

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. Hartssock, 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.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial appearing in the Boston Herald entitled "Coffee-Cup Tempest."

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances and include newspaper articles and letters.

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial appearing in the Chelsea Record.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 209]

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Abernethy | Gearhart | O'Hara |
| Adams | Geelan | Peterson, Ga. |
| Allen, Ill. | Gibson | Pfeifer |
| Andersen | Gillespie | Philbin |
| H. Carl | Granahan | Powell |
| Andrews, N. Y. | Grant, Ala. | Quinn, N. Y. |
| Barden | Gregory | Rains |
| Barry | Gwinn, N. Y. | Reece, Tenn. |
| Bell | Gwynne, Iowa | Reed, Ill. |
| Bender | Hancock | Resa |
| Bennet, N. Y. | Harless, Ariz. | Rich |
| Bland | Harness, Ind. | Richards |
| Boren | Hart | Rivers |
| Boykin | Hartley | Rizley |
| Bradley, Mich. | Healy | Robertson, Va. |
| Brehm | Hedrick | Rockwell |
| Brown, Ohio | Heseltun | Roe, N. Y. |
| Buckley | Hinshaw | Rogers, N. Y. |
| Camp | Hollfield | Rooney |
| Cannon, Fla. | Holmes, Mass. | Russell |
| Carlson | Hook | Sadowski |
| Case, N. J. | Horan | Schwabe, Okla. |
| Celler | Hull | Shafer |
| Chapman | Izac | Sharp |
| Chelf | Jackson | Sheridan |
| Chiperfield | Jennings | Short |
| Clark | Johnson, Okla. | Simpson, Pa. |
| Clippinger | Jonkman | Slaughter |
| Coffee | Kee | Smith, Va. |
| Cole, Kans. | Keefe | Snyder |
| Colmer | Kefauver | Somers, N. Y. |
| Combs | Keogh | Stevenson |
| Courtney | Kilburn | Stigler |
| Cox | King | Sumner, Ill. |
| Curley | Knutson | Sumners, Tex. |
| Daughton, Va. | Latham | Talbot |
| Dawson | Lemke | Talle |
| De Lacy | Lesinski | Tarver |
| Dickstein | Lewis | Taylor |
| Dingell | Luce | Thomas, N. J. |
| Domeneaux | McDonough | Thomason |
| Douglas, Calif. | McGehee | Torrens |
| Douglas, Ill. | McGlinchey | Towe |
| Drewry | McKenzie | Traynor |
| Durham | McMillen, Ill. | Voorhis, Calif. |
| Ellis | Maloney | Vorys, Ohio |
| Elsaesser | Mansfield, Tex. | Vursell |
| Ervin | May | Walter |
| Fellows | Monroney | Weaver |
| Fernandez | Morrison | Winter |
| Flannagan | Murdock | Wolcott |
| Fuller | Murphy | Wood |
| Gardner | Norrell | Worley |
| Gary | Norton | Zimmerman |
| Gathings | O'Brien, Mich. | |

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 258 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONVENING OF THE SECOND SESSION OF THE SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. J. Res. 294) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress shall begin at noon on Monday, January 14, 1946.

LET US BRING OUR FIGHTING MEN HOME

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. That means that this is an adjournment sine die?

Mr. McCORMACK. Until January 14.

Mr. RANKIN. It means an adjournment instead of a recess.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, this resolution does not set the date of the adjournment.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand it does not, but it does mean that when we do adjourn it is to be an adjournment and not a recess.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, when we reconvene it will be another session of Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, I am going to vote against the resolution for the simple reason, as I have pointed out before, that we have some legislation that I think ought to be passed before we go home, to permit the men who have served for 18 months or more in the armed forces to be discharged on their own motion, or, on their own application, to permit those men who have dependents at home to look after to be discharged on their own application, and to permit those boys who want to return to school to be discharged on their own application.

If this measure is carried over until after the 14th of January, the chances are we will not get a vote on it for months.

You have stripped the farms of this country of their young men; and if you postpone this proposition until spring, it means that many of them will be denied the opportunity to make crops next year. It is just as important for these young men to come home as it is for Members of Congress to go home for the holidays.

I am going to oppose any adjournment until you give us a vote on this measure to permit these boys to come home, when they are no longer in the armed forces.

General MacArthur some time ago said that he would not need more than 200,000 men in Japan at the outside, and, if I remember correctly, he said he could get along with 60,000. If General MacArthur can get along with 200,000 men in Japan, surely with Russia and France and England all helping in Europe, we can get along with 200,000 men in Germany. Then why keep in the armed forces six or seven million men, standing around in uniformed idleness, at Government expense, who are begging to come home to look after their own

affairs? I say it is an outrage and I shall oppose any adjournment until something is done about it.

