform a duty it owes to families back home who are without proper support and without the guidance of a family head. I have received hundreds upon hundreds of letters, many from the wives of servicemen, many from the men themselves, and some from persons in the community where servicemen's families reside, pointing out to me the dreadful situations which have arisen because of fatherless homes and because fathers are held in the service.

Opposition is voiced by those who voted against the proposal in the committee. I say that the motion to discharge is necessary because the Military Affairs Committee by a vote of 6 to 3 declined to send the resolution to the floor and place it on the calendar for consideration by the Senate. The committee is but a creature and a servant of the Senate, and the Senate has the right at any time to discharge the committee and bring the subject to the floor for discussion and action by the Senate upon it. I think it is too important a matter and something that touches too deeply the very domestic life of this country to be frozen in a committee, and that it ought to be considered on the floor of the Senate where it can be discussed and decided. The Senate can then come face to face with it and make a decision as to whether it wants to keep from homes in this country the men it took into the service to fight this war, now that the fighting has ended.

I recall too well that when the question of drafting fathers came up it was then said that as soon as the war was over they would be released. I believe this to have meant when the fighting was over. I recall a statement made at that time by the then Chief of Staff, General Marshall. When before the committee he was asked the question: "Do you want the induction of fathers or do you just want men?" he said it made no difference to him whether they were fathers or not, whether they were married or single; he wanted men. I think that statement, Mr. President, expresses the genuine view of the military upon this subject. They want men. As I heard the statement, they were referred to as "bodies." I quote that word because one of the high officers of the Army used it.

That is all right from the military point of view. It is all right for the mili-

tary leader to say, "I want men, and it makes no difference to me whether they are fathers or not." But the Congress and the Federal Government cannot take that view of this subject. I submit it must regard the homes of this country; it must regard the security of those homes and it must regard the security and well-being of the children of the men who are held in the armed services.

I have here the letters, which I wish to read, which were sent to the Committee on Military Affairs by the Army and the Navy and also by the Director of Selective Service. I think these letters will reveal the attitude of the services; and the Congress must consider whether, in dealing with this question, it will take that attitude or whether or not it must go beyond the military views and deal with the men in the service on a broader and more just basis, looking to the well-being of our people.

I read a letter dated December 3, 1945, addressed to the Honorable ELBERT D. THOMAS, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate. This is from the Selective Service System:

DEAR CHAIRMAN THOMAS: In response to your request of November 13, 1945, for a report on Senate Joint Resolution 116, a 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, I submit the following for the consideration of your committee:

Section 4 provides that after the date of enactment of this resolution no person who has one or more children to whom he bears, or would maintain, but for his service, a bona fide family relationship in his home, shall be inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. This provision could be accomplished administratively by amending our regulations to provide a more liberal basis for deferment of registrants.

I shall return to that sentence and discuss it when I finish the letter.

I am generally opposed to any restrictive legislation when the same result can be obtained through administrative action.

For the foregoing reasons it is respectfully recommended that the proposed legislation be not favorably reported by your committee.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

Mr. President, what does this letter mean? What is the substance of it? General Hershey says, "We could accomplish the same thing by a directive." Of course we could, but he will not issue the directive, although his office has been requested time after time to do it. The very reason why this legislation is necessary is that he will not act administratively.

Then we have this revealing sentence in the letter:

I am generally opposed to any restrictive legislation when the same result can be obtained through administrative action.

Of course he is. Was there ever anyone in the administrative side of this

Government who did not want the broadest power to act? But who has the responsibility to the people of this country—General Hershey or the Congress? We know that the Congress has it. We know he is not answerable directly to the people. We know that only by the action of Congress can his administrative powers be limited or directed.

Naturally he, as in the case of any other administrative officer, opposes action by Congress. But Congress must, for the general welfare of the people, and not for General Hershey, act upon this legislation and reach a conclusion upon it.

General Hershey has not and apparently will not by his own act issue a rule against drafting fathers. They continue to be drafted. Then he comes to us and says he opposes the legislation because he can issue such a rule. But he does not do it. We are interested in what he does and not what he can do.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. It is, of course, the responsibility of Congress, under our Constitution, to raise and maintain the Army of the United States. The fact that the Army has refused to listen to the wishes of the people and to the strong argument which has been made why servicemen who are fathers should be released certainly, it seems to me, is abundant reason for the Congress itself taking up and debating this question at the earliest possible moment, instead of allowing it to lie in the committee.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I appreciate the remarks of the able Senator from Indiana. Of course, it is the duty of Congress to consider and decide this question. It has been delayed too long. The joint resolution should be passed before the Christmas holiday is taken.

There are sitting over on the Pacific islands thousands of servicemen, many of them fathers, who desire to return home. All of them who can be returned should be brought back, and I submit that when a man who has children asks that he be returned home, the fact that he is a father should be made the basis for favorable action.

Mr. President, we will not return this country to a reconverted, peacetime basis with homes unsupported and the fathers absent from them. There is no sentimentality about this. There is a real, genuine, factual need in this country that these men be brought back to care for their children and their families. Congress is keeping them in the Army unless it passes a measure of this kind, which makes fatherhood a ground for discharge.

Now I wish to read a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Gates. The letter is dated December 4, addressed to Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and reads:

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Senate Joint Resolution 116, 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, was referred by your committee to the Navy Department with request for report thereon.

The purpose of the proposed resolution is to provide for the prompt discharge of members of the military and naval forces having one child or more to whom he bears a bona fide family relationship. It would not apply to any person volunteering into the service subsequent to September 1945.

That date should be October 6, 1945, I may say.

The resolution is intended to supplement existing demobilization programs. Persons covered by the bill would not be subject to the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

The Navy Department is generally opposed to the proposed joint resolution and similar bills providing for the discharge of particular categories of personnel. The discharge formula now in operation is considered equitable when the over-all picture of the many groups of naval personnel is borne in mind. The Department is mindful of its dual responsibility of maintaining sufficient personnel to permit the efficient functioning of the Naval Establishment and of its duty to demobilize as rapidly as possible, and on as fair a basis as possible. The discharge plan is under continuous surveillance and releases are being effected as fast as the operational situation and the availability of facilities will permit. The Navy intends to continue in its efforts to expedite the tremendous demobilization task with all possible zeal.

It is noted that the bill requires the discharge of every member of the military and naval forces of the United States who has, on the date of the enactment of the joint resolution, one child or more. The only exception to this is "anyone who has volunteered into the Army or Navy subsequent to September 1945."

October 6 would be the correct date.

This is inartistically worded because the requirement for discharge refers to all in the "military and naval forces" and the exception applies to volunteers into the Army and Navy. Thus, for example, the exception would not include the Coast Guard. Furthermore, this formula disregards the desires of particular individuals to stay in the armed forces. Under the language above, the only way in which the armed forces could retain an individual with children who wanted to remain would be to discharge him and reenlist him, and even this construction is subject to some doubt.

Let me digress at that point in the reading to say to the Senate that as the joint resolution is now written no such point as that can be raised against it. A serviceman who is a father would not be automatically discharged. First, he himself would have to apply for his own discharge. Secondly, it would be necessary to discharge a man in order that he might reenlist. He could stay in because only by his own request could he be released from the service.

I continue to read from the letter:

No comment is made concerning the provision relating to the prohibitions against inducting bona fide fathers, as it is considered to be a question which should be submitted to the Director of Selective Service for comment and recommendation.

For the foregoing reasons, the Navy Department recommends against the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 116.

The Navy Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

A. L. GATES,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. President, I wish to say that every particular criticism pointed at the joint resolution has been answered and met. The changes have been made and are shown in italics, and if the criticisms pointed out in particularity by the Acting Secretary of the Navy are still his criticisms, then he should have none to the joint resolution as it is now before the Committee on Military Affairs and attempted now to be brought before the Senate, with the possible exception that the services want to fix their own categories of discharge. Of course, they want to fix them. They want to be left alone to do that. But we have a duty on the subject which we should perform regardless of the desires of an administrative officer.

Again that raises the question: Are we going to listen to the desires of the executive department? We should be advised by them; but are we going to listen to their expressions of desire when we know or feel in our hearts that they are doing something wrong, something which is detrimental to the general well-being of the people of this country? I say we must act on our own judgment, and that is the reason why we must act.

Mr. President, there is a similar letter from the Secretary of War. I shall not read it, because it is very similar to the letter from the Navy Department, with a few changes. At this point I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the War Department may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., December 3, 1945.
Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS,
Chairman, Committee on
Military Affairs,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: The War Department is opposed to the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 116, Seventy-ninth Congress, 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.

Section 1 of Senate Joint Resolution 116 would require the discharge, as rapidly as facilities will permit, of every member of the military and naval forces, or any component of either, who has, on the date of enactment, one or more children with whom he maintains, or but for his service would maintain, a bona fide family relationship in his home. Persons who have voluntarily enlisted in the Army or Navy since September —, 1945, would be excluded. Sections 2 and 3 of the proposed joint resolution provide that the discharges directed by section 1 shall be in addition to those made on other grounds or bases; and that persons discharged under the provisions thereof shall receive an honorable discharge unless found not entitled thereto for cause. Section 4 of the joint resolution provides that after the date of enactment no person who has one or more children with whom he maintains, or would but for his service maintain, a bona fide family relationship in his home shall be inducted under the

Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The terms of Senate Joint Resolution 116 are very broad and, with the single exception of those voluntarily enlisted since September —, 1945, would require the discharge of all personnel having children with whom they maintain, or would maintain, a bona fide family relationship. This would include officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, as well as both commissioned and enlisted personnel of the National Guard, Officers' Reserve Corps, and Enlisted Reserve Corps. It is also to be noted that the resolution would require the discharge of men undergoing hospitalization, awaiting trial by courts martial, or serving sentences adjudged by courts martial.

After long and careful consideration of the numerous possible factors involved, the War Department evolved the point system for the discharge or release of personnel from active duty. The factors which were included were (a) length of service, (b) length of service overseas, (c) awards and decorations, including those for participation in battles and campaigns, and (d) number of children—12 points for each dependent child. At the present time, enlisted men with 60 points or over are eligible for discharge.

Effective December 1, enlisted personnel with 55 points, as computed on September 2, 1945, will be eligible for discharge. In addition, those with (1) 4 years or more of honorable military service or (2) with three or more children under 18 years of age dependent upon them for support will be eligible. Previously established factors for the discharge of enlisted men will also remain in effect, under which an enlisted man is eligible for discharge if he (1) is 38 years of age, regardless of the period of his military service, or (2) is between 35 and 38 years of age and has completed 2 years of honorable military service, or (3) has been a prisoner of war and/or escapee out of United States control for 60 days or more. Personnel in this country who are no longer needed and who do not qualify for overseas duty are also discharged even though they do not have enough points for release under the point system. With the exception of personnel possessing certain scarce or critical skills, no enlisted men with 36 points, or 21 or more months of honorable service since September 16, 1940, will be sent overseas for permanent duty. Enlisted men with 50 or more points, now on furlough in the United States from stations overseas, are being discharged as they report back to their places of duty.

The system of release of officers from the military service is substantially similar to that provided for enlisted men.

At the present time separations from the Army are being made at the rate of over 1,000,000 men per month. Relatively few fathers are now being inducted (less than 3 percent in October), and the number of persons in the military service who have children is being reduced rapidly. On September 1, 1945, there were about 1,800,000 such individuals in service, and it is now estimated that figure will be reduced to approximately 1,000,000 by December 1, 1945. Enactment of this resolution would require the immediate discharge of approximately 22 percent of the individuals in the Army on December 1, 1945, many of them ahead of others having longer service and higher scores. Such action would result in the disintegration of the Army to an extent making it questionable whether it could fulfill its mission, either at home or abroad. Moreover, the enactment of this resolution would disorganize existing administrative procedures for the separation of personnel. In consequence, the rate of separations would be reduced, rather than accelerated, and many individuals who are eligible for separation under existing procedures would be required to remain in the Army longer.

Section 3 of the proposed joint resolution would effect no change in present policies of the War Department. All men discharged are given an honorable discharge unless, for cause shown, they are found not to be entitled thereto.

Section 4 of the proposed joint resolution would have a relatively limited effect. Men with three or more children are no longer being inducted, and those now in the service will be eligible for discharge on December 1, 1945. As indicated above, less than 3 percent of those inducted in October 1945 had any dependent children.

The War Department is unable to determine the fiscal effects of the proposed joint resolution.

For the foregoing reasons, the War Department recommends that Senate Joint Resolution 116 be not favorably considered.

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

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The letter written by the Secretary of War does point out this criticism:

The terms of Senate Joint Resolution 116 are very broad and, with the single exception of those voluntarily enlisted since September 1945—

It should be October 6, 1945—

would require the discharge of all personnel having children with whom they maintain, or would maintain, a bona fide family relationship. This would include officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, as well as both commissioned and enlisted personnel of the National Guard, Officers' Reserve Corps, and Enlisted Reserve Corps. It is also to be noted that the resolution would require the discharge of men undergoing hospitalization, awaiting trial by courts martial, or serving sentences adjudged by courts martial.

That criticism, Mr. President, has been met, as will be seen, in the language of the bill which is italicized. I repeat, in the first place an individual can be discharged only upon application. In the second place, if a man is charged with an offense the joint resolution does not apply to him. If he is serving sentence under conviction by courts martial, of course the joint resolution does not apply to him, and it is so specifically stated.

Mr. President, I desire to accord full time and opportunity to those who will oppose this joint resolution, with the hope that they will permit this matter to come to a vote. The able chairman of the Military Affairs Committee rose earlier today when he believed that the ruling of the Chair would automatically place this joint resolution upon the calendar, and he said at that time that if I could consume the whole morning hour that I would gain my objective. That was a misunderstanding of the ruling of the Chair. I want to say, as I have said before, that I would not do that. I will divide the time evenly so that the opposition may be heard. And now I am going to ask the opposition to take the same view and permit this matter to come to a vote before 2 o'clock when the morning hour closes. For that reason I am cutting my remarks short today so that the opposition may have even more time than I have consumed in presenting this cause.

I appeal, Mr. President, to the Members of the Senate to consider this question

seriously, and to say whether or not for the welfare of this country they are going to permit the armed services to continue to draft men who have children and to hold them in the service.

I have here, and I wish I had time to read them, a number of letters from men in the service setting forth that they are stationed on far-away islands in the Pacific, in most instances doing nothing, while their wives are writing them of distressing conditions at home, of need and difficulty in meeting the costs of living. Those men want to return to their children. Regardless of their feelings about the matter, but solely from the viewpoint of their Government and the welfare of this country, they ought to be back here supporting their families because their case is somewhat different from that of men without dependents. A man with a family must come back to the United States and take up his work again, not only to make a day-to-day living, but to try to make a secure position for himself and his family, and in order that he may provide for his children the comforts and advantages which we feel that every child in America should have. A child cannot obtain such advantages without the guidance of a father in the home.

So at this time, Mr. President, without going further into the subject, I yield the floor for the purpose of permitting the opposition to speak on this question, with the hope that we may bring this matter to a vote and meet the issue squarely before 2 o'clock.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President—

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bilbo in the Chair). The clerk will call the roll.

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

Austin	Hill	Radcliffe
Ball	Hoey	Revercomb
Barkley	Huffman	Russell
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Brewster	Johnston, S. C.	Shpstead
Brooks	Kilgore	Smith
Bushfield	Knowland	Stanfil
Byrd	La Follette	Stewart
Capehart	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lucas	Taylor
Carville	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McClellan	Tobey
Connally	McKellar	Tunnell
Downey	McMahon	Tydings
Ellender	Maybank	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Mead	Wagner
Fulbright	Millikin	Walsh
Gossett	Mitchell	Wherry
Green	Moore	White
Gurney	Morse	Wiley
Hart	Murdock	Willis
Hatch	O'Daniel	Wilson
Hayden	O'Mahoney	Young
Hickenlooper	Pepper	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

LT. FRANK BURKE, RECIPIENT OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah has the floor.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SMITH. I wish to announce to the Senate that Lt. Frank Burke, of Jersey City, N. J., who yesterday was awarded by the President the Congressional Medal of Honor, is now in the Gallery. I am sure the Senate is pleased and honored to have him here today, with his family and friends. I understand that on last April 17, Lieutenant Burke, serving as a transport officer, started out to pick a forward motor pool site at Nuernberg, Germany, and wound up duelling the Nazi die-hard defenders with a light machine gun. I have learned that in face to face fighting at that time he shattered two counterattacks, resulting in the killing or wounding of some 40 Germans.

(Senators rose and applauded.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to 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.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 405) to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

PROHIBITION AGAINST DRAFTING OF MEN HAVING CHILDREN

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in beginning my brief remarks I wish to thank the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] for the courtesy he has shown me and, therefore, the committee, because the committee stand is what I wish to discuss in addressing myself to the question now before us. The Senator from West Virginia is one of the most consistently hard-working members of our committee, and whenever he makes a suggestion the committee gives it due consideration.

The matter before us is strictly a parliamentary question, insofar as the discussion today is concerned. For that reason, rather than for any other, I think I should be grateful to the Senator from West Virginia, because the question which I asked the Presiding Officer when he made a ruling in regard to the parliamentary situation resulted in having the Presiding Officer rule, if I correctly understood the ruling, in such a way as to change what is ordinarily the parliamentary process of the Senate, namely, that all Senators are given an opportunity to discuss any proposition. If it were possible for a Senator to get a measure in which he was interested before the Senate merely by consuming all the time

during the morning hour—as I understood the ruling of the Chair to suggest—of course the fundamentals of our parliamentary rules and procedure would be overcome.

Therefore, the question before us is a simple one, namely, whether the Military Affairs Committee shall be discharged from further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 116. Mr. President, yesterday I stated that that is a question for the Senate to decide. The Senator from West Virginia said that his objective is to give the Senate an opportunity to make a decision. He suggested that I allow the question to be voted on by the Senate. But the Senator's objective is more than he has stated, or else I do not understand him. Under the parliamentary situation, if the Military Affairs Committee is discharged, a resolution which has not been reported by the committee would be placed on the calendar for discussion and consideration by the Senate. That resolution would be considered on its merits by the Senate, and would be discussed by Senators without the resolution having had the advantage of committee consideration. It seems to me that the request which has been made is contrary to the fundamental procedure followed in transacting the business of the Senate and would, if it should become the practice of the Senate, result in much bad legislation.

Mr. President, I shall state the parliamentary situation. The objective of Senate Joint Resolution 116 is to prohibit the further drafting of fathers plus, of course, to lay down a policy with respect to a future drafting law, as well as to provide an arrangement whereby fathers who are now in the Army may be discharged if they so desire. When that question comes before the Senate, if the Military Affairs Committee decides that the resolution should be resisted, of course, I, as chairman of the committee, will try to defend the action of the committee as best I can. If Senate Resolution 207 prevails, and Senate Joint Resolution 116 is considered by the Senate without previous committee action having been taken, then I, like other Senators, will discuss the merits of the joint resolution at the proper time. I will either support or resist it on the basis of my own opinion, and not on the basis of committee action.

Mr. President, I believe that in a way I have covered the parliamentary situation as it exists.

In order that the RECORD may be made clear in regard to Senate Joint Resolution 116, in the event it comes directly before the Senate, and in order that Senators may have what information the committee has in regard to it, I shall read from a report to the committee which was made at the committee's request by the Secretary of War. Before doing so, out of fairness to the Senator from West Virginia, I must say that the report was submitted to the committee before the amendment suggested by the Senator to Senate Joint Resolution 116 was made. As I understand, if the Senate considers the resolution without committee action first having been taken, the Senator from West Virginia will

want us to consider his resolution as amended, instead of as he submitted it in the first instance.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The chairman of the committee will remember that the resolution was rejected with the amendments. The amendments were made before the committee took action on the resolution and rejected it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes, Mr. President; there is no question about that. The committee did not take action in regard to the motion to report the resolution either in its original or amended form.

Mr. President, in order that the Senate may have the information which the Secretary of War thought it was essential for the committee to have in regard to the joint resolution, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of the Secretary of War be printed in its entirety in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

DECEMBER 3, 1945.

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS,
Chairman, Committee on Military
Affairs, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: The War Department is opposed to the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 116, Seventy-ninth Congress, "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."

Section 1 of Senate Joint Resolution 116 would require the discharge, as rapidly as facilities will permit, of every member of the military and naval forces, or any component of either, who has, on the date of enactment, one or more children with whom he maintains, or but for his service would maintain, a bona fide family relationship in his home. Persons who have voluntarily enlisted in the Army or Navy since September —, 1945, would be excluded. Sections 2 and 3 of the proposed joint resolution provide that the discharges directed by section 1 shall be in addition to those made on other grounds or bases; and that persons discharged under the provisions thereof shall receive an honorable discharge unless found not entitled thereto for cause. Section 4 of the joint resolution provides that after the date of enactment no person who has one or more children with whom he maintains, or would but for his service maintain, a bona fide family relationship in his home shall be inducted under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 as amended.

The terms of Senate Joint Resolution 116 are very broad and, with the single exception of those voluntarily enlisted since September —, 1945, would require the discharge of all personnel having children with whom they maintain, or would maintain, a bona fide family relationship. This would include officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, as well as both commissioned and enlisted personnel of the National Guard, Officers' Reserve Corps, and Enlisted Reserve Corps. It is also to be noted that the resolution would require the discharge of men undergoing hospitalization, awaiting trial by courts martial, or serving sentences adjudged by courts martial.

After long and careful consideration of the numerous possible factors involved, the War Department evolved the point system for the discharge or release of personnel from active duty. The factors which were included were (a) length of service, (b) length of service overseas, (c) awards and decorations, including those for participation in battles and campaigns, and (d) number of

children—12 points for each dependent child. At the present time, enlisted men with 60 points or over are eligible for discharge.

Effective December 1, enlisted personnel with 55 points, as computed on September 2, 1945, will be eligible for discharge. In addition, those with (1) 4 years or more of honorable military service or (2) with 3 or more children under 18 years of age dependent upon them for support will be eligible. Previously established factors for the discharge of enlisted men will also remain in effect, under which an enlisted man is eligible for discharge if he (1) is 38 years of age, regardless of the period of his military service, or (2) is between 35 and 38 years of age and has completed 2 years of honorable military service, or (3) has been a prisoner of war and/or escapee out of United States control for 60 days or more. Personnel in this country who are no longer needed and who do not qualify for overseas duty are also discharged even though they do not have enough points for release under the point system. With the exception of personnel possessing certain scarce or critical skills, no enlisted man with 36 points, or 21 or more months of honorable service since September 16, 1940, will be sent overseas for permanent duty. Enlisted men with 50 or more points, now on furlough in the United States from stations overseas, are being discharged as they report back to their places of duty.

The system of release of officers from the military service is substantially similar to that provided for enlisted men.

At the present time separations from the Army are being made at the rate of over 1,000,000 men per month. Relatively few fathers are now being inducted (less than 3 percent in October), and the number of persons in the military service who have children is being reduced rapidly. On September 1, 1945, there were about 1,800,000 such individuals in service, and it is now estimated that figure will be reduced to approximately 1,000,000 by December 1, 1945. Enactment of this resolution would require the immediate discharge of approximately 22 percent of the individuals in the Army on December 1, 1945, many of them ahead of others having longer service and higher scores. Such action would result in the disintegration of the Army to an extent making it questionable whether it could fulfill its mission, either at home or abroad. Moreover, the enactment of this resolution would disorganize existing administrative procedures for the separation of personnel. In consequence, the rate of separations would be reduced, rather than accelerated, and many individuals who are eligible for separation under existing procedures would be required to remain in the Army longer.

Section 3 of the proposed joint resolution would effect no change in present policies of the War Department. All men discharged are given an honorable discharge unless, for cause shown, they are found not to be entitled thereto.

Section 4 of the proposed joint resolution would have a relatively limited effect. Men with three or more children are no longer being inducted, and those now in the service will be eligible for discharge on December 1, 1945. As indicated above, less than 3 percent of those inducted in October 1945 had any dependent children.

The War Department is unable to determine the fiscal effects of the proposed joint resolution.

For the foregoing reasons, the War Department recommends that Senate Joint Resolution 116 be not favorably considered.

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

Sincerely yours,

ROBT. P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I wish to read only one paragraph of the letter.

At the present time separations from the Army are being made at the rate of over 1,000,000 men per month.