This resolution means that Congress will be away for about 4 weeks. The rest of you may do as you please, but I cannot support it.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. There is nothing to object to. The joint resolution is before the House for consideration and has been debated.

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York. He has made a good fight on this proposition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has the floor.

Mr. RANKIN. This is a matter that confronts all the American people. It ought to be taken up here and discussed, and not rushed through in this hasty manner. We ought to have time to discuss it on the floor. I resent having it rammed through in this way.

The SPEAKER. We are proceeding in the regular order. The gentleman from Massachusetts has the floor. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I just want to say that I hope the gentlemen here, before they go home, will at least take the trouble to sign discharge petition No. 8. Let us get some action on this matter. We are breaking the morale of the Army, that has made a magnificent fight. They are beginning to wonder if the House of Representatives has any interest in them or in getting them home. We are breaking the morale of their families. Something ought to be done. I do not know how any man who fails to sign that petition can offer a reasonable excuse for not doing so.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. I have a discharge petition on the desk, No. 10, in which I am very, very much interested. I have no objection to this adjournment until the 14th unless I have to go back and get that signed anew. Will that carry over?

The SPEAKER. It will carry over.

Mr. FOLGER. If it will I am all right.

The SPEAKER. Everything remains on the calendar just as it is now.

Mr. McCORMACK. The next session would ordinarily start on January 3. We have practically completed our legislation. For the record, may I say that it is only fair and proper that this resolution be adopted. If we did meet on January 3 there would be no legislation to bring before the House much before the 14th of January.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that on the day before yesterday I was detained downtown and did not have the opportunity to join you in expressions of regret at the resignation of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]. It has been my privilege to serve with him for 16 years. Everything that was said about him here I join with you in echoing, because he has been an able, a conscientious, and a fine legislator, as well as a great friend. I am sorry I did not have the opportunity of saying so when others were talking about his leaving.

I would like briefly to take my hair down with my friends in the House of Representatives this morning, because, as you know, on December 31, 1945, my resignation will take effect and I will no longer be a Member of this body. My recollection of the House of Representatives goes back to 1911 when, as a young boy who had been out of Georgia only once before, I came to Washington with the Honorable William Schley Howard, who was a new Member at that time from the same district I now have the privilege to represent. I became chief clerk in the House Post Office over in the Old House Office Building. President William Howard Taft had called an extra session of the Congress to meet in April of that year, and in March Mr. Howard brought me up here and got that position for me. Whatever I have accomplished in political life has largely been due to the kindness, generosity, and friendship, as well as the good advice of my friend, Mr. Howard, who some of the older Members of the House will remember as having served 8 years in this body. There are only two Members of the House now serving who were in the Congress when I came here as a clerk in 1911. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and our distinguished friend from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] are the only two remaining Members who were here at that time. Champ Clark was Speaker of the House at that time, and Oscar Underwood was the Democratic leader as well as the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. I remember on the Republican side the distinguished Representative from Illinois, Mr. Mann, who perhaps knew more about legislation than any one man I have ever known who has served in this body. He broke himself down trying to keep up with all the legislation that was passed here.

The distinguished former Speaker, Mr. Cannon of Illinois, was also a Member

at that time. Back in those days, the executive branch of the Government consisted of only 300,000 employees. We had above 3,000,000 employees in 1944 and in that coordinate branch of the Federal system. Congress in those days remained in session on an average of about 10 months out of the 24 months for which a Member of the House was elected. The result was that Members had the opportunity to attend to other matters, practice law, stay at home and mingle with their constituents. It was a very, very different type of service from that in which we are now engaged. For a short time in 1912, I served as secretary to Mr. Howard. As my thoughts go back to those days, I can well remember that if we had as many as 15 letters in a day we had a big mail. We only had one clerk who was paid \$1,800 per year. Most of the correspondence concerned rural routes or, in our part of the country, Spanish War pensions, or free seed. Most of the legislation concerned appropriation bills and tariff bills. We had only one regulatory body at that time, as far as I recall, and that was the Interstate Commerce Commission. As CLIF WOODRUM said here the other day, the Members used to gather in the old Congress Hall Hotel and they really had the time to become friends and to know each other. They were not so busy as we are today, making it almost impossible for us to fraternize with each other in the way I know we would all like to do.

I went home in 1912 and studied law and did a great many other things. In 1926 I helped manage the campaign of a man named Leslie J. Steele, who defeated Hon. William D. Upshaw in the campaign that year. Mr. Steele took his seat here in 1927 and served until July 1929, when he died in the city of Washington. Mutual friends of the late Congressman Steele, Mr. Howard and myself, had a meeting, and they asked me to become a candidate for Congress. One of the things that entered into my decision at that time was the fact that I was informed, and I think reliably so, that the Congress was prepared and all ready, had all plans made, to increase the pay of its Members to \$12,500 per year. I mention that for a specific reason, and I will come back to it later.

I had no illusions about the service in the Congress. I cannot plead guilty to getting into some thing that I did not know anything about. I knew it was a tough job but I did not realize how tough it was going to become in the years that have passed since that time.

I came here as a new Member of Congress in October 1929, when Mr. Herbert Hoover was President, and our late friend, Nicholas Longworth, was Speaker of the House. Mr. John Q. Tilson was majority leader and Mr. Jack Garner was minority leader. I served under Speakers Longworth, Garner, Rainey, Byrns, Bankhead, and our present beloved and illustrious Speaker, Mr. Rayburn.

It has been a pleasure to serve in this body with the hundreds and hundreds of

men who have passed through its membership since I have been here. I sat down at home the other night and figured out how many were left of the 434 that I joined in the fall of 1929, and there are less than 55 of those 434 Members left. The turn-over is pretty fast.

I want to express my appreciation, not only to the Speaker of the House for his courtesy to me as a Member of this body, but also to my leader, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]; to the minority leader, my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MARTIN, and to each and everyone of them, because it has been a privilege to serve with them and to know them. They have always been courteous and kind.

I served here also during the time when the Honorable Bert Snell was minority leader and when on our side the men who later became Speakers were our majority leaders.

I want to express my appreciation to the chairmen of the committees on which I have served. They have been uniformly kind, courteous, and helpful. It has been a great privilege to serve with them. I have particularly enjoyed my service on the Labor Committee, first with the late Billy Connery, whom we all loved, and then with the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], the present chairman.

My service on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, first with Judge Davis, Tennessee, who is now a member of the Federal Trade Commission, and recently under the gentleman from Virginia, Judge BLAND, than whom there is no finer gentleman in this House.

I enjoyed my service on the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, whose chairman is the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

Recently in this Congress I have served on the Committee on Education, under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN]. I once served on the Roads Committee for a short time, and also on the Claims Committee for 10 years. I greatly enjoyed the work on that committee, although it is arduous and I had to give it up.

I especially want to thank my majority leader for selecting me 3 years ago to be Democratic whip of this House. It has been a most interesting service and one that has brought me into closer contact with the Members on my side of the aisle, and I have greatly enjoyed that service.

I wish also to express my appreciation to Will Robinson, of Utah, who is my chief assistant, and to the 15 zone assistants who have made possible whatever we have been able to accomplish with that organization.

Also I wish to thank the officers and employees of the House for their uniform courtesies, and for the friendships which I have formed with them. One of them, the postmaster of the House, Finis Scott, was my boss when I first came to Washington as a clerk in the

post office; I worked under his direction there.

I am also going to miss my association with the men and women of the press gallery. I have come to know them quite well and to know what conscientious people they are in trying to report accurately the proceedings of this great legislative body. They have a tough job trying to keep up, just as we do.

I wish to talk to you a few minutes now about the House of Representatives and the Congress, but more particularly the House, because I think I know something about the problems the Members of the House face. I, of course, have no personal knowledge about the situation in the Senate. The burdens of the Members of the House of Representatives during the years I have known something about it which, as I say, dates back to 1911—of course I have a more intimate knowledge in the past 16 years—those burdens have been tremendously increased by factors over which we have no control. Those factors in part are the growth of the population of the country. The number of Members in the House of Representatives has not changed since the reapportionment based on the census of 1910. This means of course that each of us here is today representing a great many more people because the population of the country has grown tremendously. There has been a wide extension of the activities of the Federal Government during the past 30 years and particularly during the past 16 which I have served here, and that in itself including as it does the establishment of many new agencies has brought to each Member of the House increased burdens and the necessity for additional work. The length of the sessions has also increased the burdens of the Members of this body. Just this morning I checked up on the length of the sessions of the Sixty-second Congress, which was the Congress that came into being in 1911. I found that although it had one extra session, making three in all, the three sessions totaled only 400 days. In the last Congress, the Seventy-eighth, this body was in session 695 days. This means, of course, that the Members are here in Washington practically all the time and it complicates the duties of the membership and increases the burdens under which they labor.

There has been another change in the service of this Congress which I believe it is well to note and I believe the people ought to understand—I am afraid they do not—and that is increase in the complexity of the problems with which the Members of this body must deal. As I stated a while ago, when I was secretary to Mr. Howard in 1912 legislation in this body encompassed only a few subjects, primarily appropriations and taxes. Today we are dealing with every known human activity not only in this country but with matters which affect every nation of the world and the peoples of every country. It is a much bigger job, a much more difficult job, a much more trying job to be a Member of this body today than it was in 1911 or 1912, or even in 1929 when I entered this Congress.

The work has been complicated, as I stated, by the additional days of service in both Houses of Congress, by the additional contacts made necessary by the Members of this body with the executive branch and by the added problems of the people, which means more mail to be answered, more questions to be taken up, more visitors to Washington and to your offices.