The President's message this morning said that separations from the armed services were being made at the rate of a million and a half a month.

Relatively few fathers are now being inducted (less than 3 percent in October), and the number of persons in the military service who have children is being reduced rapidly. On September 1, 1945, there were about 1,800,000 such individuals in service, and it is now estimated that figure will be reduced to approximately 1,000,000 by December 1, 1945.

This is the part of the letter which I think should be emphasized.

Enactment of this resolution would require the immediate discharge of approximately 22 percent—

AMENDMENT OF SECOND WAR POWERS ACT, 1942

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the pending resolution, Senate Resolution 207, under the practice of the Senate for many years, will be placed on the calendar, and the Chair now lays before the Senate the unfinished business, H. R. 4780, which will be stated by title by the Clerk.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4780), to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to discuss the pending business, which is the bill to extend the War Powers Act of 1942. The bill actually should be called a bill to promote reconversion and facilitate the return of military personnel to the United States.

The bill was passed by the House with certain amendments, came to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and there one amendment was adopted extending the period of the effectiveness of the War Powers Act from June 30, 1946, to December 31, 1946. However, in order to make it clear that the purpose of the administrative agency and the purpose of Congress is to continue—

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to proceed, I shall make a very brief statement, and shall not detain the Senate very long.

The committee amended the bill to provide an extension until the end of 1946 instead of until June 30, 1946, as provided in the bill as it passed the House. But in order that there might be no question as to the legislative intent, that it was the intention of Congress and the intention of the executive agency to lift all controls as rapidly as possible and to retain only such controls as may be necessary for reconversion, and for the preservation, I may almost say, of small businesses, the committee wrote into the report very specific statements. I wish

now to read to the Senate those statements, which will be found on the first page of the report on the bill:

It is understood by the committee in recommending the extension to December 31, 1946, instead of to June 30, 1946, as passed by the House, that it is the intention of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion and of the various agencies affected to lift all controls as rapidly as possible.

It is also understood by the committee that it will be the purpose of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion not to ask for another extension of the Second War Powers Act but, within the extended period provided by the pending act, to make specific recommendations to the Congress if future conditions should indicate that any controls should be maintained for a longer period. The Civilian Production Administration also gave assurance to the committee that industry committees would be consulted in all cases in which the extended powers are to be exercised.

Mr. President, this is not only a declaration of faith but it is the declaration of faith which can be sustained by a record of good works.

The evidence which was before the House committee at the time we began the hearing indicated—as I pointed out in the report—that the peak number of orders issued at any time during the war by the agencies which are affected by the bill was approximately 4,000, and that of these only about 220 were still in effect. However, I asked Mr. Klagsbrunn, the Deputy Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, to prepare an accurate statement, so that I might present it to the Senate, with respect to the lifting of controls and the reduction of personnel. The record is really, I think, rather surprising.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. I should like to ask the Senator if the controls released may not, under this extension, be reimposed. May not the orders which have been released now be reimposed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Technically, of course, they could be reimposed.

Mr. MOORE. And some of them have been reimposed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Some of them may have to be reimposed, but I think the record before the committee, as I shall show presently, is such as to allay all fears that that may be done. That is why I asked Mr. Klagsbrunn to give me a record of precisely what has been done in the lifting of controls.

The peak number of orders by the War Production Board and the Civilian Production Administration, as it is now called, amounted to just a little more than 700. On the 1st of December 1945 only 70 were still in effect.

The OPA had 16 orders and directives issued under the War Powers Act, and of these only 2 now remain.

The Office of Defense Transportation had 3,001 orders at the peak. There now remain only 5.

The Solid Fuels Administration had 13. There now remain only 6.

The Department of Agriculture had 94 basic orders and 194 suborders, of which only 43 basic orders remain, and 174 suborders, and of these 144 have been suspended.

So that the over-all picture with respect to the agencies affected by the bill is that the peak number of orders was 4,018, that there remain in effect 300, of which 144 have been suspended, leaving only 156.

Mr. President, when that is taken into consideration, in connection with the statements from Mr. Klagsbrunn which I quoted in the report, and the statement of Mr. Small, the Administrator of the Civilian Production Administration, I think there is quite sufficient to indicate that the purpose of the agencies affected is to continue to lift these controls just as rapidly as will be at all possible, and not to reinstate any unless in the public interest it is clearly necessary to do so.

Then let it be remembered that there has been written into the report, and stated by the representatives of the organization, that consultation will be had with industry representatives in every case with respect to any of these orders. This is the statement of Mr. Klagsbrunn, speaking for Mr. Snyder:

We believe we are working ourselves out of the war controls and out of the dislocations of the war emergency very quickly. * * * We are not saying that we want controls to go on indefinitely, or on into our domestic peace economy. It is only during the period in which we are correcting the dislocations of the war economy. * * *

If dislocation controls were necessary for a longer time, it would be for the Government to come up to Congress for those controls and ask for fresh legislation. It would not be a matter of continuation of a war control.

It is our view, as we have shown, we think, by our own actions in cutting out controls, that we should continue the same process in the elimination of the present controls over a reasonably short period.

Mr. Small made this statement in answer to interrogations by me, as I was presiding at the hearing:

Mr. SMALL. My own feeling is, Senator, I am a very strong advocate of the Government lifting these controls and setting industry free at the earliest possible moment. Every order and every control that we have on our books is reviewed frequently.

As a matter of fact, I go over every 2 or 3 days to find out, and to reinforce my own feeling, that this control and that control must be kept on. The burden of proof is on the man who wants to keep the control on the people, to say that this problem is so acute on this particular phase, whatever it is, that it is so acute that we must keep this on.

Mr. President, that is the clear tenor of the testimony, it is the clear tenor of the statement of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, and it is the clear tenor of the committee report. It is an expression of the legislative intent by Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming if it is fair to place the burden on the persons who want to keep the controls to show that conditions are so acute? Why is it not better to have the Congress the judge of that over a fairly short period? Why is it not better for that reason to leave

the date June 30, 1946, rather than to change it to December 31, 1946?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because of the conditions which I am about to explain with respect to certain items. Let me say, for example, that of the two orders which the OPA still has in effect one is on sugar and the other is on tires. Those are the only rationing orders which OPA still has in effect. With respect to sugar we all know that the supplies of sugar for continental United States have historically come principally from the Philippines and from Cuba. Some have come from Puerto Rico. Then we have had our own domestic production of cane and of sugar beets. The war cut off absolutely all importations of sugar from the Philippines, and there is no prospect that such importations may be restored within 6 months. To grow sugar in the Philippines for importation into the United States, it will be necessary to stabilize the economy in the Philippines, to plant the crop, to harvest the crop, to refine the sugar, or to send the raw sugar to the United States to be refined. So we are not going to be able to depend upon our historic source of supply for over 1,000,000 tons of sugar a year from the Philippines.

With respect to Cuba, as it has happened because, again, of the shipping situation, Cuba became the principal source for all the United Nations for their supplies of sugar. The Government of the United States bought the entire Cuban crop for distribution, a part of it to us, a part of it for war purposes, for various kinds of manufacture, and a part for exportation to our allies. Let it be remembered that our entire beet sugar producing area was shut off from the Allies, except that from the Irish Free State, where the cultivation of sugar beets was begun, recently, there was I think a little trickle into Great Britain. But our supply of sugar is short. There is no prospect of it being brought up within the period of extension to June 30, 1946.

So I say to the Senator from Massachusetts, in order that the people of Massachusetts, as well as the people of Wyoming, may have an equitable distribution of the available sugar supplies the President's power ought to be extended.

With respect to tires, again we are dependent either upon synthetic rubber or upon imports of raw rubber from the Dutch East Indies and from Malaya. Is it necessary for me to point out that rubber is a commodity in short supply. Is it necessary for me to point out the unlikelihood that the Malay Peninsula and the Dutch East Indies may recover from the ravages of war in time to export rubber before the expiration of 6 months in sufficient amount to enable us to provide the raw rubber, the natural rubber, which every expert tells us is necessary to make synthetic rubber really usable? A certain percentage of raw rubber, natural rubber, is necessary to get the best results from synthetic rubber at the present state of the development of the art.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask the Senator the same question in another way?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Ah, now the Senator is coming back to his Massachusetts

training and wants to ask the question in two or three ways. I was born there.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And we are always glad to have the Senator come back there.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Someone has said that the way a Yankee always answers a question is by asking another.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In the future when I ask a question of the Senator from Wyoming I shall make no preface to my remarks.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is asking the question of a transplanted Yankee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. All the other price controls of OPA will expire on June 30, 1946. How could it do any harm to have these two items with relation to priorities come up when the whole OPA question is discussed next spring?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They will come up inevitably when the OPA question is discussed next spring. When the Committee on Banking and Currency undertakes next year to pass upon the life of OPA it will then decide the question, and if the Committee on Banking and Currency should then determine that the life of OPA should be terminated, it will have the power to do so. Nothing in this bill prevents it. If it should then be the determination of the Senate and the House that rationing should be cut off, why the power is precisely there. It must be remembered that the Committee on the Judiciary is not attempting to invade the jurisdiction of other legislative committees which would normally pass upon the various subjects which are contained in this bill. And nothing in this extension would prevent the Congress or any committee of the Congress from recommending the termination of OPA powers or any other powers.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Assuming that this bill is passed, extending the Second War Powers Act until December 31, 1946, even though the Congress and the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency should consider the OPA question next summer, and even if Congress should refuse to extend the OPA law, the powers herein granted would still be in effect, and under the powers herein granted the President could issue executive orders continuing these controls irrespective of whether the Price Control Act was continued or not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The power of the President to issue executive orders is not affected by this bill at all. That is something which is not contained in it. I submit to the Senator that to assume in the face of the marvelous record of lifting controls that it would be the purpose of the President, against every declaration he has made, to undertake a program of reinstituting controls would be, would to the least be, a most unrealistic assumption.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am not assuming that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say again to the Senator that with the specific expression of legislative intent in the bill, I think

that every Member of this body may rest secure in the confident belief that the passage of this measure will only have the effect of allowing those who are handling various bureaus in good faith to continue to lift controls as rapidly as is possible in the public interest. In only a few instances are these controls necessary.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think the Senator gained the wrong impression from my question. I realize the necessity of the enactment of this measure to extend the powers proposed to be extended. I do not think we could at this time by any means safely withdraw them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to hear the Senator say that. That was my own judgment, and that was the judgment of the committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think the present administration has certainly indicated by its actions that it intends and desires to discontinue all these controls just as rapidly as possible. That is its record up to date. I have no doubt of the intent to continue to pursue that policy. The only question I was raising was this: OPA expires in June 1946. If we adopt the committee amendment we will extend the time to December 1, 1946, and even though the Congress did not renew the OPA Act in June 1946, under these powers, if extended by the adoption of the amendment until that time, the President could by Executive order continue rationing of articles, irrespective of what action the Congress took concerning the OPA.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Whatever may be the legal situation, I think the Senator has correctly stated it. The realistic situation is quite the contrary. I say that if Congress should repeal the OPA, then the President would not attempt to set up the OPA again by Executive order.

I may say with respect to OPA as a whole now, not with respect to OPA as affected by this bill, that I sought to get the information on this subject, and it is a surprising, I think, and rather encouraging record which we have before us. On August 15, 1945, at the military termination of the Japanese War, the total number of persons on the OPA pay roll was 63,217, and the number of district offices was 93. On December 1 of this year the number of persons on the OPA pay roll has been reduced to 37,729, and the number of district offices had been reduced from 93 to 65.

In other words, without any suggestion from Congress, without any compulsion, the OPA has already closed 28 district offices, and has already laid off the pay roll almost 30,000 persons.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator name any important object on which price control has been removed in any way?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But price control is not affected by this bill.

Mr. TAFT. No. I maintain that priorities are inevitably and inextricably confused with price control, but together they form the method of controlling industry in the United States. The two should be considered together, it seems to me. Take the question of meat. Ra-

tioning of meat was removed, but price control was maintained, which, to my mind, encouraged the black market in meat beyond the hope of recovery. I believe that rationing of meat should have been retained, and that price control should have been abolished.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator will grant, will he not, that that is not relevant to this discussion.

Mr. TAFT. I think it is relevant to this discussion, because OPA will end the 1st of next July. In connection with the question of what controls ought to be continued, both priorities and price control should be considered at one time. The Price Control Administration is already engaged in propaganda to continue its services and powers over price control for another year. I believe that both in this field and in the field of price control it may be necessary to continue some powers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe the Senator and I are in agreement.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator has cited the case of rubber. I believe that very likely it will be necessary to continue controls with respect to certain commodities; but merely because it is necessary to continue controls with respect to certain commodities I do not think we need to continue indefinitely powers over all industry in the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I quite agree; and the committee has made it clear that there will be no indefinite control. When the Senator tells the Senate, as he has just done, that in his opinion rationing of meat should have been repealed, but that price control should have been retained, he makes an argument for the continuation of the power of OPA to ration meat.

Mr. TAFT. Exactly; and I am in favor of continuing that power until the 1st of next July. I believe that by May—that is a long time from now, and things are changing rapidly under present conditions—we may find it to be unnecessary to continue any powers, or necessary to continue only certain powers. But the Senator justifies the bill on the ground of sugar, and on the ground of rubber. I should say that it could be justified on the ground of building materials, which he has not mentioned.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have been interrupted. I have not been able to go all the way down the line.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator would continue indefinite powers over all products. It seems to me that those who ask for the continuation of these extraordinary powers should be asked the question, With respect to what products is it necessary to apply controls? A continuation of the powers ought to be limited to the particular commodities of which there is a great shortage, or commodities which in some way are affected by the war condition. The door ought not to be wide open for the Government to step into any field it may decide to invade.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator that the committee has obtained a complete meeting of the minds, and has made its declaration that there will not again be a request for the extension of the War Powers Act.

Mr. TAFT. The committee had so stated; but there is nothing, so far as I can see, which would prevent the President from calling Congress back a year from now and saying, "We must renew these powers." When the administrators are reminded of what they previously stated, they will say, "We were wrong. We are sorry." That will be the end of it. Promises a year in advance to abandon powers at the end of the year are not worth the paper on which they are written. Such promises do not amount to anything. When we call attention to them a year later, we are told, "We were wrong. We have changed our minds. Conditions are different from what we thought they were going to be." I do not believe that we can justify a continuation of these powers on the basis of some alleged promise of an administrator who may be out of office tomorrow. I do not believe that we can justify the extension on the theory that we are not to have another extension.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I cannot escape the conclusion that the Senator is conjuring up unrealistic fears in the face of a record which is not to be denied—the record that of 4,018 orders and directives, all have been withdrawn but 156, including those which have been suspended.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, many of those orders were orders directly concerned with the production of war material. They were suspended. There is no longer any reason for them. But I venture to say to the Senator that just as the control over building material was taken off and later restored, we shall see a whole series of restorations of priority orders. While these powers were intended only for war, they are very valuable in connection with any control which anyone wishes to impose in time of peace. Many special interests will be urging that such controls be reimposed. Businessmen will be here urging that they be reimposed. Labor unions will wish certain controls reimposed. It seems to me that we ought to continue the powers only with respect to certain commodities which we feel are affected by a direct hangover from war, commodities with respect to which the powers ought to be continued. Since we are not taking that course now, I think we ought to do it next May. I do not believe that we ought to extend the powers for more than 6 months, so that we may have an opportunity to make a selective extension, as I think we should do in the case of price control when that question arises.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, the Senator's position is very clear.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska whose voice I heard first, and to whom I have become accustomed to listening.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator is most kind. I know with what zeal the distinguished Senator is supporting the proposed legislation. I do not wish to participate in the debate at this time, because I desire to listen to the entire statement of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

I believe that he ought to make an explanation as to the committee recommendations. I should like to have the RECORD show that I was not in attendance in the committee at the time the question of the extension of the War Powers Act was before the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I was engaged in the work of the Small Business Committee, attempting to obtain clothing for our GI men. I appreciate the work which the Senator has done. It is very important that the amendment to the War Powers Act be passed before the end of this session. I believe that the Senator even wrote the report alone.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wrote the report, if I may plead guilty to it.

Mr. WHERRY. The point I wish to make is that the entire membership of the Judiciary Committee was not in attendance. Some of us could not be present. I should like to have the RECORD show that while I appreciate the work of the distinguished Senator who is now presenting the legislation, yet I am not in accord with the proposal to extend the act for 1 year. If I had been in attendance at the committee meetings I would have voted accordingly.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I desire to ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming if later in his remarks he will make some statement with respect to the necessity of prolonging the extension of the powers for longer than 6 months. The House provision calls for an extension for 6 months. Many businessmen have told me that they did not consider 6 months to be sufficient time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct. That was the understanding.

Mr. MAYBANK. I also wish to ask the Senator—perhaps it may not be relevant to the present discussion—if he will discuss the impression made upon the committee by those in charge of the administration of the act in connection with the attempt to make certain adjustments of situations which had previously been called to their attention.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator will very well remember that he came to the committee with two representatives of the cotton processors. There was discussed in the committee an amendment which those gentlemen intended to offer to the committee, but the discussion proceeded in such a satisfactory way between those gentlemen and Mr. Smalley, Director of the Civil Production Administration, that the sponsors of the amendment withdrew the amendment. They stated that they would not ask the committee to consider it, and that they were completely satisfied with the assurances which they had received of consultation with the industry itself.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator. I should like to ask the Senator further

if he does not believe that the same thing might happen in many other instances when such conditions are called to the attention of those administering the law.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure it will; and I will say that if it did not happen I would be one of the first to take the floor and denounce those who failed to carry out the clear intent of Congress. But I do not believe that will be necessary.

Mr. President, let me briefly run over all the titles covered by the bill. It must be remembered that the War Powers Act, when originally presented, covered a very broad field, and several amendments were inserted on the floor. Some of them had to do with controls. Some of them had to do with assistance to our military forces, and so forth.

The first title deals with the emergency powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission over motor and water carriers, and the like. As indicated, the Office of Defense Transportation now has only five orders in existence. I believe one of them has to do with air transport. But this provision also deals with authority to bring back to the United States in the most expeditious manner the military personnel who are scattered all over the world. The War Shipping Administration, which is covered by this provision, has special problems, in connection with which it is felt that these powers should be continued.

Title II is an amendment of the act of July 2, 1917, dealing with the acquisition and disposition of property. Under this provision of the law, as originally adopted, the War Department, the Navy Department, and other departments had the right actually to seize and take possession of property, both real and personal, before condemnation proceedings had been instituted and completed. That provision is repealed by the bill which is now before the Senate. The power to seize property before condemnation is completely withdrawn. The only thing which is left is the power to dispose of property already taken over. That is why I call the measure a reversion act. It makes it possible for the War Department and the Navy Department, for example, to lease real property and plants which they have, which are necessary to be kept in standby condition. Without this provision the War Department, for example, would be governed by another law—one which authorizes the making of leases; but a lease issued under such a law would have to contain a clause giving the Secretary the power to terminate the lease at will. Of course, civilian industry cannot be built up by the issuance of leases which are terminable at will by the Secretary of War. Under the power granted by the bill he would have the right to issue a lease for 5 years, thereby giving the confidence, the certainty, and the security which are necessary if reversion is to be brought about. There would also be authority, for example, to relocate pipe lines and water lines—an authority which would expire if this law expired. Clearly, that is a power which should not expire on the 30th of June. It will be physically impossible for the Army and the Navy to dispose within 6 months

of the properties which they have thus acquired. Why, then, should not we grant the extension for a full year which the committee has recommended? It is a grant of power which is wholly in the interest of reversion.

Title III has to do with priorities powers. That is the only question which has been discussed thus far; and since there has been some discussion of it, I shall pass it for the moment, and shall return to it later.

Title IV has to do with the purchase by the Federal Reserve banks of Government obligations. Until 1935 the Federal Reserve banks had the right to make direct purchases from the Treasury of obligations of the Government. That right was changed by the law of 1935. The War Powers Act restored the power, but it placed a limitation of \$5,000,000,000 upon the amount of Government securities which could be held at any one time by the Federal Reserve banks. The record under that war power shows that the largest amount ever held at any one time was less than \$1,400,000,000.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. If that is true and if we have gone through the war without having the Federal Reserve System purchase, under the powers which are proposed to be extended, more Government securities than the amount mentioned by the Senator, what is the reason for continuing the maximum at \$5,000,000,000?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because the House of Representatives considered only the extension of the power, and no one brought up the question of the amount; and in the Senate committee no one suggested any change in the amount.

Speaking for myself, I would say that it is probable that this power is more necessary now than it was during the war period. Witness the fact that the sale of the last Government bond issue has been very much slower than the sale of any of the preceding issues. Today the national debt is greater than it has been at any previous time. The national debt is still rising. The Senator may remember that on the floor of the Senate when the tax bill was under consideration I objected to cutting down the Government's tax receipts by approximately \$6,000,000,000 at the same time we were trying to sell \$11,000,000,000 worth of debt.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the Senator will further yield, let me say I thought he was most correct in the position he took on that point.

As I understand the powers which are granted to the Federal Reserve Board under the measure now being discussed, they have nothing whatever to do with the conduct of Government bond-sale drives, such as the one which is now coming to an end.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; certainly not. But I think it is of the utmost importance that when any one of the innumerable issues of Government securities which are outstanding comes to its end and must be refinanced, the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve

banks shall have authority to step in and purchase them.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am yielding to the Senator from Utah. When he concludes I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, without desiring to have the discussion continued unduly, I should like to clarify in my own mind this point: As I understand the power under consideration—the authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase Government obligations, subject to the limitation that not more than \$5,000,000,000 worth of Government securities may be held at any one time by the Federal Reserve banks—that matter involves the financing of the Government at a time when it is anticipating the receipt of several billion dollars in taxes. The taxes may not come in as rapidly as is anticipated, and because of that the Treasury may have to resort to the procedure referred to, in order to tide it over for a very brief period of time, in anticipation of taxes. Is not that the primary purpose of the proposed extension of authority, rather than to have anything to do with the sale of Government bonds during the bond-sale drives?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course it has nothing to do with the sale of bonds. I mentioned the sale of bonds and I mentioned the national debt merely to illustrate the fact that today the fiscal condition of the country is immeasurably worse than it was when this power was first granted.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is what prompted my question.

Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me further, I wish to ask another question. Suppose Congress approves the proposed loan of \$4,400,000,000 to Great Britain—Great Britain.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, did the Senator say a loan to "Great Britain"?

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, the word "billion" is so commonly used nowadays that I was very close to saying it. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, under the powers proposed to be extended, would it not be possible for the Federal Reserve System to finance the entire loan to the British Government?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I confess that the Senator is getting a little beyond my depth. I will say that the loan to Great Britain cannot be made, in the first place, without the approval of the Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the United States Government should issue securities for the purpose of effectuating that loan, certainly under these powers the Federal Reserve banks could purchase those securities. But my understanding of the loan is that it will constitute a credit in the Treasury of the United States upon which Great Britain will draw, and that there is not the faintest prospect that if Congress approves such a loan, it will all be made at any one time.

Several Senators addressed the Chair,

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I still yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wish to ask one more question, Mr. President. It is my opinion that under the extension of powers which it is proposed to grant to the Federal Reserve System, the entire British war loan could be financed. I do not know at the present time whether it should be done, but I invite the attention of the Senate, and of the Senator from Wyoming in particular, to the fact that this is a very convenient method and procedure on the part of the Federal Reserve System of financing great loans such as is now being contemplated in regard to Great Britain.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Inasmuch as the loan will necessarily have to be referred to Congress for its approval, I assume that the bill or the joint resolution which will constitute the approval will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency of which the Senator from Utah is a very distinguished and able member.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In that committee it will be possible for the Senator from Utah, as well as other members of the committee, to offer amendments in respect to the loan if, indeed, the committee approves the loan.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming is dealing with the subject of extending this extraordinary power which has been given, in effect, to the Federal Reserve Board, in order to force \$5,000,000,000 of Government securities on the Federal Reserve banks regardless of whether they want them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The power really should not be characterized as an extraordinary one, because such was the power of the Federal Reserve banks until 1935. So there is nothing extraordinary about it except in its magnitude.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but in 1935 such power was not in the Federal Reserve Board. Prior to that time the Federal Reserve banks were independent. In 1935 the open-market committee was appointed. Power was given to say to the Federal Reserve banks, "You must buy Government bonds in the open market" or, "You will be restrained from buying bonds in the open market." When that power was granted it was expressly provided that it should extend only to the right of compelling the Federal Reserve banks to buy bonds in the open market.

As I see it, Mr. President, the only possible restraint on the Government to issue paper money is in the \$5,000,000,000 limit. Of course, while that limit exists, the power is not entirely unlimited. At one time we tried to place a limit of \$2,000,000,000, and 30-day paper. That effort was defeated, and ultimately a five-billion-dollar limit was established.

I do not object to continuing the power for only 6 months, but there is a movement under way to make it permanent, and to that I strenuously object. At the present time I do not think it constitutes a sufficiently important factor to warrant amending the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator's opinion is the same as mine, and it illustrates a fundamental proposition. There can be no grant of power, however small or great it may be, which is not open to abuse. It has been said that from the day the Constitution was ratified, the President of the United States had more power than had most monarchs. But the history of our Government has not been a history of the abuse of power by the President. In carrying on the war we granted extraordinary powers of the greatest breadth to the Army, to the Navy, and to the civilian agencies. The great glory of our country, Mr. President, and the great glory of our system, lies in the fact that those powers were not abused. Of course, there were times when the exercise of power had a very disadvantageous effect upon individuals. One of the reasons why I stand here, and why I stood in the committee, advocating the extension of the powers is because I can point to instances showing that these powers which were used for the purpose of carrying on the war can now be used for the purpose of reestablishing business enterprise which suffered by reason of the necessary exercise of the power while the war was in progress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if I heard correctly the Senator from Utah, he said that the purpose of this method of financing the Treasury is to cover the deficits which will continue until taxes can be collected. So long as we are operating at a deficit, and do not balance our Budget, we will never bring about the result to which the Senator has referred. In other words, there will always be a deficit, and the taxes collected will not be sufficient to cover the loan.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, allow me to interrupt the Senator and say that he has not stated the real purpose. I will read from the testimony of the expert of the Federal Reserve bank. What the Senator states as a possibility is not likely to occur.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts took issue with me in my explanation, and said that what I stated was not the purpose of the extension of this power. I took it upon myself, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, to interrogate the expert who was put on the telephone as a result of a call which I made to the Federal Reserve Board during the consideration of the bill. I very carefully framed my question in order to find out the real purpose. I will state very frankly to the Senator that the explanation which I received was that the essential purpose of the extension of this power was the very purpose which I have explained, and that the power had been exercised almost primarily for the purpose of financing the Treasury over periods of deficits in anticipation of tax receipts.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should not have said that it was the only purpose.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the only purpose in granting this power is to finance the Treasury over a short period of time in anticipation of the collection of taxes, I absolutely have no objection to it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator permit me to show what the purpose is,

as stated in the words of the expert who testified? I do not know much about this matter except what I read in the testimony, and what I heard from the witnesses who appeared before the committee.

The testimony of Mr. Goldenweiser was—

Mr. MURDOCK. From what is the Senator about to read?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am about to read from page 32 of the House hearings.

The testimony to which I refer reads as follows:

Mr. E. A. GOLDENWEISER. I am E. A. Goldenweiser, economic adviser to the Federal Reserve System. Since we have a public debt of \$260,000,000,000, there will be many occasions when much of it has to be refunded. The Treasury has to make estimates of the amount of revenue that it will get on a certain day, and in the very uncertain conditions that are going to prevail it could easily miss its guess by a few hundreds of millions, or even by a few billion dollars, and in that case the Treasury would find itself in a hard-pressed position for a short time in meeting this delay, even during the period while the checks go through the process of collection.

In a period of this sort it is a great convenience for the Treasury to overdraw its account on the Federal Reserve, which is what these certificates amount to in the final analysis. It is the authority to the Treasury to overdraw its account for a short time in conditions where their miscalculations or other unforeseen elements in revenues are such that they find themselves short of funds for a few days.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think that what Mr. Goldenweiser has stated is what I probably could not explain as well as I should be able to do.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is always able to make himself understood.

Mr. MURDOCK. When I made my telephone call I asked for Mr. Goldenweiser and I was given to understand that he was in New York at that time. His very able assistant, however, was put on the telephone and his explanation was almost identical, I might say, with what Mr. Goldenweiser stated, except that he stressed the fact that the Government, in anticipating tax revenues, might find itself, as Mr. Goldenweiser stated before the committee, in difficulty and that the method under discussion was a very convenient one for taking the securities of the Government, depositing them in the Federal Reserve banks, and thereby establishing demand deposits. I hope that the use of this method will be limited to that purpose rather than to have an extension of present functions for the purpose of financing a large loan to Great Britain, or to any other country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I hope that the Committee on Banking and Currency will undertake to see that this method is not used to finance loans when the loan bill comes before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to finish the question I desired to propound. The sales referred to are direct sales from the Treasury to the Federal Reserve banks. The interest rates are set as a closed transaction; they are not set by the open market.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There was testimony before one of the committees,

which I have read, to the effect that one of the problems under the national housing bill, which was introduced a few days ago, the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, was that the interest rates would be so low that they might affect insurance premiums, because the companies would have to charge more. Therefore the witness testifying questioned the bill setting interest rates so low.

If the Treasury and the Federal Reserve banks, in a closed transaction, not in the public market, set their interest rates, it may affect interest rates everywhere, it may affect insurance premiums, and everything else of the same character. My question is, if that be true, or even half true, is it not better to limit the proposed act to 6 months, and let us look it over again next June?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I personally doubt that that is necessary, because the past is the guaranty of the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record at this point the table which I now hand to the reporter, showing holdings by the Federal Reserve banks of special short-term Treasury certificates purchased directly from the Treasury since March 1942.

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

Holdings by the Federal Reserve banks of special short-term Treasury certificates purchased directly from the Treasury since March 1942

[In millions of dollars]		Amount
1942:		
	June 16.....	58
	June 19.....	70
	June 20.....	47
	June 22.....	34
	June 23.....	94
	Sept. 15.....	324
	Sept. 16.....	189
	Sept. 17.....	286
	Sept. 18.....	76
	Sept. 19.....	53
	Nov. 27.....	139
	Nov. 28.....	329
	Nov. 30.....	422
	Dec. 1.....	98
	Dec. 10.....	16
	Dec. 15.....	145
1943:		
	Jan. 29.....	115
	Jan. 30.....	202
	Mar. 2.....	3
	Mar. 4.....	174
	Mar. 5.....	354
	Mar. 6.....	543
	Mar. 8.....	591
	Mar. 9.....	648
	Mar. 10.....	632
	Mar. 11.....	790
	Mar. 12.....	940
	Mar. 13.....	1,043
	Mar. 15.....	1,302
	Mar. 16.....	1,250
	Mar. 17.....	981
	Mar. 18.....	836
	Mar. 19.....	778
	Mar. 20.....	768
	Mar. 22.....	603
	Mar. 23.....	700
	Mar. 24.....	512
	Mar. 25.....	432
	Mar. 26.....	384
	Mar. 27.....	304
	Mar. 29.....	104
	Mar. 30.....	40
	June 15.....	805
	June 16.....	659

1943—Continued	Amount
June 17.....	350
June 18.....	256
June 19.....	212
Sept. 8.....	11
Sept. 9.....	126
Sept. 10.....	243
Sept. 11.....	246
Sept. 13.....	214
Sept. 14.....	179
Sept. 15.....	424
Sept. 16.....	258
1945: Mar. 15.....	4

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will ask the Senator to pardon me just a moment. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] was on his feet several moments ago and I could not yield to him at that time, and should like to extend the courtesy to him now.

APPOINTMENT OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES TO THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to be entirely fair to the Senator. I wish to present a conference report the consideration of which will take only 2 or 3 minutes, in my opinion. It is a report on the bill we passed a few days ago providing for the appointment of our representatives to the United Nations Organization. The first meeting will take place on the 10th of January, and the situation is rather unusual; so I ask the Senator whether he will not yield so that I may take his matter up.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to 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, 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 numbered 1; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "annum, as he shall determine, but the representative of the United States in the Economic and Social Council and in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations shall be appointed only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, except that the President may, without the advice and consent of the Senate, designate any officer of the United States to act, without additional compensation, as the representative of the United States in either such Council (A) at any specified meeting thereof in the absence or disability of the regular representative, or (B) in connection with a specified subject matter at any specified meeting of either such Council in lieu of the regular representative. The advice and consent of the Senate shall also be required for the appointment by the President of the representative of the United States in any commission that may be formed by the United

Nations with respect to atomic energy or in any other commission of the United Nations to which the United States is entitled to appoint a representative."

And the House agree to the same.

TOM CONNALLY,
ROBERT F. WAGNER,
ELBERT D. THOMAS,
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.,
A. H. VANDENBERG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

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

Managers on the Part of the House.

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

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

Mr. CONNALLY. Just one word, Mr. President. The only difference in disagreement was as to the matter of the confirmation of appointees to represent the United States. Additional language was added to the bill, as follows:

The advice and consent of the Senate shall also be required for the appointment by the President of the representative of the United States in any commission that may be formed by the United Nations with respect to atomic energy or in any other commission of the United Nations to which the United States is entitled to appoint a representative.

The Senate inserted a provision that Representatives and Senators should be confirmed as all other appointees were confirmed. Some question was raised as to whether or not confirmation in the case of a Senator or Representative might be construed as appointing him to another office, and thereby creating a vacancy in his office as a Member of Congress. After very thorough consideration the committee decided that that was not the case.

Mr. President, I have here a memorandum which I should like to have inserted in the RECORD. I shall not read it, but it contains a ruling by Attorney General Harry M. Daugherty holding that a temporary appointment of this particular kind does not constitute an office. The ruling was brought about by the appointment of Representative Burton and Senator Smoot to the Debt Funding Commission following the First World War. The memorandum contains a number of court decisions on other cases. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, not as a part of my remarks, but as a memorandum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs considered whether the amendments made on the floor of the Senate to section 2 (c) of S. 1580—by providing for Senate confirmation of the representatives to the General Assembly and the payment of compensation to them—resulted in the creation of an office under the authority of the United States within the meaning of the constitutional provision against Members of Congress holding Federal office. The provision in question, which is article I, section 6, of the Constitution reads as follows:

"No Senator or Representative shall, during the time for which he was elected, be

appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States which shall have been created or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased during such time, and no person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office."

In the light of the available precedents, and in order to minimize any possibility of ineligibility on the part of the Members of Congress to act as representatives to the General Assembly, the House amended section 2 (c) so as to provide that Members of Congress should not be entitled to receive compensation for serving in this capacity. On this basis it is believed that no such ineligibility has been created.

One of the most important precedents in which this whole question was thoroughly explored is the case of the appointment of Senator Smoot and Representative Burton to serve on the World War Foreign Debt Commission in 1922. This Commission was created by joint resolution of Congress providing for a Commission consisting of five members under the chairmanship of the Secretary of the Treasury to be appointed upon Senate confirmation. The functions of the Commission were, subject to the approval of the President, to refund or convert or extend the time of payment of any obligation of any foreign government to the United States arising out of the World War. Attorney General Daugherty rendered an opinion to the effect that the Members of Congress could validly be appointed to act on the Commission despite the provision of the Constitution. The following excerpts indicate the reasons on which this opinion was based:

"I have failed to find any judicial interpretation of the section of the Constitution now under consideration, and in the absence of such finally authoritative interpretation, great weight must be attached to the practical construction put upon the Constitution from the beginning of the Government. In such practical construction a distinction has always been made between special employment on the one hand and offices on the other, and between offices—using that term in a general sense—which serve only a temporary purpose, and those which have duration and permanency. From the very beginning of the Government Members of the Senate and the House have, from time to time, been asked to render services for the Government upon commissions of various kinds, and it has never been decided that such temporary employment for a special purpose and to serve an immediate exigency constituted a civil office within the meaning of the constitutional provision above referred to.

"The Supreme Court has held in a number of cases (*United States v. Hartwell* (6 Wall. 385); *United States v. Germaine* (99 U. S. 508); *Aufmordt v. Hedden* (137 U. S. 310)) that the word 'office' expresses the idea of tenure, duration, emolument, and duties. Its duties must be 'continuing and permanent, not occasional and temporary.' In the last-cited case the office then under consideration had no general functions, nor any employment which had any duration as to time or which extended over any case further than the power to act on that particular case. It was held by the Supreme Court 'that the incumbent did not hold an "office" within the meaning of article II, section 2, of the Constitution.'

"Where, therefore, a position does not have continuancy and permanency and its function is restricted to a single matter, the position seems to be that of an executive agent and not an 'office' within the meaning of the Constitution.

"Many cases could be cited in other jurisdictions and the views of text writers could also be readily adduced to justify the theory that the idea of an office 'clearly embraces the idea of tenure, duration, fees or emolu-

ments, rights, and powers, as well as that of duty.'

"Applying this distinction between an 'office' and a temporary trust to the act of Congress which created the World War Foreign Debt Commission, I would say that for several reasons it excludes the application of the word 'office' as above defined.

"The commissioners receive no compensation.

"Their tenure of office is limited in time and is restricted to a single object.

"The subject matter of their duties is work in which the Congress has a peculiar interest and as to which it is finally responsible; for if the adjustment of the debts due to the United States by foreign nations shall ultimately be accomplished by treaty, the latter must receive the sanction of the Senate and therefore there is propriety in a Member of that body participating in the negotiations. So far as the adjustment of the debt does not depend upon treaty obligations, the question as to what adjustment will be made of it is for Congress to determine, and it has seen fit to delegate the difficult task of adjustment to the Commission, with the approval of the President. This increases the propriety of having a Member of the Senate and of the House participate in such adjustment.

"Moreover, the Commissioners can take no action except with the approval of the President. Their duties, therefore, are primarily those of negotiators for the terms of such adjustment, and, secondarily, as an advisory body to the President of the United States."

The Senate Judiciary Committee, to whom the question was referred, recommended against the confirmation of the nominees on the basis of the alleged constitutional ineligibility. A minority report, however, agreed with the views of the Attorney General. After a full debate of the matter on the floor of the Senate, Messrs. Smoot and Burton were confirmed by a vote of 47 to 25. There are numerous other cases in which Members of Congress have been appointed on commissions to settle international disputes such as boundary commissions or other arbitration commissions.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask for a vote on the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

NOMINATION OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES TO THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I understand the President has sent to the Senate certain nominations of delegates to the forthcoming meeting of the United Nations Organization. If that be true, I shall have to ask the indulgence of the Senator from Wyoming for about 2 minutes so that as in executive session the Senate may confirm the nominations.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When the time arrives for the Senate to go into executive session, I will say to the Senator from Texas, I hope I shall not be on my feet. I shall be present, however, to listen to the words of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations referred to by the Senator from Texas have been received.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will ask the Presiding Officer to lay the President's message before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As in executive session, the Chair lays before

the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

In conformity with the provisions of S. 1580, I am sending to the Senate herewith for its advice and consent nominations of the American representatives and alternate representatives for the first part of the first meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations which is to convene in London early in January. I am also sending to the Senate herewith the nominations of the American representative to the Security Council which will also meet in London sometime in January as soon as that body has been established through the election of its nonpermanent members by the General Assembly.

Section 2 (d) of the pending bill wisely provides that the President, or the Secretary of State at the direction of the President, may represent the United States at any meeting of the United Nations regardless of those provisions which call for the appointment of representatives by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. At my request the Secretary of State will, for at least a portion of the session, attend the initial session of the General Assembly. For that reason I am sending to the Senate the nominations of only four representatives to the General Assembly. The Secretary of State will, during the period he is present, act as the senior representative of the United States to the General Assembly. The nominations of the alternates will insure that there will at all times be five representatives of the United States qualified under the provisions of S. 1580.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 19, 1945.
[Enclosures: Nominations.]

THE WHITE HOUSE,
December 19, 1945.

To the Senate of the United States:

I nominate Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., of Virginia, to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
December 19, 1945.

To the Senate of the United States:

I nominate the following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946:

Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., of Virginia.

TOM CONNALLY, United States Senator from the State of Texas.

ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, United States Senator from the State of Michigan.

Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York.

In the absence of the President or the Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius will be the senior representative of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
December 19, 1945.

To the Senate of the United States:

I nominate the following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946:

SOL BLOOM, a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the State of New York.

CHARLES A. EATON, a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the State of New York.

Frank C. Walker, of Pennsylvania.

John Foster Dulles, of New York.

John G. Townsend, Jr., of Delaware.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WHITE. Were these nominations received today?

Mr. CONNALLY. They were received today.

Mr. WHITE. Did the Committee on Foreign Relations act on them this morning?

Mr. CONNALLY. The committee has authorized me to report them favorably, which I now do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the consideration of the nominations? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I understood that nominations had to lie on the table for 1 day before action.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator will not insist on that rule. I asked unanimous consent for the consideration of the nominations as in executive session.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I object to none of them except that of Mr. Stettinius. I have no objection to any of the others, but I prefer to take them up separately, and I want a chance to be heard on the nomination of Mr. Stettinius.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then, I ask for a vote on all the others at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not take that action, because we have before us a very important bill, and we were about to dispose of it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not disposed to take up the Stettinius end of the matter. I will say to the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand, but I think in the interest of orderly procedure, if the Senator from Texas will permit me to conclude my statement on the War Powers Act, the results will be very much better. We have had 2 weeks of example of what confusion is promoted by switching subjects before they have been determined by the Senate. I hope the Senator will withhold his request.

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly, I shall do what the Senator wishes. I thank the Senator for having indulged me thus far.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think I shall conclude in half an hour if Senators will not continue to ask me so many questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair). Without objection, the nominations are all confirmed with the exception of that of Mr. Stettinius.

Mr. TAFT. No, Mr. President; I do not think there was a motion put or suggestion made or unanimous consent request made for confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Texas made such a request.

Mr. TAFT. I understood he was going to proceed with the request.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am at a loss. I am not clear on the matter. I do not know whether the motion was put or not. It was my purpose to move the confirmation of all the nominations except that of Mr. Stettinius, but on the intervention of the Senator from Wyoming I was ready to let the matter go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair made the statement "without objection," and of course if there is objection the nominations are not confirmed.

Mr. TAFT. I make the objection, Mr. President. It seems to me that nominations of such tremendous importance ought to lie over for a day for the consideration of the Senate. I shall vote for all of them, but I do not like the precedent set of having important nominations presented and passed on immediately, when many Senators have not even heard the names, do not know that the nominations have been made. I think we should insist on the regular order. I do not insist that the names go to the committee. I do not think they should at all, but I do think the nominations should lie over 1 day.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me for just one word?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to say a word in reply, Mr. President. I do not suppose it will make any difference to the Senator from Ohio, but the Senator from Texas is leaving the city tonight, and he was very anxious to conclude this matter. But I suppose on objection—

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will yield, I shall be glad to take his place tomorrow and urge the confirmation of all the nominations, including that of himself, but I think as a matter of practice it ought not to be done today.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed 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. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the

Senate numbered 18, 35, 42, 48, 54, and 88 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 59 and 103 to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed 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. 3749) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II.

AMENDMENT OF SECOND WAR POWERS ACT OF 1942

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4780) to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming has placed in the RECORD a list of the limited amounts in which this power has been availed of during the war, when, as I understand, the Federal Reserve Board has overdrawn its account with the Federal Reserve banks, in some cases up to \$1,300,000,000, and, as I understand, only for special short-term Treasury certificates, and not for any long-term bonds? Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is my understanding.

Mr. TAFT. I merely want to say that I think that was the purpose of the original law, and I offered an amendment which proposed a limitation of \$2,000,000,000 and 30-day certificates. If that amendment had become a part of the law the Treasury would have operated within its terms. But the danger is not when bonds can be sold. The danger comes when bonds cannot be sold. What happened in Germany and in France when they had this power and forced on the central banks their notes when they could not sell them to the public, was simply to build up an inflation which was extremely dangerous. Therefore I think this power should not be permanent, and it ought to be more severely limited than as now provided. Yet the \$5,000,000,000 limitation is an effective limitation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct, but the fact that it never reached the amount which he suggested in his original amendment of \$2,000,000,000, is another striking illustration of the fact that the power we granted was not abused.

Mr. TAFT. No; the power was not abused but I wanted to point out that it has not been necessary to exercise it to the limit. What has been done is to force the Federal Reserve banks to buy \$22,000,000,000 or \$23,000,000,000 of Government bonds, which they hold today, which is pure and simple inflation. I mean it has created that much purchasing power with no corresponding production or anything else.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is perfectly correct.

Mr. TAFT. That power, it seems to me, has been rather abused. I trust very much that the Federal Reserve banks may get rid of that tremendous proportion of Government bonds.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest to the Senator that when Congress year after year passes bills such as the housing bill, sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, which was enacted into law within the past few days, creating new demands upon the resources of the United States, we are building up the national debt. There is your inflation. That is done in the face of a national debt of \$260,000,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. But \$100,000,000 a year for housing, or \$75,000,000 for hospitals must be balanced by taxes. There is no excuse for issuing bonds to cover such an expense. I may say that \$100,000,000 a year for housing, which is probably the most important necessity of American life, if we ever appropriate it, seems to me to be a very minor part of \$22,000,000,000, which will probably be the approximate amount of Government expenditures.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct. And the problem with which we are confronted is a problem which can be settled only by the Banking and Currency Committee and by the Finance Committee. The step that was taken by the Finance Committee and by the Senate within the last few weeks to cut our tax receipts at the very time that our national debt was piling upward was the very reverse of the fight upon inflation.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have been very much interested in the explanation the Senator has been making and in the various reasons he has given for the bill. But we are pressed in the matter of time. Some of us have to go to conference at half past 3, particularly the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and myself. We have prepared an amendment to which I understand there is no objection.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no objection on the part of the Senator in charge of the bill. The Senator is referring, I think, to the amendment which he proposed to offer to title X of the War Powers Act.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I say first that title X is not a part of the bill before the Senate, because in the form in which it was passed in the War Powers Act, it was permanent legislation, and granted powers? If the Senator desires to amend that title I shall be very glad to have him explain the amendment, and I will say to the Senator that when the time comes to offer the amendment I shall be very glad to support it. I am sorry that although the Senator spoke to me about the amendment before the Committee on the Judiciary met, I utterly neglected to call it to the attention of the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. I can state the case to the Senate in a moment. Title X, which we propose to amend, relates to

the naturalization of persons serving in the armed forces of the United States in the present war, and reads:

Any person not a citizen, regardless of age, who has served or hereafter serves honorably in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war and who, having been lawfully admitted to the United States, including its Territories and possessions, shall have been at the time of his enlistment or induction a resident thereof, may be naturalized upon compliance with all the requirements of the naturalization laws except that (1) no declaration of intention and no period of residence within the United States or any State shall be required; (2) the petition for naturalization may be filed in any court having naturalization jurisdiction regardless of the residence of the petitioner; (3) the petitioner shall not be required to speak the English language, sign his petition in his own handwriting, or meet any educational test.

It was entirely proper to do that while we were at war, when men were risking their lives to fight for us. Then we gave them these easy terms of citizenship. But now the war is over. No one is going to be required to fight for us. I took the matter up with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the Committee on Immigration, and we proposed to change the law by striking out this provision:

The petition shall be filed not later than 1 year after the termination of the effective period of those titles of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, for which the effective period is specified in the last title thereof.

And substitute in lieu thereof:

And (3) the petition shall be filed not later than December 31, 1946.

That is, any alien who has entered our Army would have all of next year in which to perfect his citizenship.

Then there is the further provision in the amendment:

No person shall be naturalized under the provisions of this title unless such person had served in the military or naval forces of the United States prior to the date of enactment of this section:

That is to say, if he enlists in our Army from now on he will not be entitled to the benefits of the provisions of the title.

Mr. President, I shall offer the amendment, so it may be acted upon, and if accepted it will be out of the way.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand the amendment which the Senator offers is not the printed amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. The printed amendment is exactly what I am offering. I should like to offer the printed amendment and if there is no objection to it we will get it out of the way and the Senator from Georgia and I can leave.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment must first be acted upon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I merely wanted to be sure that the amendment now offered is in harmony with the bill as reported by the committee. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment must first be acted upon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this is not a committee amendment,

The Senator has asked unanimous consent to offer the amendment. I have no objection, and I am willing to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona that he be permitted to offer an amendment? The Chair hears none. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] for himself and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, between lines 2 and 3, it is proposed to insert the following:

(c) Title III of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended by title X of the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (relating to naturalization of persons serving in the armed forces of the United States during the present war), is amended as follows:

(1) Section 701 of such title is amended by striking out "and (3) the petition shall be filed not later than 1 year after the termination of the effective period of those titles of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, for which the effective period is specified in the last title thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof "and (3) the petition shall be filed not later than December 31, 1946."

(2) Such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 706. No person shall be naturalized under the provisions of this title unless such person has served in the military or naval forces of the United States prior to the date of enactment of this section."

On page 2, line 3, strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)."

On page 2, line 10, strike out "(d)" and insert "(e)."

On page 2, line 14, strike out "(e)" and insert "(f)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona for himself and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question. Under the terms of the proposed amendment, could an alien who had served in our armed forces be naturalized without ever having been in the United States?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is what the law now provides.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thought the present law required that he be in the United States.

Mr. HAYDEN. No. The provision in the present law is as follows:

Any person not a citizen, regardless of age, who has served or hereafter serves honorably in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war and who, having been lawfully admitted to the United States, including its Territories and possessions, shall have been at the time of his enlistment or induction a resident thereof, may be naturalized upon compliance with all the requirements of the naturalization laws except that (1) no declaration of intention and no period of residence within the United States or any State shall be required; (2) the petition for naturalization may be filed in any court having naturalization jurisdiction regardless of the residence of the petitioner; (3) the petitioner shall not be required to speak the English language, sign his petition in his own handwriting, or meet any educational test; and (4) no fee shall be charged or collected for making, filing, or docketing the petition for naturalization, or for the final hearing thereon, or for the certification of naturalization, if issued.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That means that he must at one time have been in a Territory or State.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct. Under the War Powers Act, any alien, even though he were a visitor here, under a visitor's visa, if he were legally admitted to the country, and if he entered the armed forces of the country, would have to meet none of the tests of naturalization.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Has the committee ever considered permitting a soldier in the Army of the United States to be naturalized if he has never been in the country?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not understand that that can legally be done. This amendment would not affect such a case. We did have a special law in the case of natives of the Philippines who went into the armed forces of the Philippine National Army. They were allowed citizenship in the United States, but that privilege has since been terminated by law.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it the opinion of the chairman of the committee that an extension of the privilege along the lines I have suggested might be unwise?

Mr. RUSSELL. We are not proposing to extend it. We are proposing to terminate it. Under the general war powers bill presented by the Senator from Wyoming an alien could go into the armed forces of the United States next May and be entitled to become naturalized as an American citizen merely by virtue of the fact that he had gone into the armed forces, though he did not do so in a time of danger.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to make a correction, nothing that has been proposed by the Senator from Wyoming affects this question.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I did not intend so to infer. I did not mean to say that the pending bill affected the situation. It does not affect it in any degree, because under the War Powers Act any person would have a right to enlist in the United States Army or Navy, up until the time when hostilities were officially terminated, either by act of Congress or by Presidential proclamation, and thereby become entitled to naturalization as an American citizen.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Provided he had once been in the country.

Mr. RUSSELL. Provided he had once been legally admitted to the country. The amendment provides that that privilege shall be terminated upon the approval of the pending bill. In other words, a person could not enlist in the Army after the approval of the act and thereby be entitled to citizenship.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, in the opinion of the Senator the act should not be amended so as to permit a man who went into the Army in January 1942 to become a citizen if he had never been in a Territory or State of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Personally, I would strongly oppose such a proposal.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. The purpose of the amendment is to terminate the power

to grant citizenship, and not to extend it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] for himself and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the next title is title V, which constitutes a waiver of the navigation and inspection laws. This is necessary if we are to continue to expedite the transportation of our military personnel from foreign soil to the United States. The waiver of certain inspection rules is necessary in order to make effective use of all the vessels which are available to the Army and Navy, and because of the fact that the military occupation of foreign areas is not likely to be terminated by the 30th of June, the committee was of the belief that this power should be extended.

Title VI of the War Powers Act is not affected by the bill which is now before the Senate. It involves the power to requisition. By previous legislative action Congress has extended the power of requisition to June 30, 1946, and nothing in this bill extends that power or affects it in any way, so no further extension is required.

Title VII is the title which exempts from the Hatch Act persons who are voluntary members of ration boards and other Government agencies—those who are patriotically contributing their services toward the carrying out of various activities.

Title VIII of the original War Powers Act has already expired, and there is no proposal here to continue it.

Title IX of the original act was the title which provided free postage for sailors, soldiers, and marines. That provision has been made permanent law by the passage of the act approved October 6, 1945. Therefore, this bill provides that it shall be eliminated from the War Powers Act.

Title X deals with the naturalization of persons serving in the armed forces. The only amendment is the amendment which the Senate itself has now adopted. The committee proposed none.

Title XI deals with the acceptance of conditional gifts to further the war program. The bill before us limits it exclusively to the acceptance of gifts which are in the interest of our military personnel abroad. I might say, for example, that the Government of France has made a contribution of \$20,000,000, I believe, which went into the gift account in the Treasury Department, and which is being used for the purpose of supplementing the income of our soldiers in France. The GI and the officer, no matter what his rank, each receives every month 850 francs out of this fund, in addition to the pay which he receives from the Government of the United States. Eight hundred and fifty francs amounts to approximately \$17. The purpose of this provision is to enable the American soldier abroad to adjust himself to the existing exchange. That, I submit, is a power which should not be made to expire on the 30th of June.

Title XII deals with the coinage of 5-cent pieces. Because of the shortage

of copper and nickel during the war, the War Powers Act authorized the coinage of 5-cent pieces composed 50 percent of silver and 50 percent of copper. That power would not expire until December 31, 1946. The bill before us makes that power terminate as of December 31 this year, so it is a cutting down and not an extension of one of the war powers.

Title XIII of the War Powers Act deals with the inspection and audit of war contractors. That is in the nature of permanent legislation. It is not affected by this bill in one way or the other.

Title XIV deals with the utilization of vital war information. For example, it allows the Civilian Production Administration to obtain from the Bureau of Census of the Department of Commerce statistics which otherwise would not be available.

The next title is Title XV, the time limit and the short title. It is to this title that the committee amendment has been reported, granting an extension to December 31, 1946, instead of June 30, 1946.

The law expires on the 30th of December this year, unless extended. We are rapidly drawing to the close of this session. We are rapidly approaching the 31st of December. I say, without any equivocation or reservation, that in my judgment the extension of the power for a full year is definitely in the public interest; that the power granted will not be abused; and that if there should be any danger of abuse the Congress could readily correct it. Precautions have been taken which will guarantee full conference with various industry committees; and, above all, there is the record which has been made by the war agencies affected by the bill. That record is such as to make it clear, in all reason, that we can depend upon the assurances which have been given by everyone in the executive branch, from the President down, that the purpose is to lift these controls as rapidly as possible.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Before the Senator from Wyoming takes his seat, I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very happy to try to answer it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Knowing the Senator's jealous regard for the powers and prerogatives of the Congress, may I ask why he feels that it is necessary to make this extension until the 31st of December 1946, and what harm could come from a review by the Congress prior to the 30th of June 1946?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will answer the Senator in this way: I have just recited all the titles in the bill. In all of them, with the exception of title III, there is a perfectly obvious reason why the extension should be granted to the 31st of December of next year. Consider, for example, the authority to continue to receive francs for the benefit of our military personnel in France. Why should we cut that off?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, knowing the Senator's regard for the preservation of the powers of the legislative arm of the Government, if it is

obvious on the face of the titles which he has recited that they should be extended, I am simply asking what harm could come from a review of the entire situation by the Congress before the 30th of June 1946.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I do not think any particular harm would come, but I think the better practice would be to grant this extension so that the Civilian Production Administration, particularly, will be in a position to protect the public interest.

Let me give the Senator an example. Consider the case of tin. We all know that tin is in short supply. We know that it is not produced in the United States. We know that we must depend upon importations from Malaya, Sumatra, and Java. If the power of the Civilian Production Administration to allocate tin to all of those in the United States who wish to use the short supply of tin should be repealed as of the 30th of June 1946, it would be repealed, first, before the tin supply which we need had been made available; and in the second place it would be a mistake because it would immediately create conditions under which those in a position to hoard tin could do so to the disadvantage of the little businessmen all over the United States.

So, bearing in mind that when a particular power of this kind is dying as of a certain deadline, the inevitable reaction of those who are affected by allocations and priorities is to say, "Well, this power will die in just a few weeks, so we shall pay no attention to it." I am convinced that with respect to lumber, tin, rubber, and other items, it will be necessary in the public interest that these powers be extended for a full year, and that, therefore, because of the effect upon clothing for example, or the effect upon brick for small brickyards all over the country, a failure to extend the power would be against the interests of the small businessman, against the interests of those who are not in the position of some of the large industries which are able to obtain their own supplies.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator for his statement. Will he further yield, to permit me to ask him another question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In view of the fact that very shortly there will be a recess of the Congress for the holiday season, is the Senator convinced that if the amendment is attached by the Senate it will be concurred in by the House of Representatives?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, I cannot say as to that.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator has stressed the urgency of making the extension. I think we all concede that. But I apprehend that within the next 48 hours both Houses of Congress will be doing business by unanimous consent, or else not doing business at all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I can only say to the Senator that the Member of the House Committee on the Judiciary who was in charge of the bill in the House of Representatives, and who made the report in the House of Representatives—the distinguished and able Representa-

tive from Alabama [Mr. HOEBS]—was on the floor of the Senate this afternoon during the discussion of this bill. He talked to me during one of the interruptions, and he gave no indication that there would be any difficulty. I may say to the Senator that if any difficulty arises, I think it can be straightened out.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY—PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a moment ago I observed that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] was temporarily out of the Chamber, and I asked a page to request him to return, inasmuch as I wished to make a few remarks in which I thought he would be interested. I observe that he has now returned to the Chamber, from the reception room.

The statement which I desire to make is quite brief. Three weeks ago on Sunday, I left Washington on business, after having on the preceding Friday obtained permission of the Senate to go. On the Saturday before I left Washington, I noticed a news account of a radio address which had been delivered the night before by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. In that address, according to the newspaper account, the Senator from Arkansas rather severely criticized, if not condemned, what he termed our foreign policy or our confused foreign policy or our lack of foreign policy. I do not recall the exact terms of condemnation which the Senator from Arkansas heaped upon our State Department and perhaps upon the President of the United States and perhaps upon ourselves, who have a part in formulating the foreign policy of the United States.

On the Saturday before I left Washington, I commented upon that radio address by the Senator from Arkansas. I said, in substance, as I remember now—I think I correctly recall the substance of my remarks—that I deplored the fact that the able Senator from Arkansas had seen fit to make an address of that nature over the radio, rather than on the floor of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose today to rehash ancient history, and that is ancient history now; but I wish to say that all my life I have had a fundamental principle, namely, never to give needless offense to anyone. From what I learned about what occurred on the floor of the Senate on Monday, following my departure from Washington, it occurred to me that the Senator from Arkansas had taken offense at my comment. I wish to assure him—and all Members of this body, so far as that is concerned—that it is never my purpose to offend any Senator personally or to criticize a Senator personally. I did not do so in the comment I made. I did deplore—I think I can now quote the language I used at that time—that a Senator of the United States would criticize and condemn his own Government's policy in a manner of as grave concern as is the foreign policy of this Nation, the relations of our Nation with the other nations of the world, in a place where his statement could not be challenged, could not be debated, and could not be questioned.

That comment by me was not at all a personal criticism of the Senator from Arkansas. Probably the thought never had occurred to him. Many of us from time to time go out over the country and speak in behalf of principles and matters which we advocate, and in doing so we use the radio, which is natural and proper. But, Mr. President, I repeat that there is nothing more grave, there is nothing more serious, than our relations with the other nations of the world. When Senators of the United States speak on this subject, their voice should be carried all around the world. The subject is one which should not be commented upon lightly. I still insist that Senators might well bring their criticisms here to the floor of the Senate, where there exists the greatest forum in all the world for public speech and debate, and where Senators may discuss any subject. I am now speaking of general policies, and not with respect particularly to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. President, I have about concluded the statement which I wanted to make on this, the first day of my return to the Senate after an absence of some time. I assure the Senator from Arkansas that what I have said was intended in no way as a personal reflection upon him. He and I have seen eye to eye on almost all questions, and I hope that we shall continue to do so. I have great confidence in him, and I respect him for his ability and his patriotism.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the statement of the Senator from New Mexico to the effect that nothing was intended in a personal way in his criticism of my having made a speech over the radio. I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Senator from New Mexico did not disagree with the sentiments which were expressed in my speech, but only with regard to the place at which the speech was delivered. I had expected, of course, that the Senator would challenge some of my opinions with reference to the confusion which currently exists in connection with our foreign relations. Since the speech was made I have not observed any substantial change in our foreign policy. After the Senator has had time to contemplate the present trend in our foreign policy I hope that he will enlighten me, as well as other Members of the Senate, by showing me wherein my statements were erroneous.

MAJ. GEN. LEONARD F. WING

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I wish to record the sad fact that a great friend and a very distinguished citizen, one of our foremost generals of the war, passed away this morning at the untimely age of 52 years after having fought all through the Pacific campaign. He was Maj. Gen. Leonard F. Wing. His death is of public interest not only because of his service but also because of the unique character of the status which he held in the Army. He was the first National Guard officer to attain the rank of major general.

General Wing entered the war in February 1941 with the Forty-third Division, which was then a National Guard outfit.

His unit was preserved by replacements throughout the war. It participated in the Battles of Guadalcanal, the North Solomons, New Guinea, and Luzon. He entered Japan with General MacArthur.

This great man performed a service for humanity and made the supreme sacrifice, although his death did not occur until he had reached his home at Rutland, Vt., where he has left a widow and three children. His death was a consequence of his service for humanity.

General Wing's merit was evidenced by four decorations, namely, the Distinguished Service Medal as Forty-third Division commander, Legion of Merit for service as assistant division commander, Silver Star for gallantry in action on July 11, 1943, and the Bronze Star Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster.

Fortunately, I have before me an editorial from the Montpelier Evening Argus of, I believe, January 29, 1945, which affords some understanding of the kind of service in which General Wing's unit was engaged. The editorial is entitled "Vermonters battling at Luzon." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

VERMONTERS BATTLING AT LUZON

Battle-tested Vermonters, hailing from Montpelier and from communities the length and breadth of the State and who have had their baptism by fire at Guadalcanal, New Britain, and New Guinea, are now serving as an element of the First Corps and carrying out the heaviest burden of the fighting at Luzon. It is something of irony and pride that the famed Vermont Forty-third Division, built upon the foundation of the peacetime National Guard, should be weaving an epic of glorious history through some of the fiercest of the Pacific campaigns against the Japs. Some of the members of the Forty-third have already returned to their Vermont homes, with honorable medical discharges and with the Pacific campaign still a living memory to them. Some of them have made the supreme sacrifice; they will never return. Those of their comrades remaining in the Forty-third are continuing their roles in the great Pacific story, determined to fight it out to the last chapter with the triumphant climax of the Japs defeated forever as a war power.

The Luzon saga marks the second amphibious campaign for the Forty-third, which captured the New Georgia group of the Solomon Islands in the summer of 1943. After this nerve-shattering 83-day jungle campaign, the division, necessarily reoutfitted, returned to a much-needed rest area and was sent to New Zealand for some time to recoup its vigor. The Forty-third afterwards went to New Guinea, where it played a big part in helping hold the line against Japanese who had been trapped by MacArthur's leapfrog landing along the rugged coast. On this particular assignment relatively little fighting had to be done, but in the current Luzon battle the Forty-third have drawn what is believed to be the stiffest of Japanese opposition.

Gen. Leonard F. Wing, of Rutland, is the commander of this division, which is made up largely of troops from Vermont, Maine, and Connecticut, and it is generally assumed that he is in active command now. Recently the general was ill and was hospitalized for a time.

The campaign for control of the Philippines, in regard to which MacArthur's historic words "I will return" were said, will undoubtedly

prove one of the decisive battles of the Pacific, and the Vermont troops have the confidence of the entire Green Mountain State that they will render as good an account of themselves in this battle as they have in preceding ones.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, all who know of the great service rendered and the sacrifice made for humanity by Gen. Leonard F. Wing sympathize deeply with his family in their great bereavement.

ADMINISTRATION AND LIQUIDATION OF FEDERAL REHABILITATION PROJECTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, for several days I have attempted to call a bill which is noncontroversial. I have consulted with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. I do not think that there will be any controversy with regard to the bill. Inasmuch as it will be difficult to develop a quorum, I ask that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 704 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to continue administration of and ultimately liquidate Federal rural rehabilitation projects, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what is the business before the Senate at the present time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment to House bill 4780.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is obvious that there is not a quorum present in the Chamber. We have a calendar which is loaded down with bills. I know of several bills on the calendar which have been reported by the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys. If each Senator who is interested in a bill should now, at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, rise and follow the example of the Senator from Arkansas by asking unanimous consent to set aside the unfinished business and to proceed to the consideration of his particular measure, obviously we would get nowhere. The most important bill before the Senate now is the unfinished business of the Senate. I happen to know that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] desires to speak with reference to it. Under the unanimous-consent rule, I am forced to object to the request of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a few minutes ago the Senator from Wyoming did not object to laying aside consideration of the pending bill in order to consider other bills. I agree with the Senator that the procedure in the Senate has been very difficult. I may add, for the benefit of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], that the presence of so few Senators in the Chamber during the past few weeks while he was absent, is the best example I can cite of the inadvisability of making speeches on the floor of the Senate.

I wonder if the Senator can recall any time during the past 10 months when a sustained debate of any significance was held with the exception of the one which was held in connection with the United Nations Charter when for a few days

there was a sort of desultory discussion. With that exception, I do not recall any sustained debate in the Senate with regard to foreign relations, and I do not recall that the Senator from New Mexico, with the exception of a few statements which he made, addressed the Senate at any length. I do not recall any sustained debate having taken place in which there was a real analysis of any of the major fundamental issues then pending before this country.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to say to the Senator from Arkansas that what he has just said is most unfortunately true.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In other words, it is the last place where it is possible to get a development of such ideas. That is one reason why there is no inclination to make a speech on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator will agree that instead of being the last place, the Senate of the United States should be the first place.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It should be, I agree, but it is the same way with the little bill to which the Senator from Wyoming objects. For 3 or 4 days I have been told, "Yes; tomorrow the calendar will be called." This is a little bill to which there is no objection, so far as I know, from any Member on either side of the Senate, and I have consulted several on the other side. The subject matter with which it deals is rapidly being dissipated. I think about 60,000 acres are being disposed of. The purpose of the bill is to enable returning soldiers, about whom we talk so much, to purchase farms.

Since I introduced the bill last spring I suppose at least half the land which it was intended to cover has already been disposed of, and if we continue a few more months, there will be absolutely nothing worth while left. It will be in a position similar to that of the surplus property from the war. I have yet to find one soldier who has found a jeep, or truck, or anything else. Yet the procedure in the Senate continues to go the way which in effect blocks most of the bills which are submitted for consideration.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. When order of business 790, Senate bill 704, came up in regular order at the last call of the calendar I interposed an objection, because I did not know how the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry felt about the bill. I have consulted the minority members of the committee. They have heard the bill discussed in committee, and are agreeable to its passage. I therefore join with the Senator from Arkansas in asking that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside in order that this bill may be considered and passed. I am sure it will not take more than 5 minutes to dispose of it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I certainly should object to setting aside the unfinished business. I think the worst pro-

cedure I have ever seen in the Senate has been that of the last 3 weeks, during which a number of times we have laid aside one bill before we finished with it, and proceeded to another.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. I certainly will object. Incidentally, Mr. President, I understand the calendar will be called tomorrow, and there is no hurry about this particular bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have understood all week that the calendar was to be called the next day.

Mr. TAFT. The pending bill amending the Second War Powers Act is the only bill which must be passed at this time. So far as I can see, its consideration can be finished in 10 minutes, and I see no reason why we should not proceed with the regular order.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ORDER DISCONTINUING THE DRAFTING OF FATHERS

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

Mr. TAFT. For what purpose?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to make an announcement to the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I have just been advised that the Selective Service System has issued an order stopping the drafting of all fathers. The order was issued this afternoon. I wish to say that it is very gratifying to me to know that this step has been taken. It should have been taken a long time ago, but now that it has been done, that much of the purpose of the joint resolution I introduced has been accomplished. I hope that they will go further immediately and look after the fathers who are now in the service.

AMENDMENT OF SECOND WAR POWERS ACT OF 1942

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4780) to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the only controversial matter in connection with the renewal of the Second War Powers Act relates to the committee amendment, which is now before the Senate.

The House considered this whole matter much more thoroughly than did the Senate. The committee held hearings, but only the House hearings have been printed. I suppose there were some hearings in the Senate committee; I do not know. They have not been printed, in any event.

After long and serious consideration the House decided that the extension should be made for 6 months, and not for a year. The House bill, as it came to the Senate, provided for an extension for 6 months. The Senate committee, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, proposes to extend the War Powers Act for another 6 months. I think there are many reasons why there should be no such further extension.

The most important provision of the bill is that dealing with priorities, giving

the President unprecedented power over the industries of the United States. The priorities powers, together with the price-control powers, practically give the Government the power to dictate the daily action of every industry in the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understood the Senator to say a moment ago that the hearings before the Senate committee had not been printed. They have been printed.

Mr. TAFT. They have been printed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. They were less extensive than the House hearings, and they did not represent the careful consideration which the House has given to the matter.

The priority powers cover every kind of material and every kind of transportation, and affect the daily life of every individual and the daily transactions of every business. I think all of us are agreed that these powers should be abandoned just as fast as they can be abandoned. I do not think the Congress would properly perform its obligation by extending for a full year the powers of the President, without any limitation, leaving him with all the powers he has had during the entire war, not attempting to limit him to materials such as rubber, tin, and a few other things which we know are scarce, but giving him indefinite power to regulate all industry throughout the United States.

I cannot see any possible harm from reconsidering this matter next May. Today things are in a state of rapid flux, they change overnight, they change in the course of a month. Where we had a surplus, we find a deficiency, and where we had a deficiency, we find a surplus. I cannot see any harm in reviewing the necessity for these extensive powers next May.

Mr. President, that is particularly true when we realize that we must consider then the power of price control. It seems to me the two powers tie in together. It seems to me should decide at that time what commodities are scarce, what powers should be continued, and what powers should not be continued.

There is one other reason why I think December 31 next year is a poor date for this power to expire. In some respects it may be necessary to continue the powers even beyond that time. We are to have a recess next summer, we hope, over the 1946 election. It would be most unfortunate if we had to be called back after the election merely because this particular act was about to expire, and the President found some necessity for continuing it beyond the expiration date fixed.

I believe we should very definitely determine before the first of next July what we are going to do at that time for the next year. I think it is going to be necessary to continue then some of the price controls and some of the priority controls, but I think the powers should be confined at that time to a limited number of articles which are scarce, and

that otherwise industry should be entirely relieved from the controls.

The statement of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is that the Administration says, "Well we are abandoning these controls, and we are going to continue to abandon them." I think they did abandon them rather rapidly, particularly those relating to the manufacture of war materials, but from now on I believe we will find they are going to be steadily restored. People will want a priority on particular services, as the veterans now want a priority on housing materials. I think they should have such a priority. But we are going to have new peacetime demands to which it will be perfectly possible to apply these war powers. Before we get through we shall have a demand for the permanent continuation of many of the powers.

Mr. President, I believe very strongly we will accomplish every purpose sought if we follow the House, if we extend the act for 6 months only, and if at the end of that time we consider selective continuation of priority controls and price controls.

I therefore hope the committee amendment will be rejected, and that the House provision will be restored.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Kilgore	Shipstead
Bilbo	Knowland	Smith
Brooks	La Follette	Stanfill
Byrd	Langer	Stewart
Capper	McCarran	Taft
Carville	McClellan	Taylor
Chavez	McKellar	Tobey
Ellender	McMahon	Tunnell
Fulbright	Maybank	Tydings
Gossett	Mead	Vandenberg
Green	Millikin	Wagner
Gurney	Mitchell	Walsh
Hart	Moore	Wheeler
Hatch	Murdock	Wherry
Hayden	O'Daniel	White
Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Hill	Pepper	Willis
Hoey	Radcliffe	Wilson
Huffman	Revercomb	Young
Johnson, Colo.	Russell	
Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall	

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

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. A vote "yea" is a vote in favor of the committee amendment extending the time 12 months. A vote "nay" is a vote in favor of the 6 months' extension provided in the House bill. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that a vote "nay" is a vote against an extension of 1 year. A vote "yea" is a vote for extension of 1 year.

Mr. TAFT. A vote "nay" is a vote against the extension for 1 year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1946—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, for which I ask immediate consideration.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if this is the conference report on the appropriation bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator whether the amendment which the committee recommended with respect to the protection of the rights of the Indians was agreed to in the report?

Mr. McKELLAR. It was agreed to by the House, and it had been agreed to by the Senate conferees. We must first adopt the conference report. The committee has instructed me to move two amendments, one of which is to strike out "one thousand eight hundred and thirty" where it occurs twice. The motions will be made after the conference report is agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand the Senator to say that the Senate committee amendment protecting the rights of the three Affiliated Tribes remains in the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct. It remains in the bill.

Mr. TAFT rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, does the Senator from Ohio desire to ask a question?

Mr. TAFT. I had hoped that this would not be a controversial matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think it will be.

Mr. President, I submit the conference report.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, 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 Senate recede from its amendments numbered 15, 38, 39, 39½, 40, 51, 53, 55, 67, 68, 69, 75, 89, and 101.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 21, 23, 30, 33, 34, 43, 44, 49, 52, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 66, 70, 79, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 98, 99, 100, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, and 127 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 13 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the sum "\$750,000,000", strike out the proviso down to the period in line 17; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$730,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in line 4 of said amendment insert "\$600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "Provided, That none of the funds available under this head for administrative expenses shall be used in paying the salary of any person engaged in making or processing loans in excess of \$500,000 to any State, any subdivision thereof, any municipality therein, or any public authority, for construction purposes, unless in pursuance of a specific authorization, except, however, that this provision shall not apply to any application or loan approved or made prior to December 15, 1945"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,469,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$212,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 5 of said amendment strike out the sum "\$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$25,000."

In line 7 of said amendment strike out the sum "\$101,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$93,000."

In line 9 of said amendment strike out the sum "\$12,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$11,250."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Provided, That such additional amount of \$90,000 shall not become available for obligation until a contract shall have been concluded with the lessor allowing Federal occupancy for a period of not less than eighteen months with the rights to extend the period of occupancy an additional period of eighteen months or less, the rental charge for any period of occupancy not to exceed the rate heretofore agreed upon; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 12 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "\$601,540" and insert in lieu thereof "\$320,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,766,625"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$132,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,216,210"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$266,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,748,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the sum "\$164,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$82,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "and the immediately succeeding additional appropriation for the construction of hospitals and domiciliary facilities, shall be merged with the existing appropriation for the construction of such facilities and remain available until expended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$187,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,435,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$21,242,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$10,275,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$44,640,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$10,780,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$111,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,385,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 18, 35, 42, 43, 54, 59, 88, and 103.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
PAT MCCARRAN,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMETT O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to pursue a little further the question with respect to the Indian amendment. I understand from the clerk of the committee that the amendment is in disagreement.

Mr. McKELLAR. The amendment is in disagreement, but the language concerning the Indians is not in disagreement, except as the whole amendment is in disagreement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I understand, the disagreement affects only the height of the dam.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is purely a technical disagreement, so far as the Indian amendment is concerned.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

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

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 4805, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
December 19, 1945.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 18, 35, 42, 48, 54, and 88 to the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount of \$15,000,000 named in said amendment insert "\$7,500,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available or used to maintain or operate the Garrison (N. Dak.) Reservoir at a higher maximum pool elevation than 1,830 feet, or for constructing dikes or levees which would be required by a higher pool elevation than 1,830 feet for operating such dam, unless an operation at a higher level should be authorized hereafter by law; *Provided further,* That no part of the appropriation for the Garrison Reservoir herein contained may be expended for actual construction of the dam itself until suitable land found by the Secretary of the Interior to be equal in quality and sufficient in area to compensate the Three Affiliated Tribes shall be offered to the said tribes in exchange for the land on the Fort Berthold Reservation which shall be inundated by the construction of the Garrison Dam."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now move that the Senate agree to the amendment of

the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, with an amendment, as follows:

Strike out the language "one thousand eight hundred and thirty" wherever it appears in said amendment, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "one thousand eight hundred and fifty."

A majority of the committee has instructed me to make this motion, and I ask that the motion be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, before the motion is put I should like to make a statement. I believe that North Dakota will be eternally grateful for the action of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations supporting the 1,850-foot Garrison Dam. About 25 years ago the State of North Dakota realized the necessity of having planned water development. Devils Lake, one of the cities now suffering, had a large lake. In fact, there was navigation by steamboats on the lakes at that time. At the present time there are only inches of water in the lake. It is a stinking lake close to the city of Devils Lake. The only water supply of the city is now by means of shallow wells. Close by is another city of about 2,000 population—Fessenden—which has no water supply at all, and must haul its water.

North Dakota also has realized the necessity of having water for irrigation and for power development. It has realized the necessity of helping other States in flood control.

The bill as passed by the Senate would provide an 1,850-foot dam. The extra 20 feet of height would provide approximately 6,000,000 extra acre-feet of water, or about one-third more than the 1,830-foot height. In my opinion and in the opinion of the people of North Dakota it is the only means by which North Dakota can be assured of needed irrigation and power development. In the whole State of North Dakota at the present time we have only about 90,000 kilowatts capacity for generating electricity. If we are to carry on our REA program to provide electricity for all the farms in North Dakota we must have this additional water and power development.

Continuing with the history of this program, about 12 years ago North Dakota established a State water commission, and since that time has appropriated approximately one and a half million dollars in support of this program or approximately \$3 for every man, woman and child. This commission is unanimously agreed on the program.

In the development of this program for North Dakota we have had considerable difficulty. The Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have always disagreed as to programs. In order to develop a unified program and settle these differences, a conference was held in Omaha, Nebr., on August 22. At that conference there were representatives of the Department of Agriculture of the United States, the Federal Power Commission, the Bureau of Reclamation, the

Army engineers, and the governors of all the 10 States affected. Out of that meeting came a unanimous agreement for an 1,850-foot dam. At that meeting were four representatives from the community of Williston. Two of those gentlemen agreed at that time to support an 1,850-foot dam. Since then, at the instance of a wealthy rancher—banker who would be injured—and I cannot blame him—the city of Williston has been influenced to make presentations against the dam.

In my opinion, if the dam were finally built at 1,830 feet, not only would the State of North Dakota suffer in irrigation and power development, but the development of the entire valley would suffer. It would be impossible to develop the Missouri River under the present system of the four agencies.

I may also state that I have received a telegram from one of the prominent citizens of Williston, whose name I do not wish to divulge. The telegram reads as follows:

I spent hours pleading with city commission and chamber of commerce attempting to convince them that they should support Governor Aandahl's 1,850-foot dam with Army engineers assurance of adequate protection, but the d— fools continue to believe we have intelligent Senators and Congressmen who can be trusted with determining the height of the Garrison pool after the Army has done its experimenting.

Certainly after the Army engineers have demonstrated their ability in this war North Dakota ought to have confidence in them. The Army engineers have assured the city of Williston that they will provide every protection to the city and that it will not be injured in any way. The State of North Dakota has faith in the program of the Army engineers for the construction of this great earthen dam. If any danger were involved, cities below the dam, including Bismarck and Mandan, with three times the population of Devils Lake, would be in jeopardy if the dam were to go out. If such a thing should happen those cities would be ruined; but I believe that we should have confidence in the Army engineers.

I have received a telegram from the Greater North Dakota Association, which reads as follows:

FARGO, N. DAK., December 18, 1945.
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG:

Sending following telegram to Congressman CANNON today and urge your cooperation. The Greater North Dakota Association, a State-wide chamber of commerce, assures you vast majority in State favor 1,850-foot water level Garrison Dam according to plans of Army engineers and approved by State water conservation commission as No. 1 project and key to State's water-development plans for irrigation, power, flood control, municipal water supplies. This is plan also approved by interagency committee and all Federal agencies at Omaha August 22. Plan includes protection city of Williston and irrigation projects there through dikes, and displaced Indians and farmers will be protected, so we urge your support for 1,850-foot water level for greatest benefit to greatest number
GREATER NORTH DAKOTA ASSOCIATION,
B. E. GROOM, Secretary.

Mr. President, if the Congress of the United States is to enter into this controversy as an engineering agency, I suggest that the Congress at least send out a

committee to investigate this problem in North Dakota. Surely North Dakota would not be so selfish as to interfere with other interests involved in the development of the Missouri River Valley.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks many telegrams from practically every city in North Dakota, from chambers of commerce, farm organizations, and others.

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

FARGO, N. DAK., December 8, 1945.

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,

United States Senator:

West Fargo must have water to expand Nation's fifteenth livestock market. City of Fargo future growth dependent upon additional water supply. Feel imperative to future welfare of State that water level of Garrison Dam be maintained at 1,850-foot level according to plans of Army engineers.

F. A. IRISH.

DEVILS LAKE, N. DAK., December 7, 1945.

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,

Washington, D. C.:

Very much favor high dam at Garrison.
LAKE ELECTRIC CO.

DEVILS LAKE, N. DAK., December 7, 1945.

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,

Capitol Building:

Believe you would be representing the best interest of North Dakota by supporting high Garrison Dam.

RAY A. YOUNG.

COOPERSTOWN, N. DAK., December 7, 1945.

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,

Washington, D. C.:

Cooperstown City Council strongly urges effort reinstating 1,850 as height of Garrison Dam and effort on your part to expedite construction according to plan of Army engineers and Bureau of Reclamation in accordance with recommendations of our own State water commission.

O. F. COOPERUD,
City Auditor.

FARGO, N. DAK., December 8, 1945.

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,

United States Senator,

Washington, D. C.:

Army engineers worked for years with national experts on plans for the Garrison Dam in order to make it give greatest service to entire State. Now small group of untechnical men ask Congress to lower water level in a manner which would lose million acres irrigation, destroy possibility of diversion for water needed for municipalities. Urge you work to restore water level to 1,850 feet.

CLARKE BASSETT.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., December 6, 1945.

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Garrison Dam can well be the making of North Dakota if Congress follows through on plans of Army engineers for an 1,850-foot level. We urge you to do everything in your power to accomplish this end.

B. O. REFVEM.

NEW ROCKFORD, N. DAK., December 6, 1945.

Senator MILTON YOUNG,

Washington, D. C.:

Realizing that we must have the Garrison Dam at the 1,850-foot level to develop our water reserves in North Dakota, we urge your support for this height.

NEW ROCKFORD KIWANIS CLUB.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., December 6, 1945.
HON. MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

We believe that it is most beneficial to North Dakota and we strongly urge your support to reinstate the 1,850-foot level for the Garrison Dam.

DAVIS CHEVROLET CO.,
F. M. DAVIS,
D. T. DAVIS,
W. C. DAVIS.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., December 5, 1945.
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Building:

We feel that the major portions of North Dakota are better served from all standpoints by the 1,850-foot level of the Garrison Dam and are grieved by the 1,830-foot limitation now present in the appropriations bill.

FINNEYS DRUG,
J. W. JOHNSON.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., December 5, 1945.
MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I am very much interested in the height of the proposed Garrison Dam and will appreciate using your influence toward the 1,850-foot level. This level will be of the greatest benefit to the greatest number of dairy and livestock farmers in the State. Thanks.

CARL NELSON.

ROLLA, N. DAK., December 11, 1945.
Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:

Board of directors of Rolla Commercial Club urges you to support 1,850 level Garrison Dam, Missouri River development.

ROLLA COMMERCIAL CLUB.

FARGO, N. DAK., December 8, 1945.
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG:

Urge that you endeavor to effect the elimination of the 1,830 restriction on the Garrison Dam appropriation. This amendment nullifies fully 50 percent of the effectiveness of the Garrison Reservoir and hazards the diversion of Fort Peck water for the Missouri-Souris program, Devils Lake, and all of the eastern part of the State. We are interested to the extent that the water resources of the State shall benefit all of the people of the State.

FRED C. HAGEN,
Commissioner of Water Works and Sewage.

NEW ROCKFORD, N. DAK., December 8, 1945.
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The city commission in regular meeting assembled this 7th day of December 1945, unanimously adopted the following resolution and directed the auditor to transmit copies of the same to our two Congressmen and our two Senators:

"Whereas the needs of North Dakota for power and irrigation cannot be adequately developed with a Garrison Dam less than 1,850 feet: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the New Rockford City Commission does hereby go on record protesting the now proposed 1,830-foot level."

By order of the city commission.

L. E. LESKE,
City Auditor, New Rockford, N. Dak.

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., December 3, 1945.
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge the deletion in the Senate of amendment restricting height of dam, to legisla-

tion pertaining to funds allocated for start of Garrison construction. This amendment nullifies 50 percent of effectiveness of Garrison Reservoir. Eliminates possibility of diversion and irrigation from Garrison. Makes for loss of power head to ineffective amount. Reduces Garrison to silt pool. Jeopardizes effectiveness of any development of Missouri source program. Cannot understand apathy displayed by ROBERTSON and LEMKE in permitting this to go through without a fight. Plays directly into hands of South Dakota who have advocated large development at Oahe site.

Lieutenant ORLANDY.

MANDAN, N. DAK., December 7, 1945.
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The Garrison Dam represents a project which affects the entire State of North Dakota and is extremely important to the State. The height of the dam was set at a conference of the interagency committee, representing 10 States and 4 Federal agencies, and decision made after careful consideration of all angles. We do not believe that Congress should be influenced by the protests of an individual community. The Representatives of our State should work with the State water commission, which represents the entire State, in restoring the height of the dam to the original figure. We trust that you will do everything in your power to accomplish this.

MANDAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

CARRINGTON, N. DAK., December 5, 1945.
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Re proposed change in height of Garrison Dam. This community 100 percent in favor of State water commission and Army engineer plan for 1,850 maximum pool level. We feel that reduction of pool level to 1,830 would entirely nullify benefits which community and surrounding territory would otherwise receive.

Urge your utmost effort to restore 1,850-foot level when measure for preliminary funds is brought to your attention.

CARRINGTON KIWANIS CLUB,
C. W. YODER, President,
FRANK JOHNSON, Secretary.

CARRINGTON, N. DAK., December 5, 1945.
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Re proposed change in height of Garrison Dam. This community 100 percent in favor of State water commission and Army engineers plan for 1,850 maximum pool level.

We feel that reduction of pool level to 1,830 would entirely nullify benefits which this community and surrounding territory would otherwise receive.

Urge your utmost effort to restore 1,850-foot level when measure for preliminary funds is brought to your attention.

DON L. TRACY, Mayor.

NASH, N. DAK., December 5, 1945.
MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate:

The rural-electrification program will be severely handicapped in North Dakota if the amendment by the House of Representatives on the height of Garrison Dam is permitted to be enacted into law. If North Dakota farms are to be electrified area coverage it is most essential that we have an abundance of cheap power available. The only way we can obtain such cheap power is through construction of the Garrison Dam as originally

outlined by North Dakota Water Commission. Please lend every assistance toward having height of dam restored to original height.

NORTH DAKOTA RURAL ELECTRIFICATION
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
P. J. DONNELLY, President.

CARRINGTON, N. DAK., December 5, 1945.
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Re proposed change in height of Garrison Dam. This community 100 percent in favor of State water commission and Army engineer plan for 1,850 maximum pool level.

We feel that reduction of pool level to 1,830 would entirely nullify benefits which this community and surrounding territory would otherwise receive.

Urge your utmost effort to restore 1,850-foot level when measure for preliminary funds is brought to your attention.

JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
A. HEINITZ, President.

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., December 5, 1945.
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you support Garrison Dam at 1,850-foot level. Unless this height is obtained water for 75 percent of people in North Dakota will not be available. Present House bill would reduce power development, but more serious, there would be no water to divert into James and Cheyenne Rivers. Urge you to do all in your power to secure high Garrison Dam which would benefit more than 75 percent of people in North Dakota.

JOHN F. OLSON,
Mayor, City of Jamestown.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., December 6, 1945.
The HONORABLE MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We believe 1,850-foot Garrison Dam level most beneficial all concerned.

LIGNITE COMBUSTION ENGINEERING
CORP.,
C. C. LARSON, President.

BISMARCK, N. DAK.
MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senator:
Dam must be original height for any real benefit to North Dakota.

CLEM CASEY.

DEVILS LAKE, N. DAK., December 7, 1945.
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:

Think engineers' plan for 1,850-foot Garrison Dam should not be stymied.

W. T. WEST.

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., December 4, 1945.
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., December 6, 1945.
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Regarding Garrison Dam: Please give full consideration. The 1,850-foot level is necessary to benefit central and eastern North Dakota.

F. A. LAHR.

ST. JOHN, N. DAK., December 10, 1945.
Senator YOUNG:

Six hundred members urge you to support original bill for Garrison Dam at 1,850-foot level.

ISAAC WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
JOHN A. VLASIN,
Chapter President.

C. M. BRYANT,
National Vice President.
DANA WRIGHT,
National Director.

DEVILS LAKE, N. DAK., December 7, 1945.
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Must these States suffer irreparable loss to save a few townships? Keep engineers' original height.

F. T. CUTHBERT.
W. N. NORTZ.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., December 6, 1945.
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We want the 1,850-foot Garrison Dam. At that height the increase in power will increase our irrigation acreage and benefit more people in North Dakota. The success or failure of the North Dakota project depends on cheap power rates.

UNIVERSAL MOTOR CO.
EARLE F. TUCKER.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., December 6, 1945.
Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

A 1,850-foot dam absolutely essential for best interests entire State because of power development and adequate storage for irrigation. Hope you give it your full support.

E. D. SALTZMAN.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., December 6, 1945.
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We believe 1,850-foot Garrison Dam level most beneficial all concerned.

LIGNITE COMBUSTION ENGINEERING CORP.,
C. C. LARSEN, President.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., December 6, 1945.
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

I am very much concerned about the Garrison Dam and I am asking you to give your support for the 1,850-foot project.

H. J. DUEMELAND.

LAKOTA, N. DAK., December 4, 1945.
Senator M. R. YOUNG:

Lowering of Garrison Dam makes it useless in our territory.

S. I. MONTEITH.

CANDO, N. DAK., December 4, 1945.
Senator MILTON YOUNG:

Use every effort to stop the restriction on the heights of the dam for the Missouri River diversion legislation.

CANDO CITY COUNCIL,
J. M. TORSON, Mayor.

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., December 5, 1945.
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

From information I have been able to gather it appears to me that it would be detrimental to the best interests of the State of North Dakota to have the congressional Snyder amendment to the Garrison legislation approved by the United States Senate.

I would therefore urge you to work for the deletion of such amendment when it comes before the Senate.

A. W. AYLMEY, Lawyer.

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., December 4, 1945.
Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Suggest you check carefully amendment restricting height of dam which would seriously delay, if not ruin North Dakotas chance for irrigation and diversion from Missouri.

F. L. DURAND.

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., December 4, 1945.
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Urge deletion of Snyder amendment to Garrison construction legislation feel it will be a definite detriment to majority State of North Dakota.

R. M. STOUT.

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., December 4, 1945.
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

For the good of North Dakota please use your influence to have amendment deleted restricting height of Garrison Dam.

R. E. MCKENZIE.

LAKOTA, N. DAK., December 4, 1945.
Senator M. R. YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:

Lowering of Garrison Dam makes it useless in our territory.

GREG LEDUC.

LAKOTA, N. DAK., December 4, 1945.
Senator M. R. YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:

Lowering of Garrison Dam makes it useless in our territory.

A. E. GOLDAMMER.

LAKOTA, N. DAK., December 4, 1945.
Senator M. R. YOUNG:

Lowering of Garrison Dam makes it useless in our territory.

DR. O. J. EINERSON.

LAKOTA, N. DAK., December 4, 1945.
Senator M. R. YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:

Lowering of Garrison Dam makes it useless in our territory.

OLE SUNDEEN.

LAKOTA, N. DAK., December 4, 1945.
Senator M. R. YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:

Lowering of Garrison Dam makes it useless in our territory.

ABE THAL.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., December 5, 1945.
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Restating flood-control appropriation in the House bill a good job, but the amendment reducing the dam level causing plenty of adverse criticism. Urge you to have the level restored to 1,850 feet so that the full possibilities of this construction will be available to the largest part of the State.

V. L. GILBREATH,
Secretary Bismarck Association Commerce.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., December 5, 1945.
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Fine job to get the appropriation Garrison Dam. However would urge your further support reestablishing the 1,850-foot level believing most beneficial to the State of North Dakota.

R. A. TRACY.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., December 5, 1945.
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

I believe in the 1,850-foot dam at Garrison to be most beneficial to North Dakota, therefore urge your support and influence to have the 1,850-foot level reenacted in the bill.

ARTHUR SANDIN.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., December 5, 1945.
Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate your efforts to get dam restored to 1,850-foot level.

A. C. VAN WYK.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., December 6, 1945.
Senator MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

We earnestly solicit your support of the 1,850-foot Garrison Dam. We feel that the greatest benefit will be derived by the States as a whole with an 1,850-foot dam.

ANDERSON HARDWARE CO.
PAUL G. BREWER.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., December 6, 1945.
Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:

It seems to us that the great increase in potential power output and irrigable area would make the 1,850-foot dam at Garrison far outweigh the inconvenience or loss to the relatively small minority who object. We sincerely hope that you will hear both sides of the story on this issue.

JOHN W. LARSON.

DEVILS LAKE, N. DAK., December 4, 1945.
MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

It appears our Members of the House forgot there was any place in North Dakota except Williston when it came to action on the Garrison Dam. Please don't make the same mistake when it comes before the Senate. North Dakota needs the 1,850-foot dam.

G. E. MINER.

DEVILS LAKE, N. DAK., December 4, 1945.
MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Your support of the 1,850-foot dam is needed by 95 percent of the people of North Dakota. Please give the high dam your support.

MILTON G. KELLY.

DEVILS LAKE, N. DAK., December 5, 1945.
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Board of directors unanimously endorse resolution of State water conservation commission dated November 30. House action limiting Garrison Dam level to 1,830 feet considered extremely regrettable. Urge you do all in your power to delete limitation amendment when bill reaches Senate.

DEVILS LAKE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
D. J. DONAHUE, Secretary.

DEVILS LAKE, N. DAK., December 4, 1945.
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Hope you will make every effort to delete amendment limiting Garrison Dam height from deficiency appropriation bill. Need 1,850-foot level to insure success of entire State water program. Limiting height sabotages 25 years of effort for diversion.

DEVILS LAKE DAILY JOURNAL,
M. R. GRAHAM, Publisher.

DEVILS LAKE, N. DAK., December 5, 1945.
HON. MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge that State water commission recommendation of 1,850-foot level Garrison Dam be followed.

RAMSEY COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
GEORGE MIKKELSON, President.

DEVILS LAKE, N. DAK., December 4, 1945.
Senator MILTON YOUNG:

Correct Mistake of LEMKE and ROBERTSON. Must have 1,850-foot level Garrison Dam to raise level necessary in second largest inland storage basin in United States to supply water for needs of eastern part State.

W. E. HOCKING, Mayor.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., December 5, 1945.
HON. MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senator:

Nice job getting the appropriation Garrison Dam. However, we are for the 1,850-foot dam and urge your support to eliminate the level amendment tacked on in the House of Representatives.

A. E. BRINK,
T. O. QUANRUD.

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., December 3, 1945.
Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

A vote of the dam level of 1,830 feet is a vote against 85 percent of the people in the State of North Dakota. Use your head.

BOB EDDY.

CANDO, N. DAK., December 17, 1945.
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:
We favor 1,850-foot level for Garrison Dam.
CANDO COMMERCIAL CLUB.

Mr. YOUNG. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks numerous editorials from newspapers in North Dakota condemning the action of our Members in the House.

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

[From the Foster County Independent of December 13, 1945]

RESTORATION OF 1,850-FOOT LEVEL ON GARRISON DAM IS ADVOCATED

Controversy has developed which may delay start of construction of the Garrison Dam and retard the irrigation program which Army and reclamation engineers have outlined.

Approval in Washington of the Garrison Dam at an 1,830-foot level was announced last week and set off the fireworks. The State water commission and Army and reclamation engineers had set the maximum height of the dam at 1,850 feet, to permit irrigation of a greater part of the State of North Dakota. Through the efforts of a group of Williston men, the height of the dam was approved at 1,830 feet.

The argument for the 1,850-foot level was brought out recently by Kenneth W. Simons, Bismarck, vice chairman of the State water conservation commission. "Surveys now under way show that 800,000 acres of land can be irrigated from Garrison if the plan of the Army engineers and the interagency commission is carried out," he declared.

Much of North Dakota will be handicapped in its development if the height of the Garrison Dam is dropped from 1,850 to 1,830 feet, Simons asserted.

He said the action of Congress in reducing the height of the dam throws the entire State water program out of kilter and will greatly reduce the value of the structure

to the people of central and eastern North Dakota.

IRRIGATION POSSIBILITIES

The total areas susceptible to irrigation from Garrison doubtless will run above a million acres, but for every foot the reservoir level is dropped a sharp curtailment must be made in the potential irrigated acreage. Reasons for this are many, Simons said, but one of the simplest is that it costs money to pump water and every foot of additional lift makes some land uneconomical to irrigate while it would be considered satisfactory if the levels were lower.

Pointing out that the taxpayers of the State have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in the development of the State water plan, Simons said it would be a tragic error if it were to be upset now because of ill-considered action in Congress.

Simons said the proper height of the dam was determined after careful study by both Army engineers and those representing the State and that it is unwise for Congress to change their findings without giving proper consideration to all the factors. He said, "It is a great deal like having a committee of doctors decide on the course of treatment for a patient after careful study of his case and then have someone who knows nothing about it, rush in and cut off the patient's leg."

Last week the Kiwanis Club of Carrington wired Senator WILLIAM LANGER asking his support in getting the 1,850-foot level restored.

[From the McClusky Gazette of December 13, 1945]

LOW-LEVEL DAM DECLARED THREAT TO NORTH DAKOTA WATER PLAN

North Dakota's entire water conservation program is endangered by an amendment inserted into the flood-control bill as it passed the lower House of Congress November 30, is the statement of the State Water Conservation Commission.

The amendment fixed the height of the proposed Garrison Dam at 1,830 feet above sea level despite the fact that the Interagency Basin Committee, representing every Federal agency in the Missouri Basin, has approved an 1,850-foot plan and that the water commission also had endorsed on behalf of the State of North Dakota.

Kenneth W. Simons, Bismarck, vice chairman of the North Dakota Water Conservation Commission, represented Gov. Fred G. Aandahl at a Washington Senate subcommittee hearing Friday afternoon when the height of the proposed Garrison Dam was under consideration. Lt. Col. Delbert B. Freeman, Omaha Army district engineer, also attended the meeting at the request of the Governor to present detailed engineering facts.

In a formal resolution made public by Governor Aandahl, commission chairman, the State body said the lower level would "greatly reduce the capacity for hydroelectric power development and flood control and materially reduce the feasibility of irrigation and diversion from the Garrison Reservoir, and that it would reduce the amount of water available from the Fort Peck Reservoir, which is necessary for the successful development of the Missouri-Souris diversion project."

"Surveys now underway show that 800,000 acres of land can be irrigated from Garrison (in the central part of the State), if the plan of the Army engineers and the interagency commission is carried out," Mr. Simons said in an address before a Bismarck service club.

Much of North Dakota will be handicapped in its development if the height of the Garrison Dam is dropped from 1,850 to 1,830 feet, Simons asserted.

He said the action of Congress in reducing the height of the dam throws the entire

State water program out of kilter and will greatly reduce the value of the structure to the people of central and eastern North Dakota.

The total acres susceptible to irrigation from Garrison doubtless will run above a million acres, but for every foot the reservoir level is dropped a sharp curtailment must be made in the potential irrigated acreage. Reasons for this are many, Simons said, but one of the simplest is that it costs money to pump water and every foot of additional lift makes some land uneconomical to irrigate, while it would be considered satisfactory if the levels were lower.

Pointing out that the taxpayers of the State have spent "hundreds of thousands of dollars" in the development of the State water plan, Simons said it would be a tragic error if it were upset now because of ill-considered action in Congress.

The proper height of the dam was determined after careful study by both Army engineers and those representing the State, Simons said, and added that it is unwise for Congress to change their findings without giving proper consideration to all the factors. He said "It is a great deal like having a committee of doctors decide on the course of treatment for a patient after careful study of his case and then have someone who knows nothing about it rush in and cut off the patient's leg."

[From the Renville County Farmer of December 13, 1945]

STATE'S WATER PLAN THREATENED BY LOW-LEVEL GARRISON DAM—WILLISTON POLITICIANS RESORT TO TRICKERY, THOMPSON CLAIMS

North Dakota's entire water conservation program is endangered by an amendment inserted into the flood-control bill as it passed the lower House of Congress November 30, is the statement of the State Water Conservation Commission.

The amendment fixed the maximum height of the proposed Garrison Dam at 1,830 feet above sea level despite the fact that the interagency basin committee, representing every Federal agency in the Missouri Basin, has approved an 1,850-foot plan and that the water commission also had endorsed on behalf of the State of North Dakota.

In a formal resolution made public by Gov. Fred G. Aandahl, commission chairman, the State body said the lower level would "greatly reduce the capacity for hydroelectric power development and flood control, and materially reduce the feasibility of irrigation and diversion from the Garrison Reservoir, and that it would reduce the amount of water available from the Fort Peck Reservoir, which is necessary for the successful development of the Missouri-Souris diversion project."

It is to the latter project that the State commission looks for the development of more than 1,000,000 acres of irrigation in the Minot area.

The resolution asserts that "the rights and the protection of property of the people in the Williston area were fully considered and amply provided for" when the level was fixed at 1,850 feet. The attitude of the water commission was set forth in the following statement:

"In any development program of this kind, we must expect some opposition from persons who, even fully paid for their property, do not like to move or be disturbed. Their rights must be recognized and paid for or protected to the fullest extent but the North Dakota Water Commission cannot let the whims of such individuals stand in the way of the greatest benefit to our State nor should Congress let it stand in the way of the greatest benefit to the Missouri Basin."

This was a veiled reference to certain individuals at Williston where the opposition to the 1,850-foot dam has centered. That

this is the case was made plain in a supporting statement issued by S. W. Thompson, Devils Lake, long-time member of the commission and father of the Missouri River diversion program. He said the commission's whole program is endangered by the unconsidered action of Congress and loosed a blast at what he called "back-stage plotting and legislative connivery."

Thompson, in his statement, said: "Not only does it greatly diminish the usefulness of the Garrison Dam but it strikes a mortal blow at the Missouri-Souris irrigation project upon which we have counted to irrigate more than a million acres of land in north-western North Dakota."

"Under the agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers," he continued, "water from Fort Peck is to become available for irrigation only when other storage is available to meet the needs of downstream States. The height limitation written into the bill reduces the amount of water to be stored at Garrison to such an extent that the Army engineers, mindful of the downstream interests of other States, will refuse to relinquish their claim to the water in Fort Peck upon which we depend to supply the Missouri-Souris project."

"In addition, it either will make impossible or greatly increase the expense of irrigating approximately 1,000,000 acres of land in central North Dakota. It either will make impossible or greatly increase the expense of diverting water from the Missouri into eastern North Dakota to meet the critical water supply situation facing many areas there."

"The action of the House came as a complete surprise to us since no hearing was held on the matter and we were not advised the height of the dam was an issue. It was not even mentioned until the limitation suddenly appeared in the amendment to the deficiency appropriation bill which restored the money for flood-control purposes."

"The proper height for the Garrison Dam was fixed by Army engineers after exhaustive study. The commission's own engineers and a consulting engineer employed for the purpose reached the same conclusion independent of the Army engineers. The proper height for the dam was agreed upon by all the Government's technical experts, representing the Army engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Agriculture, and the Federal Power Commission. It was approved by all of the States in the basin, speaking through the Governors of four States who also are members of the interagency committee. But the lower House of Congress apparently did not even look at this record. Its Members quite evidently were deceived by a piece of legislative trickery as crass as any which ever threatened the welfare of a large number of people."

"The demand for this action came only from a few persons in the city of Williston, led by Bill Davidson, banker and sidewalk farmer. They put their selfish interests ahead of the welfare of the State. One of our own Congressmen actively aided them in their efforts, according to press reports, while the other stood supinely by and saw the interests of North Dakota sold down the river without protest."

"We sincerely hope full and open hearings will be held in the Senate so all the facts may be presented. This issue is too important to be decided by the back-stage plotting and legislative connivery. It must be decided on its merits and all of the people of the State, not merely a selfish few, must have the opportunity to be heard."

"Four major dams have been proposed for construction in the Missouri River. We have been happy that the best dam site and the dam chosen for initial construction is at Garrison. We want it built as soon as possible, but it will be a tragedy for this and for succeeding generations if it is not constructed so as to be of the greatest possible

value to the people of North Dakota and to the Missouri basins as a whole."

[From the Turtle Mountain Star of December 13, 1945]

PROTESTING MOVE TO LOWER GARRISON DAM AND REDUCE BENEFIT

Lively interest in whether we are to have an MVA plan of Missouri Valley development has been overshadowed by the recent proposal to lower the level of the proposed Garrison Dam.

S. W. Thompson of the North Dakota State Water Commission, who has been plugging for Missouri River development for 25 years, goes so far as to claim that 95 percent of the State of North Dakota will be deprived of any benefits from the huge program if the dam is lowered as threatened.

A House amendment to the supplementary appropriation bill limits the Garrison Dam pool elevation to 1,830 feet, and forbids the use of any money to build dikes or levees to protect areas from flooding if any higher level is used.

PLAN WAS FOR 1,850 FEET

All plans so far had been for a 1,850-foot level, with no objections until quickly and unexpectedly the House inserted and approved the amendment. The original level has the approval of the Interagency Committee, representing the four governmental departments, Agriculture, Interior, Army, and Power Commission.

All sections of North Dakota except the Williston area, it is asserted, want the higher level for the very good reason that little of the State will derive water benefits if the level is lowered as proposed. Williston was to be protected by levees and dikes from any threat of flooding under the original plan.

In his strong letter of protest to Congressman LEMKE, who is said to be backing the Williston move to lower the dam, Mr. Thompson set up the following objections, among others:

CITES OBJECTIONS

"The result would be that the Garrison reservoir would have only about one-half the contemplated storage, with the final result as follows: (1) Power development within the State would be reduced enormously; (2) no diversion could be had from the Garrison Dam to the eastern half of the State except by pumping, the cost of which would be prohibitive; (3) the Missouri-Souris project would perhaps not be built because water for irrigation from Fort Peck will not be available for irrigation unless there was adequate storage provided below; (4) the Baldhill Reservoir north of Valley City would mean nothing without added water from the Missouri River; 50,000 acres of irrigated land at Jamestown and another 50,000 at New Rockford would have no water supply; the areas from Garrison south, both in the easterly and westerly directions, could not be developed for irrigation; many cities that are now hauling water from a supply which may become dry at any time would be forced out of existence; such cities are equally as important as Williston."

MENTIONS SOUTH DAKOTA PROJECT

Mr. Thompson is afraid that the North Dakota Congressmen, who are understood to be backing the lowering of the Garrison Dam, may be favoring a proposal to build the big dam at Oahe in South Dakota. This dam would provide ample power for South Dakota, would provide water for a million acres of irrigation for South Dakota, but neither Oahe nor Fort Peck furnish power development for North Dakota, nor will they furnish sufficient water to develop our agricultural resources.

Mr. Thompson thinks the amendment to lower the Garrison Dam, out of deference to Williston, is selling North Dakota down the river and that all the big dreams for

more water for dry areas of our own State will come to nothing, unless individuals, civic groups, cities, and towns let our North Dakota Senators in Washington know that a great error is being made.

[From the Wells County Free Press of December 13, 1945]

STATE'S WATER PLAN THREATENED BY LOW-LEVEL GARRISON DAM

North Dakota's entire water conservation program is endangered by an amendment inserted into the flood control bill as it passed the lower House of Congress November 30, is the statement of the State Water Conservation Commission.

The amendment fixed the maximum height of the proposed Garrison Dam at 1,830 feet above sea level despite the fact that the interagency basin committee, representing every Federal agency in the Missouri Basin, has approved an 1,850-foot plan and that the water commission also had endorsed on behalf of the State of North Dakota.

In a formal resolution made public by Gov. Fred G. Aandahl, commission chairman, the State body said the lower level would "greatly reduce the capacity for hydroelectric power development and flood control and materially reduce the feasibility of irrigation and diversion from the Garrison Reservoir, and that it would reduce the amount of water available from the Fort Peck Reservoir, which is necessary for the successful development of the Missouri-Souris diversion project."

It is to the latter project that the State commission looks for the development of more than 1,000,000 acres of irrigation in the Minot area.

The resolution asserts that "the rights and the protection of property of the people in the Williston area were fully considered and amply provided for" when the level was fixed at 1,850 feet. The attitude of the water commission was set forth in the following statement:

"In any development program of this kind, we must expect some opposition from persons who, even when fully paid for their property, do not like to move or be disturbed. Their rights must be recognized and paid for or protected to the fullest extent, but the North Dakota Water Commission cannot let the whims of such individuals stand in the way of the greatest benefit to our State nor should Congress let it stand in the way of the greatest benefit to the Missouri Basin."

This was a veiled reference to certain individuals at Williston where the opposition to the 1,850-foot dam has centered. That this is the case was made plain in a supporting statement issued by S. W. Thompson, of Devils Lake, long-time member of the commission and "father" of the Missouri River diversion program. He said the commission's whole program is endangered by the unconsidered action of Congress and he loosed a blast at what he called back-stage plotting and legislative connivery.

Thompson, in his statement, said: "Not only does it greatly diminish the usefulness of the Garrison Dam, but it strikes a mortal blow at the Missouri-Souris irrigation project upon which we have counted to irrigate more than a million acres of land in north-western North Dakota."

"Under the agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers," he continued, "water from Fort Peck is to become available for irrigation only when other storage is available to meet the needs of the downstream States. The height limitation written into the bill reduces the amount of water to be stored at Garrison to such an extent that the Army engineers, mindful of the downstream interests of other States, will refuse to relinquish their claim to the water

in Fort Peck upon which we depend to supply the Missouri-Souris project.

"In addition, it either will make impossible or greatly increase the expense of irrigating approximately 1,000,000 acres of land in Central North Dakota. It either will make impossible or greatly increase the expense of diverting water from the Missouri into eastern North Dakota to meet the critical water-supply situation facing many areas there.

"The action of the House came as a complete surprise to us since no hearing was held on the matter and we were not advised the height of the dam was an issue. It was not even mentioned until the limitation suddenly appeared in the amendment to the deficiency appropriation bill which restored the money for flood control purposes.

"The proper height for the Garrison Dam was fixed by Army engineers after exhaustive study. The commission's own engineers and a consulting engineer employed for the purpose reached the same conclusion independent of the Army engineers. The proper height for the dam was agreed upon by all the Government's technical experts, representing the Army engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Agriculture, and the Federal Power Commission. It was approved by all of the States in the basin, speaking through the Governors of four States who also are members of the interagency committee. But the lower House of Congress apparently did not even look at this record. Its Members quite evidently were deceived by a piece of legislative trickery as crass as any which ever threatened the welfare of a large number of people.

"The demand for this action came only from a few persons in the city of Williston, led by Bill Davidson, banker and sidewalk farmer. They put their selfish interests ahead of the welfare of the State. One of our own Congressmen actively aided them in their efforts, according to press reports, while the other stood supinely by and saw the interests of North Dakota sold down the river without protest.

"We sincerely hope full and open hearings will be held in the Senate, so all the facts may be presented. This issue is too important to be decided by back-stage plotting and legislative connivance. It must be decided on its merits and all of the people of the State, not merely a selfish few, must have the opportunity to be heard.

"Four major dams have been proposed for construction in the Missouri River. We have been happy that the best dam site and the dam chosen for initial construction is at Garrison. We want it built as soon as possible, but it will be a tragedy for this and for succeeding generations if it is not constructed so as to be of the greatest possible value to the people of North Dakota and to the Missouri basin as a whole."

[From the Benson County Press of December 7, 1945]

Congressmen LEMKE and ROBERTSON pulled one on the State when they let the Williston folks use them to disrupt the plans for the Garrison Dam in the House when the appropriation bill was amended to set the height of the dam at 1,830 feet.

It is rather amusing to see such astute politicians let a minority group in North Dakota put one over on them. But it is also indicative of the determination of the Williston faction to spike the whole project if they cannot protect their relatively minor irrigation projects.

The difference of a few feet in the height of the dam at first sight would not seem to make much difference. If we can believe the statement of the engineers it would reduce the capacity of the dam by one-third. It would mean that less water would be available for diversion into the Sheyenne and James Rivers and that means the Devils Lake Reservoir. These ideas mean nothing to the

Williston group, if their few thousand acres are endangered.

Maybe Williston supporters elected LEMKE and ROBERTSON. It may also be that they can return these men to Congress. We hope they don't come around here asking us to vote for them. They sort of kicked the voters of this part of the State in the face when they did not oppose the amendment, and one of them took the floor covering the reduction in the height of the dam.

The diversion portion of the development program for the Missouri River has been one of our pets for a long time. Now when its realization is closer than ever before, it hurts to have it handled like this by the men who are supposed to be working for the best interests of the entire State.

This messing around with the affairs of the entire valley system, and the damage that one small faction can do, is just another good argument for control by a Missouri Valley Authority.

[From the Bismarck Tribune of December 6, 1945]

AMENDED HEIGHT OF GARRISON DAM ATTACKED ON THREE FRONTS

IN WASHINGTON

Reasons why North Dakota's State Water Commission wants a "high" dam in the Missouri River near Garrison will be presented to a Senate Appropriations Committee by Kenneth W. Simons, commission vice chairman and editor of the Tribune.

Simons flew to Washington Wednesday night to testify before the Senate committee, holding hearings on the House-passed deficiency appropriation bill which includes \$2,000,000 for initiating construction of the \$130,000,000 Garrison Dam.

Gov. Fred G. Aandahl, chairman of the water commission, said Simons would officially represent the commission at the hearings and would present the commission's viewpoint in seeking elimination of a House amendment which would limit the height of the dam itself to 1,830 feet above sea level.

The State water commission went on record this week as opposing the 1,830-foot height limitation and urging that the Senate strike it out.

The commission wants the dam built to permit an operating pool level of 1,850 feet above sea level and the United States Army engineers want to build the dam to permit such an operating level. A group of residents of Williston, which would be at the upper end of the reservoir, want the lower level. They contend that the 1,850 level would constitute a danger to Williston and nearby irrigation projects. The Army agreed earlier this year to construct dikes to protect Williston and the irrigation projects.

In a formal resolution adopted by the commission, the commission said limiting the dam height to 1,830 feet would mean that the normal pool level would have to be "materially below this level to reserve room for floodwaters."

"Such low level," the resolution said, "would greatly reduce the capacity for hydro-electric power development and flood control, and materially reduce the feasibility of irrigation and diversion from the Garrison Reservoir."

IN BISMARCK

A protest meeting over the amended height of the Garrison Dam was held Wednesday night in the World War Memorial Building under the auspices of the Bismarck Association of Commerce.

More than 50 Bismarck businessmen attended the session and went on record as being opposed to the House amended height of the dam. The height, as agreed upon by the interagency committee was 1,850. The House, in its deficiency appropriation bill, limited the height of the dam to 1,830.

J. J. Walsh, secretary of the State Water Commission, told the merchants of the advantages of the 1,850-foot level, pointing out that the power potentialities of the dam were reduced by one-third by lowering the height of the dam 20 feet. He also claimed that the amount of land which could be brought under irrigation would likewise be reduced.

Gov. Fred G. Aandahl told what had already been done on the dam and urged all those who attended the meeting to contact their Congressmen to impress upon them the need of maintaining the height of the dam at 1,850 feet.

Dr. Sinclair Harper, consulting engineer, Berkeley, Calif., Thursday was completing review of the United States Army Engineers' preconstruction planning for the Garrison Dam.

Dr. Harper and a group of United States Army engineers, representatives from the engineers' district office at Omaha, Nebr., arrived here Wednesday and were to go to Pierre, S. Dak., late Thursday to review foundation explorations for the proposed Oahe Dam. Lt. Col. John W. Sibert, Jr., area engineer in Bismarck, is conducting the party on its tour.

Dr. Harper, former chief engineer of the Bureau of Reclamation, is a regular member of the board of consulting engineers which has been reviewing studies made for the Garrison Dam. That board met here last September 10 and 11, but Dr. Harper was in Afghanistan as a consultant engineer for that country's government and was unable to be present at the Bismarck meeting.

Dr. Harper's activities on the various waterways of this Nation are subject of a recent magazine article, River Doctor, by Lewis Nordyke.

Representatives of the Omaha office who were with Dr. Harper include Maj. Wendell E. Johnson and F. H. Kellog, M. E. Stalker, H. O. Egeberg, P. T. Bennett and E. R. Kendall.

IN FARGO

Early diversion of water from the Missouri River to eastern North Dakota may be seriously interfered with or even precluded if the 1,830-foot pool level limitation for the Garrison dam be established. Lt. Col. Delbert B. Freeman, Omaha, Nebr., district Army engineer, said here Wednesday night.

Colonel Freeman declared that any loss of storage capacity in the Missouri River would provide that much less water for diversion for irrigation purposes or replenishing of underground and surface water supplies to eastern North Dakota. He also said downstream interests who are interested in adequate storage for flood control and navigation, are concerned about the possibility of the Garrison Dam storage being materially reduced.

(The Missouri Basin inter-agency committee, consisting of representatives from 10 States and 4 Federal agencies, last August unanimously approved a design for a dam to an elevation of 1,874 feet which would permit the reservoir to be operated at a level of 1,850 feet.)

Colonel Freeman said "if the reference to a pool elevation of 1,830 feet refers to the maximum normal operating pool elevation, it means a loss of 7,000,000 acre feet of the cheapest storage in the basin. If the reference means maximum operating pool elevation, it means even greater loss of storage."

Mr. YOUNG. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks a letter from R. A. Wheeler, lieutenant general, Chief of Engineers.

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

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D. C., December 6, 1945.
HON. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: At the conclusion of the hearing before your committee yesterday with regard to the War Department items in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, you requested that I advise the committee of my views with respect to the amendment offered by Representative LEMKE as a substitute for the proviso now contained in the act limiting the height of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir. As I am scheduled to be out of Washington next week on official business, you excused me from further appearance before the committee. I am, therefore, presenting my views in this letter, which General Crawford will deliver to the committee. He will also be available for any further questioning you may desire.

If the committee and the Congress desire to include in the act language restricting the development of the Garrison project, the substitute language suggested by Representative LEMKE is less objectionable, in our opinion, than the language contained in the act as passed by the House of Representatives, since the substitute language would permit the initiation of construction of the dam in accordance with the authorized project. However, for several reasons which I shall discuss below, I believe it inadvisable for the best over-all development of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin that any restriction be placed by law on the Garrison project at this time. I therefore recommend that neither the proviso now in the act nor the proposed substitute be enacted.

The determination of the pool elevations in the Garrison project is a highly involved technical matter, and if the Congress desires to fix the maximum pool elevation I believe that the legislation should be considered initially by the particular committees established to deal with this type of legislation where all of the technical interests concerned can make full presentation of their views.

The coordinated plan for the Missouri River Basin as developed by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers and authorized by the Congress in the 1944 Flood Control Act definitely contemplated that the final storage capacities of the main stem reservoirs and precise elevations and heights of reservoirs and dams will be agreed upon after further studies have been made and after consideration of the desires and objections of persons affected by the proposed developments. Several months ago the States in the Missouri River Basin, the Department of the Interior, Federal Power Commission, Department of Agriculture, and the Corps of Engineers formed the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee as the means for settling on a cooperative basis all problems which may arise in working out the details of the Missouri Basin projects. This committee considered the height of the Garrison project at its regular meeting on August 16, 1945, and the proposal for a maximum normal operating pool at elevation 1,850 was discussed. It was agreed unanimously by the interagency committee that the Garrison Dam should be constructed to a height which would permit operation at a maximum normal pool up to elevation 1,850, but the decision as to the maximum normal pool at which the project should be operated was not made. As this Department is one participating in the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee and has agreed to the committee action as outlined above, I cannot properly acquiesce in the establishment of a limiting height for the Garrison pool in view of this

joint agreement that has already been reached.

This Department now believes that it will be feasible to protect Williston and the existing irrigation projects in that vicinity by a system of dikes and drainage wells. However, here will be a period of 8 or 10 or more years from the time the dam construction is initiated until pool levels approach the higher elevations now under discussion, during which time the studies and investigations of optimum pool levels will be continued, thus providing more information, both from theoretical studies and from actual operating experience.

In our studies of the elevations of the Garrison Reservoir, we consider that project as one of the most important elements in the authorized plan for developing the water resources of the entire Missouri River Basin. That plan is region-wide and each project must be considered in its relationship to the regional plan. In this connection I wish to quote a paragraph from President Truman's letter of November 10, 1945, to Mr. Ora Bundy, president of the National Reclamation Association, which reads as follows: "At this time I would like to make one further suggestion. The key to success of any regional resource development will be found in how active cooperation is organized between the people of the region, their civic and commercial organizations, and local and Federal Governments. TVA has remonstrated successfully one way in which this can be done. Another experiment in which four Federal agencies are participating—the War Department, Department of the Interior, Department of Agriculture, and the Federal Power Commission—is now making another demonstration. The manner in which these agencies work together, and at the same time work with local political units and private organizations, will be watched closely."

It is my strong conviction that the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee can resolve all of the questions which have arisen with respect to the Garrison project and which will certainly come up as other elements of the Missouri Basin plan are undertaken and placed in operation. To accomplish this the interagency committee must have free rein to develop its procedures and come to agreements. It would, therefore, appear to be unwise to circumscribe the scope of that committee's functions through legislative action prescribing the elevation of the Garrison Reservoir.

Sincerely yours,

R. A. WHEELER,
Lieutenant General, Chief of Engineers.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I plead with the Senate to insist on its position, thereby giving protection to the State of North Dakota in its electrical and power development and irrigation projects.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is there any controversy between the House and the Senate as to this matter?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes; the controversy still remains as to whether the dam shall be 1,830 feet or 1,850 feet high.

Mr. LANGER. Then let me say to the Senator that the water commission which has been referred to was created while I was Governor of North Dakota. The dam was very important to us then, and it is most important now. I hope the distinguished Senator from Tennessee will do all in his power to see to it that the differences between the House and the Senate are amicably adjusted, even if it is necessary for the Senate con-

feres to recede from the position of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF SECOND WAR POWERS ACT OF 1942

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4780) to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, am I correct in understanding that the amendment now pending is that in line 20, on page 2 of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHITE. On that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. 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	Kilgore	Shipstead
Blibo	Knowland	Smith
Brooks	La Follette	Stanfill
Byrd	Langer	Stewart
Capper	McCarran	Taft
Carville	McClellan	Taylor
Chavez	McKellar	Tobey
Ellender	McMahon	Tunnell
Fulbright	Maybank	Tydings
Gossett	Mead	Vandenberg
Green	Millikin	Wagner
Gurney	Mitchell	Walsh
Hart	Moore	Wheeler
Hatch	Murdoch	Wherry
Hayden	O'Daniel	White
Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Hill	Pepper	Willis
Hoey	Radcliffe	Wilson
Huffman	Revercomb	Young
Johnson, Colo.	Russell	
Johnston, S. C.	Saitonstall	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I merely desire to say that on the vote about to be taken, a vote "yea" will be a vote to sustain the committee amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to state my understanding of the situation. As I understand, a vote "yea" will be to extend these war powers until December 31, 1946, and a vote "nay" will be to limit them to June 30, 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, in line 20. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered, and 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 Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who, if present and voting, would vote as I intend to vote. I am, therefore, free to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are detained at a meeting of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on official business at Government departments.

I wish to announce further that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

I announce also that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has a general pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who would vote "nay," has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] has been excused.

The Senators from Oregon [Mr. CORDON and Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business.

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

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—30

Carville	Hayden	McKellar
Chavez	Hill	McMahon
Ellender	Huffman	Maybank
Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.	Mead
Gossett	Johnston, S. C.	Mitchell
Green	Kilgore	Murdock
Hatch	McCarran	O'Mahoney

Pepper
Radcliffe
Russell

Stewart
Taylor
Tunnell

Wagner
Walsh
Wheeler

NAYS—31

Austin
Bilbo
Brooks
Byrd
Capper
Gurney
Hart
Hickenlooper
Hoey
Knowland
La Follette

Langer
McClellan
Millikin
Moore
O'Daniel
Revercomb
Saltonstall
Shipstead
Smith
Stanfill
Taft

Tobey
Tydings
Vandenberg
Wherry
White
Wiley
Willis
Wilson
Young

NOT VOTING—35

Aiken
Andrews
Bailey
Ball
Bankhead
Barkley
Brewster
Bridges
Briggs
Buck
Bushfield
Butler

Capehart
Connally
Cordon
Donnell
Downey
Eastland
Ferguson
George
Gerry
Glass
Guffey
Hawkes

Lucas
McFarland
Magnuson
Morse
Murray
Myers
Overton
Reed
Robertson
Thomas, Okla.
Thomas, Utah

So the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the committee amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. TAFT. I move that the motion be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I make the point of order that the announcement has been made by the Chair, and the request comes too late.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The third reading of the bill is in order.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. McMAHON and Mr. O'DANIEL asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 4780) was passed.

AMENDMENTS TO GI BILL OF RIGHTS—
CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3749) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II, 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 to

the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That the second sentence of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'The Administrator is authorized, for the purpose of extending benefits to veterans and dependents, and to the extent he deems necessary, to procure the necessary space for administrative, clinical, medical, and outpatient treatment purposes by lease, purchase, or construction of buildings; or by condemnation or declaration of taking, pursuant to existing statutes.'

"Sec. 2. Section 104 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by striking out the second paragraph thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Any veteran entitled to a prosthetic appliance shall be furnished such fitting and training, including institutional training, in the use of such appliance as may be necessary, whether in a Veterans' Administration facility, other training institution, or by outpatient treatment, including such service under contract and including necessary travel expenses to and from their homes to such hospital or training institution.

"The Administrator may procure any and all items mentioned herein, including necessary services required in the fitting, supplying, and training in use of such items by purchase, manufacture, contract, or in such other manner as the Administrator may determine to be proper without regard to any other provision of law."

"Sec. 3. Section 200 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The Administrator is further authorized at his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe to furnish, if available, necessary space and suitable office facilities for the use of paid full-time representatives of such organizations."

"Sec. 4. Section 302 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 302. (a) The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized and directed to establish, from time to time, boards of review composed of five commissioned officers, two of whom shall be selected from the Medical Corps of the Army or Navy, or from the Public Health Service, as the case may be. It shall be the duty of any such board to review, at the request of any officer retired or released from active service, without pay, for physical disability pursuant to the decision of a retiring board, board of medical survey, or disposition board, the findings and decisions of such board. Such review shall be based upon all available service records relating to the officer requesting such review, and such other evidence as may be presented by such officer. Witnesses shall be permitted to present testimony either in person or by affidavit, and the officer requesting review shall be allowed to appear before such board of review in person or by counsel. In carrying out its duties under this section such board of review shall have the same powers as exercised by, or vested in, the board whose findings and decision are being reviewed. The proceedings and decision of each such board of review affirming or reversing the decision of any such retiring board, board of medical survey, or disposition board shall be transmitted to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Treasury, as the case may be, and shall be laid by him before the President for his approval or disapproval and orders in the case."

"Sec. 5. (a) Paragraph 1 of part VII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"1. Any person who served in the active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable, and who either shall have served ninety days or more, exclusive of any period he was assigned for a course of education or training under the Army specialized training program or the Navy college training program, which course was a continuation of his civilian course and was pursued to completion, or as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies, or shall have been discharged or released from active service by reason of an actual service-incurred injury or disability, shall be eligible for and entitled to receive education or training under this part: *Provided*, That such course shall be initiated not later than four years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the present war, whichever is the later: *Provided further*, That no such education or training shall be afforded beyond nine years after the termination of the present war."

"(b) Paragraph 2 of part VIII of such Regulation is amended to read as follows:

"2. Any such eligible person shall be entitled to education or training at an approved educational or training institution for a period of one year plus the time such person was in the active service on or after September 16, 1940, and before the termination of the war, exclusive of any period he was assigned for a course of education or training under the Army specialized training program or the Navy college training program, which course was a continuation of his civilian course and was pursued to completion, or as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies, but in no event shall the total period of education or training exceed four years: *Provided*, That his work continues to be satisfactory throughout the period, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institution: *Provided further*, That wherever the period of eligibility ends during a quarter or semester and after a major part of such quarter or semester has expired, such period shall be extended to the termination of such unexpired quarter or semester."

"(c) Paragraph 3 of part VIII of such Regulation is amended to read as follows:

"3. (a) Such person shall be eligible for and entitled to such course of education or training, full time or the equivalent thereof in part-time training, as he may elect, and at any approved educational or training institution at which he chooses to enroll, whether or not located in the State in which he resides, which will accept or retain him as a student or trainee in any field or branch of knowledge which such institution finds him qualified to undertake or pursue: *Provided*, That for reasons satisfactory to the Administrator, he may change a course of instruction: *And provided further*, That any such course of education or training may be discontinued at any time, if it is found by the Administrator that, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institution, the conduct or progress of such person is unsatisfactory."

"(b) Any such eligible person may apply for a short, intensive post-graduate, or training course of less than 30 weeks: *Provided*, That the Administrator shall have the authority to contract with approved institutions for such courses if he finds that the agreed cost of such courses is reasonable and fair: *Provided further*, That (1) the limitation of paragraph 5 shall not prevent the payment of such agreed rates, but there shall be charged against the veteran's period of eligibility the proportion of an ordinary school year which the cost of the course bears to \$500, and (2) not in excess of \$500 shall be paid for any such course."

"(c) Any such eligible person may apply for a course of instruction by correspondence without any subsistence allowance: *Provided*, That the Administrator shall have authority to contract with approved institutions for such courses if he finds that the agreed cost of such courses is reasonable and fair: *Provided further*, (1) That the provisions of paragraph 5 shall not apply to correspondence courses; (2) that one-fourth of the elapsed time in following such course shall be charged against the veteran's period of eligibility; and (3) that the total amount payable for a correspondence course or courses for any veteran shall not exceed \$500: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to preclude the use of approved correspondence courses as a part of institutional or job training, subject to regulations prescribed by the Administrator."

"(d) Paragraph 5 of part VIII of such Regulation is amended to read as follows:

"(5) The Administrator shall pay to the educational or training institution, for each person enrolled in full time or part time course of education or training, the customary cost of tuition, and such laboratory, library, health, infirmary, and other similar fees as are customarily charged, and may pay for books, supplies, equipment, and other necessary expenses, exclusive of board, lodging, other living expenses, and travel, as are generally required for the successful pursuit and completion of the course by other students in the institution: *Provided*, That in no event shall such payments, with respect to any person, exceed \$500 for an ordinary school year unless the veteran elects to have such customary charges paid in excess of such limitation, in which event there shall be charged against his period of eligibility the proportion of an ordinary school year which such excess bears to \$500: *Provided further*, That no payments shall be made to institutions, business or other establishments furnishing apprentice training on the job: *And provided further*, That any institution may apply to the Administrator for an adjustment of tuition and the Administrator, if he finds that the customary tuition charges are insufficient to permit the institution to furnish education or training to eligible veterans, or inadequate compensation therefor, may provide for the payment of such fair and reasonable compensation as will not exceed the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction; and may in like manner readjust such payments from time to time."

"(e) Effective on the first day of the first calendar month subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act, the first sentence of paragraph 6 of part VIII of such Regulation is amended to read as follows:

"While enrolled in and pursuing a course under this part, such person, upon application to the Administrator, shall be paid a subsistence allowance of \$65 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or \$90 per month, if he has a dependent or dependents, including regular holidays and leave not exceeding thirty days in a calendar year."

"(f) Paragraph 7 of part VIII of such Regulation is amended to read as follows:

"7. Any such person eligible for the benefits of this part, who is also eligible for the benefit of part VII, may elect either benefit or may be provided an approved combination of such courses: *Provided*, That the total period of any such combined courses shall not exceed the maximum period or limitations under the part affording the greater period of eligibility."

"Sec. 6. Section 4 of Public Law Numbered 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, as added by section 402 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided further*, That returned books, supplies,

or equipment may be turned in to educational or training institutions for credit under such terms as may be approved by the Administrator, or disposed of in such other manner as may be approved by the Administrator.'

"Sec. 7 (a) The proviso in paragraph 1 of part VII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is amended to read as follows: '*Provided*, That no course of training in excess of a period of four years shall be approved except with the approval of the Administrator, nor shall any training under this part be afforded beyond nine years after the termination of the present war.'

"(b) Effective on the first day of the first calendar month subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act, paragraph 3 of part VII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"3. While pursuing training prescribed herein, and for two months after his employability is determined, each veteran shall be paid the amount of subsistence allowance specified in paragraph 6 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended: *Provided*, That the minimum payment of such allowance, plus any pension or other benefit, shall be, for a person without a dependent, \$105 per month; and for a person with a dependent, \$115, plus the following amounts for additional dependents: (1) \$10 for one child and \$7 additional for each additional child, and (2) \$15 for a dependent parent: *Provided further*, That the rates set out herein shall not be subject to the increase authorized by Public Law Numbered 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 27, 1944: *And provided further*, That when the course of vocational rehabilitation furnished to any person as herein provided consists of training on the job by an employer, such employer shall be required to submit monthly to the Administrator a statement in writing showing any wage, compensation, or other income paid by him to such person during the month, directly or indirectly, and based upon such written statements, the Administrator is authorized to reduce the subsistence allowance of such person to an amount considered equitable and just."

"Sec. 8. Title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE III—LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTY

"CHAPTER V—GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR LOANS

"Sec. 500. (a) Any person who shall have served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of ninety days or more, or by reason of an injury or disability incurred in service in line of duty, shall be eligible for the benefits of this title. Any loan made by such veteran within ten years after the termination of the war for any of the purposes, and in compliance with the provisions, specified in this title, is automatically guaranteed by the Government by this title in an amount not exceeding fifty per centum of the loan: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount guaranteed shall not exceed \$2,000 in the case of non-real-estate loans, nor \$4,000 in the case of real-estate loans; or a prorated portion thereof on loans of both types or combination thereof."

"(b) Loans guaranteed under this title shall be payable under such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by the parties thereto, subject to the conditions and limitations of this title and the regulations issued pursuant to section 504: *Provided*, That the liability under the guaranty within the limitations of this title shall decrease or increase pro rata with any decrease or increase

of the amount of the unpaid portion of the obligation: *Provided further*, That loans guaranteed under this title shall bear interest at a rate not exceeding four per centum per annum and shall be payable in full in not more than twenty-five years, or in the case of loans on farm realty in not more than forty years: *And provided further*, That (1) the maturity on a non-real-estate loan shall not exceed ten years; (2) any loan for a term in excess of five years shall be amortized in accordance with established procedure; (3) except as provided in section 505 any real-estate loan, other than for repairs, alterations or improvements, shall be secured by a first lien on the realty, and a non-real-estate loan, except as to working or other capital, merchandise, good will and other intangible assets, shall be secured by personalty to the extent legal and practicable.

"(c) An honorable discharge shall be deemed a certificate of eligibility to apply for a guaranteed loan. Any veteran who does not have a discharge certificate, or who received a discharge other than honorable, may apply to the Administrator for a certificate of eligibility. Upon making a loan as provided herein, the lender shall forthwith transmit to the Administrator a statement setting forth the full name and serial number of the veteran, amount and terms of the loan, and the legal description of the property, together with the appraisal report made by the designated appraiser. Where the loan is automatically guaranteed, the Administrator shall provide the lender with a loan guaranty certificate or other evidence of the guaranty. He shall also endorse on the veteran's discharge, or eligibility certificate, the amount and type of guaranty used, and the amount, if any, remaining. An amount equivalent to four per centum on the amount originally guaranteed shall be paid to the lender by the Administrator out of available appropriations, to be credited upon the loan. Nothing herein shall be deemed to preclude the assignment of any guaranteed loan nor the assignment of the security therefor.

"(d) Loans guaranteed hereunder may be made by any Federal land bank, national bank, State bank, private bank, building and loan association, insurance company, credit union, or mortgage and loan company, that is subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State or Territory, including the District of Columbia. Any loan at least twenty per centum of which is guaranteed under this title may be made by any national bank, or Federal savings and loan association; or by any bank, trust company, building and loan association or insurance company organized or authorized to do business in the District of Columbia; without regard to the limitations and restrictions of any other statute with respect to—

"(1) ratio of amount of loan to the value of the property;

"(2) maturity of loan;

"(3) requirement for mortgage or other security;

"(4) dignity of lien; or

"(5) percentage of assets which may be invested in real estate loans.

"(e) Any loan proposed to be made to an eligible veteran by any lender not of a class specified in subsection (d) may be guaranteed by the Administrator, if he finds that it is in accord otherwise with the provisions of this title, as amended.

"PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOMES

"Sec. 501. Any loan made to a veteran under this title, the proceeds of which are to be used for purchasing residential property or constructing a dwelling to be occupied as his home or for the purpose of making repairs, alterations, or improvements in property owned by him and occupied as his home, is automatically guaranteed if made pursuant to the provisions of this title, including the following:

"(1) That the proceeds of such loan will be used for payment of the property purchased or constructed or improved;

"(2) That the contemplated terms of payment required in any mortgage to be given in part payment of the purchase price or the construction cost bear a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses; and that the nature and condition of the property is such as to be suitable for dwelling purposes; and

"(3) That the price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property or for the cost of construction, repairs, or alterations does not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator.

"PURCHASE OF FARMS AND FARM EQUIPMENT

"Sec. 502. Any loan made to a veteran under this title, the proceeds of which are to be used for purchasing any lands, buildings, livestock, equipment, machinery, supplies or implements, or for repairing, altering, constructing or improving any land, equipment, or building, including the farmhouse, to be used in farming operations conducted by the veteran involving production in excess of his own needs, or for working capital requirements necessary for such operations, or to purchase stock in a cooperative association where the purchase of such stock is required by Federal statute as an incident to obtaining the loan, is automatically guaranteed if made pursuant to the provisions of this title, including the following:

"(1) That the proceeds of such loan will be used for any such purposes in connection with bona fide farming operations conducted by the applicant;

"(2) That such property will be useful in and reasonably necessary for efficiently conducting such operations;

"(3) That the ability and experience of the veteran, and the nature of the proposed farming operations to be conducted by him, are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that such operations will be successful; and

"(4) That the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property does not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator.

"PURCHASE OF BUSINESS PROPERTY

"Sec. 503. Any loan made to a veteran under this title, the proceeds of which are to be used for the purpose of engaging in business or pursuing a gainful occupation, or for the cost of acquiring for such purpose land, buildings, supplies, equipment, machinery, tools, inventory, stock in trade, or for the cost of the construction, repair, alteration, or improvement of any realty or personalty used for such purpose, or to provide the funds needed for working capital, is automatically guaranteed if made pursuant to the provisions of this title, including the following:

"(1) That the proceeds of such loan will be used for any of the specified purposes in connection with bona fide pursuit of gainful occupation by the veteran;

"(2) That such property will be useful in and reasonably necessary for the efficient and successful pursuit of such business or occupation;

"(3) That the ability and experience of the veteran, and the conditions under which he proposes to pursue such business or occupation, are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that he will be successful in the pursuit of such business or occupation; and

"(4) That the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property, or the cost of such construction, alterations, or improvements, does not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator.

"REGULATIONS

"Sec. 504. The Administrator is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations not inconsistent with this title, as amended, as are necessary and appropriate for carrying out the provisions of this title, and may delegate to subordinate employees authority to issue certificates, or other evidence, of guaranty of loans guaranteed under the provisions of this title, and to exercise other administrative functions hereunder.

"SECONDARY LOANS

"Sec. 505. (a) In any case wherein a principal loan, for any of the purposes stated in section 501, 502, or 503, is approved by a Federal agency to be made or guaranteed or insured by it pursuant to applicable law and regulations, and the veteran is in need of a second loan to cover the remainder of the purchase price or cost, or a part thereof, the Administrator, subject otherwise to the provisions of this title, may guarantee the full amount of the second loan: *Provided*, That such second loan shall not exceed 20 per centum of the purchase price or cost: *And provided further*, That regulations to be promulgated jointly by the Administrator and the head of such agency may provide for servicing of both loans by such agency and for refinancing of the principal loan to include any unpaid portion of the secondary loan with accrued interest, if any, after the curtailment thereon equals twice the amount of the secondary loan.

"(b) Any person who is a veteran eligible for the benefit of this title, as provided in section 500 hereof, and who is found by the Secretary of Agriculture by reason of his ability and experience, including training as a vocational trainee, to be likely to carry out successfully undertakings required of him under a loan which may be made under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, shall be eligible for the benefits of such Act to the same extent as if he were a farm tenant.

"PROCEDURE ON DEFAULT

"Sec. 506. In the event of default in the payment of any loan guaranteed under this title, the holder of the obligation shall notify the Administrator who shall thereupon pay to such holder the guaranty not in excess of the pro rata portion of the amount originally guaranteed, and shall be subrogated to the rights of the holder of the obligation to the extent of the amount paid on the guaranty: *Provided*, That prior to suit or foreclosure the holder of the obligation shall notify the Administrator of the default, and within thirty days thereafter the Administrator may, at his option, pay the holder of the obligation the unpaid balance of the obligation plus accrued interest and receive an assignment of the loan and security: *Provided further*, That (1) nothing herein shall be construed to preclude any forbearance for the benefit of the veteran as may be agreed upon by the parties to the loan and approved by the Administrator; and (2) the Administrator may establish the date, not later than the date of judgment and decree of foreclosure or sale, upon which accrual of interest or charges shall cease.

"LOANS ON DELINQUENT INDEBTEDNESS

"Sec. 507. Any loan made to a veteran, the proceeds of which are to be used to refinance any indebtedness of the veteran which is secured of record on property to be used or occupied by the veteran as a home or for farming purposes, or indebtedness incurred by him in the pursuit of a gainful occupation which he is pursuing or which he proposes in good faith to pursue, or any delinquent taxes or assessments on such property or business, is automatically guaranteed if made pursuant to the provisions of this title, including the following:

"(1) Such loan became in default or the delinquency occurred not later than ten years after the termination of the war;

"(2) Such refinancing will aid the veteran in his economic readjustment; and

"(3) The amount of the guaranteed loan does not exceed the reasonable value of the property or business, as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator.

"INSURANCE OF LOANS

"SEC. 508. (a) Any loans which might be guaranteed under the provisions of this title, when made or purchased by any financial institution subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State or Territory, including the District of Columbia, may, in lieu of such guaranty, be insured by the Administrator under an agreement whereby he will reimburse any such institution for losses incurred on such loan up to 15 per centum of the aggregate of loans so made or purchased by it.

"(b) Loans insured hereunder shall be made on such other terms, conditions, and restrictions as the Administrator may prescribe within the limitations set forth in this title. The Administrator may fix the maximum rate of interest payable on any class of non-real-estate loans insured hereunder at a figure not in excess of a 3 per centum discount rate or an equivalent straight interest rate on nonamortized loans.

"(c) The Administrator shall pay the same amount on each loan insured hereunder as he would be required to pay under the sixth sentence of section 500 (c) hereof if the loan were guaranteed rather than insured.

"POWERS OF ADMINISTRATOR

"SEC. 509. (a) With respect to matters arising by reason of this title as now or hereafter amended and, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Administrator may—

"(1) Sue and be sued in his official capacity in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal;

"(2) Subject to specific limitations in this Act, consent to the modification, with respect to rate of interest, time of payment of principal or interest or any portion thereof, security or other provisions of any note, contract, mortgage or other instrument securing a loan which has been guaranteed or insured hereunder;

"(3) Pay, or compromise, any claim on, or arising because of, any such guaranty or insurance;

"(4) Pay, compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, lien or demand, however acquired, including any equity or any right of redemption;

"(5) Purchase at any sale, public or private, upon such terms and for such prices as he determines to be reasonable, and take title to, property, real, personal, or mixed; and similarly sell, at public or private sale, exchange, assign, convey, or otherwise dispose of any such property; and

"(6) Complete, administer, operate, obtain and pay for insurance on, and maintain, renovate, repair, modernize, lease, or otherwise deal with any property acquired or held pursuant to this title: *Provided*, That the acquisition of any such property shall not deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil or criminal jurisdiction of, on, or over such property (including power to tax) or impair the rights under the State or local law of any persons on such property.

"(b) The powers by this section granted may be exercised by the Administrator without regard to any other provisions of law not enacted expressly in limitation hereof, which otherwise would govern the expenditure of public funds: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall apply to any contract for services or supplies on account of any property acquired pursuant to this section if the amount of such contract exceeds \$1,000.

"(c) The financial transactions of the Administrator incident to, or arising out of,

the guaranty of loans pursuant to this title, and the acquisition, management, and disposition of property, real, personal or mixed, as incident to such activities and pursuant to this section, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government.

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 510. This title, as amended, shall be effective from the date of enactment: *Provided*, That any application for guaranty of a loan filed within ninety days after such date may be approved under the title as it existed prior to amendment: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to affect any contractual right under any certificate of guaranty issued thereunder.

"SEC. 9. Section 1505 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 10. Title VI of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 1506. Persons who served in the active military or naval service of any government allied with the United States in World War II and who at time of entrance into such active service were citizens of the United States shall, by virtue of such service, and if otherwise qualified, be entitled to the benefits of titles II, III, IV, and V of this Act or of Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, in the same manner and to the same extent as persons who served in the active military or naval service of the United States: *Provided*, That any such benefit shall not be extended to any person who is not a resident of the United States at time of filing claim or to any person who has applied for and received the same or similar benefit from the government of the nation in whose active military or naval service he served.

"SEC. 1507. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1503, any person while on terminal leave, or while hospitalized pending final discharge, may be afforded the benefits of titles II and III of this Act, or vocational rehabilitation training under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, subject to all conditions thereof except actual discharge: *Provided*, That no subsistence allowance shall be paid in such cases under title II of this Act or Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress. This section shall be effective from June 22, 1944."

And the Senate agree to the same. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
TOM CONNALLY,
ED. C. JOHNSON,
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.,
E. D. MILLIKIN,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

J. E. RANKIN,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
JAMES DOMENGAUX,
EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

HOUSING FACILITIES FOR SERVICEMEN AND THEIR FAMILIES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 122) to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other

purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and for other purposes, which was, on page 2, line 8, after "housing" insert "And provided further, That any educational institution, State or political subdivision thereof, local public agency, or nonprofit organization which has incurred expenses in the relocation (including the costs of disassembling, transporting, site preparation, and reerection but not including the costs of site acquisition or the installation of off-site utilities) of temporary housing or other facilities (but not including demountable houses) under the jurisdiction or control of the National Housing Administrator for reuse in providing temporary housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families shall, upon application therefor, be reimbursed for such expenses by said Administrator out of the funds made available by the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946 (H. R. 4805), to carry out the purpose of this title."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, in the conference report on the first deficiency bill, 1946, there appears the following statement as to an amendment which, I understand, is still in disagreement:

Amendment No. 48, making an appropriation of \$191,900,000 for veterans' housing: That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate with the understanding that the amount of \$191,900,000 shall be construed as including any unused funds under title I of the Lanham Act which may be made available for veterans' housing.

I presume that the conferees meant the unused part of title I of the Lanham Act authorization, because there was an authorization of \$160,000,000 in the resolution which passed the Senate a few days ago, and there was a \$35,000,000 authorization in title I of the Lanham Act. Together they make a total of \$195,000,000. I presume that reference is made in the conference report to the unused portion of the money under title I of the Lanham Act authorization.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what is the motion?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion was made by the Senator from South Carolina that the Senate concur in the House amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 122.

The motion was agreed to.

ADMISSION TO THE UNITED STATES OF ALIEN WIVES AND CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 867, House bill 4857.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4857) to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the acting majority leader whether the calendar will be called tomorrow?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if at all possible, it is our intention to dispose of the strategic minerals bill, and then call the calendar.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I desire to make an announcement.

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have just cast my eyes over the vote which was taken a few moments ago on the committee amendment. I find that the motion to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was rejected was made by a Senator who voted against the committee amendment; namely, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. Therefore, Mr. President, I challenge the vote and move a reconsideration of the vote by which the motion to reconsider the amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that the Senator from Nebraska voted with the prevailing side, and had a right to make the motion which he made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Did the Senator from Nebraska vote with the prevailing side?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. He did. He voted "nay" and the nays prevailed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think we should not consider the various bills which Senators are asking the Senate to consider until tomorrow, providing that we may be assured that there will be a call of the calendar. I suggest that the calendar might be called even before the strategic minerals bill is considered.

Mr. HILL. I understand that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming believes that the disposition of the strategic minerals bill will not take very long.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My thought is that it will not take very long.

Mr. HILL. Then, after the disposition of that bill it will be my intention to have the calendar called.

Mr. WHITE. Does the Senator mean tonight?

Mr. HILL. No; tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I am in charge of a bill of tremendous importance. I refer to Calendar No. 871, House bill 4717 to establish a department of medicine and surgery in the Veterans' Administration. I hope that by tomorrow I will have an opportunity to have the bill considered. It is a bill which would reorganize the medical department of the Veterans' Administration. I am sorry to have such an important bill on the deadline.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, as a member of the subcommittee of the

Veterans' Committee of the Committee on Finance, of which the able Senator from Colorado is chairman, I wish to join with him in urging the majority leadership to make certain that an opportunity will be afforded to have the bill considered before the Senate takes its holiday recess. A great deal of criticism has been voiced through the press and other channels concerning the type of medical care which is being afforded the veterans. The situation which has been criticized cannot be corrected, however, until a reorganization takes place of the medical department of the Veterans' Administration. The subcommittee heard both General Bradley and General Halley, and I believe the full committee also heard them. The bill was reported unanimously by the subcommittee and unanimously by the full committee, and I think it would be a mistake for the Senate to take a recess until the bill has been considered and disposed of.

Mr. TAFT. I think the bill can be passed under the 5-minute rule. I think we should clear away all the bills on the calendar we can dispose of, and then take up the strategic minerals bill.

Mr. HILL. I myself believe, inasmuch as the bill referred to by the Senator from Colorado was unanimously reported by the subcommittee and by the full committee, that when the bill is reached on the calendar no difficulty will be experienced in having it passed. I will say to the distinguished Senator, however, that if any difficulty is experienced I shall cooperate with him in any way that I can to the end that the bill may be disposed of.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I am glad of the assurance that the calendar is not to be called this evening, for I think it is altogether too late to undertake a call of the calendar. There is a very large number of bills on the calendar. Earlier in the day two Senators, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], spoke to me about two bills in which they have an interest. I have checked with minority members on this side so far as I could do so, and I find no objection either to the bill urged by the Senator from Georgia or the bill urged by the Senator from Arkansas. So far as I am concerned, I should be perfectly willing to see the two bills disposed of this evening, if we then might call it a day.

Mr. HILL. It was the thought of the Senator from Alabama to yield the floor at this time so that the Senators referred to might ask for consideration of their respective bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate has not disposed of the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Georgia. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4857, to expedite the admission into the United States of certain alien spouses?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Reserving the right to object, will the Senator from Georgia explain the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was preparing to explain it. The bill is an emergency measure to be limited to 3 years of operation. It is designed to expedite the admission into the United States of women who have become the wives of American soldiers who have served overseas. It relieves them of some of the expense of very cumbersome machinery which usually attends the securing of a visa, and also waives the medical examination on the other side.

Dr. Parran has testified before a committee of the House that examination on the other side would require quite an expense, because there are almost 100,000 of these women. The medical examination will be made on this side, and if any defects are noted the public health officer of the community in which the wife of the veteran will reside will be notified to that effect. The bill also simplifies the admission of children of men who served overseas.

Every safeguard is provided to insure that only the wives and children of veterans who married overseas will be admitted, and there is protection provided by the very thorough medical examination on this side.

I am advised that within the next 2 or 3 weeks there will be some shipping available for these women. They will have to wait until all the high-point military men have returned. The bill will not delay the return of one soldier or sailor who has the points prescribed by the War or Navy Department. It merely relieves the wives of veterans of the necessity of waiting for days around the American consulate, and relieves the Government of the United States of the necessity of sending overseas a large number of public-health officers to make a preexamination before application for visa.

Mr. President, I think this is the least we can do for the men who fought our wars overseas, who have married aliens, and who now wish to have their wives join them in this country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4857) an act to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizens, members of the United States armed forces, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMINISTRATION AND LIQUIDATION OF FEDERAL RURAL REHABILITATION PROJECTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to call up order of business No. 790, Senate bill 704. The bill was introduced last March and has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What is the calendar number?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Calendar No. 790, on page 6 of the calendar.

The purpose of the bill is to permit the Department of Agriculture to give preference to veterans in the disposition of lands, primarily lands under the Farm Security Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 704) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to continue administration of and ultimately liquidate Federal rural rehabilitation projects, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "war", to insert "and present project occupants", on page 2, line 20, after the word "Congress", to insert "and to present occupants of such lands", and at the end of the bill to strike out section 4, as follows:

SEC. 4. Until such time as the functions, powers, and duties of the War Food Administrator or the War Food Administration are terminated, the authority vested in the Secretary of Agriculture by this act shall be exercised by the War Food Administrator.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture, in order to assure the maximum preferential disposition to veterans of the present war and present project occupants, is hereby authorized and directed to maintain, administer, and utilize, for such period as he may deem necessary until disposal thereof as hereinafter provided, not to exceed 3 years, from the date of termination of the present war, such of the lands (improved and unimproved) comprising or incident to those resettlement projects and rural rehabilitation projects for resettlement purposes, and other like enterprises heretofore initiated for similar purposes and financed, in whole or in part, with funds made available to the Secretary, War Food Administrator, Farm Security Administration, Resettlement Administration, or Federal Emergency Relief Administration, as he determines are suitable for ultimate disposition in economic farm units. Nothing contained herein shall be deemed to authorize retardation of the expeditious liquidation of other land or property comprising or incident to such projects insofar as is deemed practicable by the Secretary consistent with the purpose of this act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall sell or cause to be sold, from time to time, those of such lands as are suitable for disposition in economic farm units, at the earning capacity value as determined by him and otherwise on such terms as he may deem advisable, to veterans, as defined in the Surplus Property Act of 1944, Public Law 457, Seventy-eighth Congress and to present occupants of such lands, who meet the requirements of eligibility specified in title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 7, secs. 1000-1006), as amended.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, including, without limitation, the maintenance and operation of the project properties and making betterments and improvements deemed necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

ACQUISITION OF STOCKS OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am about to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 812, Senate bill 752, the stock-pile bill, but I shall not ask for its disposition

tonight. I make the motion merely that the bill may become the unfinished business.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed now to the consideration of Senate bill 752.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by its title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 752) to amend the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, relating to the acquisition of stocks of strategic and critical materials for national-defense purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the acting majority leader about the program. There are on the calendar several small bills which Senators wish to have considered. It is my understanding that the calendar will be called tomorrow. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. The understanding is that we will proceed to dispose of the strategic materials bill. From the information I have I do not think it will take very long to dispose of the bill, and as soon as we dispose of that measure, we will proceed to a call of the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the acting majority leader for his statement. The only draw-back is that it is not a definite assurance that the calendar will be called at all.

Mr. HILL. No; I cannot say it is. It might be that if we encountered a long debate on the strategic minerals bill we might not have a call of the calendar. The calendar is called by unanimous consent anyway, as the Senator knows.

Mr. WHERRY. In the event the bill shall take longer than he now anticipates, may we have assurance that the acting majority leader will ask for a call of the calendar so that other bills may be considered?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if, as I do not anticipate, this measure shall take a longer time than I now believe it will, and thereby prevent the Senate from considering other bills, I shall not object to its being laid aside for the call of the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 752) to amend the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, relating to the acquisition of stocks of strategic and critical materials for national defense purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senate take up for immediate consideration House bill 1793, to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, under the arrangement which has just been reached, I shall have to object to the consideration of any other bills on the calendar this evening.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wonder if the acting majority leader will yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Can the Senator furnish the Senate some information as to when the conference report on the GI bill of rights will be acted upon? I believe the senior Senator from Colorado may have the information.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report has already been agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Seybourn H. Lynne, of Alabama, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Alabama, vice Thomas A. Murphy, deceased.

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 calendar.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Clarence E. Gauss to be a member of the Board of Directors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the Public Health nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Louis L. Bennett to be commodore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph E. Stika to be commodore.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the Army nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the Marine Corps nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Marine Corps nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified at once of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, December 20, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 19, 1945:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons now foreign-service officers of class 6 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Hector C. Adam, Jr., of New York.
Maurice M. Bernbaum, of Illinois.
William E. Cole, Jr., of New York.
George E. Miller, of New Jersey.
Elim O'Shaughnessy, of New York.
Charles O. Thompson, of Alaska.

Bernard C. Connelly, of Illinois, now a foreign-service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

Jay Dixon Edwards, of Oregon, now a foreign-service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as foreign-service officers, unclassified, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Harry H. Bell, of New Jersey.
Donald C. Bergus, of Indiana.
Thomas D. Bowie, of Minnesota.
Miss Lora C. Bryning, of Washington.
Robert E. Cashin, of Missouri.
David P. Coffin, of Massachusetts.
Dwight Dickinson, of New Jersey.
Robert J. Dorr, of California.
Donald A. Dumont, of New York.
David I. Ferber, of Arizona.
William J. Ford, of New Hampshire.

David L. Gamon, of California.
Thomas A. Goldman, of the District of Columbia.

Marshall Green, of Massachusetts.
Walter C. Isenberg, Jr., of Wisconsin.
Spencer M. King, of Maine.
George T. Lister, of New York.
Rupert A. Lloyd, of Virginia.
Albert K. Ludy, Jr., of Arizona.
Hendrik van Oss, of New Jersey.
Douglas W. Overton, of New Hampshire.
Henry C. Ramsey, of California.
Ralph A. Schweitzer, of California.
Richard M. Service, of California.
Sheldon B. Vance, of Massachusetts.
Harvey R. Wellman, of New York.
George M. Widney, of Alabama.
Louis A. Wiesner, of Michigan.

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., of Virginia, to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946:

Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., of Virginia.
TOM CONNALLY, United States Senator from the State of Texas.

ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, United States Senator from the State of Michigan.

Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York.

In the absence of the President or the Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius will be the senior representative of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly.

ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVES

The following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946:

SOL BLOOM, a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the State of New York.

CHARLES A. EATON, a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the State of New Jersey.

Frank C. Walker, of Pennsylvania.
John Foster Dulles, of New York.
John G. Townsend, Jr., of Delaware.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Edmund A. Flagg for appointment as executive, Communications and Records Division, National Headquarters, Selective Service System, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Compensation for the position of executive, Communications and Records Division, National Headquarters, Selective Service System, will be at the rate of \$5,180 per annum.

Colgate Hoyt for appointment as Assistant Chief, Veterans Personnel Division, National Headquarters, Selective Service System, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Compensation for the position of Assistant Chief, Veterans Personnel Division, National Headquarters, Selective Service System, will be at the rate of \$6,230 per annum.

IN THE ARMY

ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Brig. Gen. Thomas Jefferson Davis (lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as Assistant The Adjutant General, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Adrian R. Marron, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as manager, Navy Yard, Boston, Mass., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

Capt. Robert N. S. Baker, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as manager, Navy Yard, Charleston, S. C., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

Capt. Webster M. Thompson, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as manager, Puget Sound Navy Yard, Bremerton, Wash., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

Capt. Andrew I. McKee, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as manager, Navy Yard, Philadelphia, Pa., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

Capt. Lisle F. Small, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as manager, Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

Capt. Joseph W. Fowler, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, United States naval shipyards, Hunters Point, San Francisco, Calif., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

Capt. George T. Paine, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, United States naval shipyards, Terminal Island, San Pedro, Calif., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 19, 1945.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

Clarence E. Gauss, to be a member of the board of directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C., for a term expiring June 30, 1950.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS OR PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED AFTER NAME

To be assistant dental surgeon

Joseph E. Unsworth, effective date of oath of office.

To be senior assistant surgeons

Emory S. Moore, Jr., August 20, 1945.
Frederic C. Bartter, December 10, 1945.

To be pharmacists

Raymond D. Kinsey, July 1, 1944.
Thomas C. Armstrong, July 1, 1944.

To be senior dental surgeon

Hubert H. Martin, August 15, 1945.

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Donald L. Truscott, August 3, 1945.
Frederick S. Loe, Jr., August 2, 1945.
John C. Heckel, August 3, 1945.
Eugene H. Hess, August 3, 1945.
William B. Treutle, October 1, 1945.

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

Ernest C. Anderson, December 26, 1945.
Kaarlo W. Nasi, August 21, 1945.

To be temporary senior assistant surgeons

Vactor O. Connell, July 1, 1945.
Ardell B. Colyar, December 1, 1945.

To be temporary surgeons

Gilcin F. Meadors, December 1, 1945.
Clarence K. Aldrich, November 1, 1945.
Paul C. Campbell, Jr., September 1, 1945.
Lloyd R. Hershberger, July 1, 1945.
Louis Jacobs, December 1, 1945.
Allen B. Eschenbrenner, September 1, 1945.
Robert V. Holman, January 1, 1945.
Lloyd S. Rolufs, July 1, 1945.

To be temporary medical directors

Carl E. Rice, December 1, 1945.
Alfred J. Aselmeyer.

To be temporary senior assistant dental surgeon

William B. Treutle, August 24, 1945.

To be temporary sanitary engineers

Callis H. Atkins, December 1, 1945.
Fredrick C. Roberts, Jr., August 3, 1945.

To be temporary scientist director

Willard H. Wright, June 26, 1945.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To Quartermaster Corps

Capt. Francis Joseph Corr
Capt. Walter Abner Huntsberry

To Finance Department

Maj. Herbert Spencer Jordan

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonels

Stuart Adams Hamilton, Chemical Warfare Service, subject to examination required by law.

Barnwell Rhett Legge, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.

Edward Mallory Almond, Infantry.

Charles Paul Stivers, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.

Oliver Lincoln Haines, Cavalry, subject to examination required by law.

Oscar Irvin Gates, Field Artillery.

Percy William Clarkson, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.

Robert Chapin Candee, Air Corps.

Yarrow Daniel Vesely, Field Artillery, subject to examination required by law.

Lee Saunders Gerow, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.

Shuey Earl Wolfe, Coast Artillery Corps, subject to examination required by law.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major general

Chaplain Luther Deck Miller to be major general (brigadier general, Chief of Chaplains), United States Army.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR MARINE CORPS EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED AFTER NAME

To be first lieutenant

Robert J. Hoey, October 1, 1940.

To be second lieutenants from dates indicated

Charles P. Weiland, April 10, 1941.

Edward R. Polgrean, August 4, 1941.

William M. Watkins, Jr., October 14, 1941.

Richard R. Amerine, October 16, 1941.

Herbert A. Peters, February 9, 1942.

Robert R. Ayres, Jr., February 9, 1942.

Louis F. Ferguson, March 12, 1942.

Homer S. Hill, March 12, 1942.

Lawrence L. Herzog, March 14, 1942.

Jack B. Winters, March 17, 1942.

Scott G. Gier, March 25, 1942.

Cloyd R. Jeans, March 25, 1942.

Dean S. Hartley, Jr., April 3, 1942.

Wilbur F. Evans, May 1, 1942.

Robert L. Cremer, May 15, 1942.

Austin Wiggins, Jr., May 15, 1942.

James H. Phillips, May 22, 1942.

Elswin P. Dunn, June 8, 1942.

John M. Walker, Jr., June 18, 1942.

David R. Moak, June 25, 1942.

Edmond P. Hartsock, July 18, 1942.

Ralph E. Robinson, July 18, 1942.

Charles E. Call, October 1, 1942.

Emmett O. Anglin, Jr., November 1, 1942.

Phillip C. DeLong, December 16, 1942.

Edwin H. McCaleb III, February 1, 1943.

Bruce J. Matheson, February 1, 1943.

Thomas H. Miller, Jr., March 1, 1943.

John H. Glenn, Jr., March 16, 1943.

Earl W. Johnson, March 16, 1943.

George W. Brewer, April 1, 1943.

Loren K. Bronleewe, April 1, 1943.

Thomas J. Burnam, April 1, 1943.

David Cleeland, April 16, 1943.

Lynn W. Griffiths, April 16, 1943.

John E. Hansen, April 16, 1943.

George F. Bauman, May 16, 1943.

Stewart R. Lauer, May 16, 1943.

Joseph A. Mitchell, May 16, 1943.

George E. Jenkins, June 1, 1943.

Stanley J. Posluszny, June 1, 1943.

Richard H. Rainforth, June 1, 1943.

Eddie C. Torbett, June 1, 1943.

Thomas T. Tulipane, June 16, 1943.

Boyd "M" Phelps, July 1, 1943.

Harold D. Shields, July 1, 1943.

James C. Frew, July 16, 1943.

Richard M. Moore, July 16, 1943.

William K. Treynor, July 16, 1943.

Albert F. Dellamano, August 1, 1943.

Robert E. Wellwood, August 1, 1943.

Claude O. Barnhill, Jr., August 16, 1943.

Robert S. Hemstad, August 16, 1943.

Elmer E. Luther, September 1, 1943.

Dwight E. Mayo, September 1, 1943.

George H. Elias, October 1, 1943.

Frank K. Reilly, Jr., November 1, 1943.

Walter E. Daniel, December 16, 1943.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

APPOINTMENTS, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, IN THE COAST GUARD

Louis L. Bennett to be a commodore, to rank from November 1, 1945, while serving as commanding officer of Coast Guard training station, Groton, Conn., or in any other assignment for which the rank of commodore is authorized.

Joseph E. Stika to be a commodore, to rank from November 1, 1945, while serving as commanding officer of the Coast Guard group, Alameda, Calif., or in any other assignment for which the rank of commodore is authorized.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Arthur M. Matthews, Alicia.
Fred G. Williams, Bismarck.
Barbara L. Payne, Patmos.

CALIFORNIA

Mabel L. Hulsey, McArthur.
Lilburn G. Rice, Upper Lake.

KENTUCKY

Daisy H. Hampton, Artemus.
Verne W. Dunham, Dover.
Vernon Hall, McDowell.
Mattie S. Catlett, Mount Eden.
Clyde W. Rice, Tyner.

MAINE

Mary E. Burbank, Maplewood.

MICHIGAN

Earle S. Treend, Gobles.
Ward Gibbs, Sixlakes.

MINNESOTA

Lucile M. Bell, Lake Elmo.
Peter F. Hipp, New Brighton.
Lillian S. Mahlum, Nisswa.

OHIO

Herbert D. Holshoe, Homerville.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Allan R. Newman, Chamberlain.
Margaret A. Jones, Cresbard.

UTAH

Cedena A. Cloward, Aurora.
Erastus R. Curtis, Orangeville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1945

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

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

Almighty God, we rejoice in Him whose whole life was sacred and whose labors were divine. The star that poured its radiance upon the waiting world in memory bears us back to childhood's happy hours, when the Christmas snow blotted out a world of loathsome sin. In our observance of this holy day, grant that it may be free from the god of mammon, or that our people should make it a pagan festival. Never was there a time when we needed more to make a pilgrimage to the manger, out of whose poverty came the greatest riches of earth, pouring contempt upon class distinction, bigotry, and false idealism.

O Mary's Holy Child, reveal to this world, sated with strife, that an unselfish life is infinitely more than mere livelihood. O Son of God, who lived not in a palace but for the poor, help our country to rise from the shades of materialism into the Christmas dawn. We pray for the regenerating spirit, the faith and love which make us inheritors of these riches; this is the surety of the Christ birth.

We pray for our President, the Speaker, the Members, and all associated with the Congress. May they have the gladness of Christmas, which is hope; the spirit of Christmas, which is peace; the heart of Christmas, which is love. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. R. 3603. An act to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1415. An act to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANDIS (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.