The methods of campaigning today are more trying on a Member of Congress and more expensive than in the earlier days. The radio alone has brought increased expenses to Members who seek reelection. I think something ought to be done about this situation and after I get out of the Congress I am going to take advantage of every opportunity I have to tell every public audience I can speak to that they should let you know they want you to remedy the conditions which are making service in this body such a burden on its Members.

In the first place, the pay of the Members of Congress is entirely inadequate. If it was not too much in 1925, it is too little today. No one else I know of is working for the same pay today that they received in 1925. It would not be so bad if the \$10,000 received by the Members of Congress were used for the same purposes which people working in private industry use their pay for; but you and I know that it is not possible. Actually what you are working for, as compared with a person in private life, is less than \$5,000 per year. That is a shame and a disgrace, and the people of this country would not want it to continue, in my judgment, if they knew the facts, and they ought to know them. This is the time to act. It was deferred in 1929. The depression came and the opportunity was lost. The people are for it now. It should be done.

I say that every expense incurred by a Member of Congress in the discharge of his official duties should be reimbursed to him. We do that for the executive branch of the Government. I will cite you an illustration of how we suffer under this disadvantage as compared with those in the executive branch of the Government.

Last April while we were in recess I went home and during my stay there the Military Order of the World War had a luncheon celebrating Army Day. A distinguished gentleman from Washington, who is head of one of the agencies here, made the principal address. I sat next to him at the speaker's table. He was a little late getting in. He came in followed by three men who worked for the United States Government in the branch office of that agency in Atlanta. One of them was carrying a brief case, the other one looking after his travel reservations and so forth. He had a book in his hand that he used to write out an order for a ticket. They do not need any money. The third one was driving him around in an automobile at Government expense.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, there I was representing a half million con-

stituents, staying in a hotel room at my own expense, no secretarial staff, no assistants, not even anyone to help me answer the telephone which was ringing about as fast as it could. It just does not make sense, Mr. Speaker. We appropriate the money to take care of those in the executive branch of the Government and we ought to staff our own offices and our own committees adequately so that we can render the service which the people want and are demanding from the Members of Congress. There ought to be better paid assistants. Only a year and a half ago I lost a fine young man who had been with me for 15 years. That kind of experience cannot be duplicated. There was nowhere I could turn to replace him, and the result was that after he left I had to put in at least 2 hours a day longer doing things which could be done just as well and were done just as well by him over a period of years. The reason I lost him was because at that time we were limited to \$4,500 a year as salary for our chief assistant. He was offered \$6,000 at home. I do not blame him for going. He did the right thing, but it is foolish for us to let those things happen; and the people in my district have suffered because I could not retain the services of that experienced assistant.

I think we ought to have an office in the District staffed at all times so that when we go home we will have some assistants there and in order that the people in our districts may have a place where they can go to get information and make the necessary contacts.

There is one other subject I think I know a little something about; I had a little experience with it in this House, and that is the question of what to do about old-age security or retirement. That is the principal reason, my colleagues, that I am leaving this House. I am approaching the time in life when I have to think about the consequences that come to all of us if we stay here long enough, and there certainly is no reason for a man to stay here until he suffers the consequences that we know have come to many men who have served here long and faithfully, only to go out in their old age with no means of livelihood and no chance to make a decent standard of living. This Congress ought to provide some form of retirement for its membership, and I hope you will do it. My friend the gentleman from Virginia, CLIFF WOODRUM, said that the bill that has been reported and that will probably be considered next year is not adequate. That may be true. The committee had some difficulty even reporting that bill. It can be perfected later. It certainly is a start in the right direction, and I do hope, although I am going out, and I will not be here at the time, that that matter will be taken up and thoroughly considered. Tell your constituents when you go home for the Christmas recess just what this situation is, just what your problems are, and explain to them what this bill does. If you get a copy of the report, you can give them all the information they may want to have about it, and I believe that the people of this country will back you up when they understand the situation.

I am confident they will. Certainly there is no reason in the world so far as I can find out why this group of public servants should be the only ones in the Federal Government without any form of old-age security. Sometime in my early days one of my friends sent me a motto which read something like this: "The way to have friends is to be one." I have often thought about that motto, and it seemed to me it was a good one to follow. I have tried to follow it here among my colleagues in the House. As far as I am concerned, there has been no Member of this body with whom I have served that I have not had the greatest respect for and that I did not like personally. I hope that as I leave here I may take with me the friendship of each one of you. I have enjoyed my contacts with you, and I am going to be continuously interested in the welfare of the Members of this body. If I can contribute anything to your welfare as a private citizen, I expect to do it. I am going to carry with me memories that are dearer to me than anything that life can hold. In connection with that feeling I just want to read an extract from *Diary of a Dude Wrangler*, written by Struthers Burt, which appeals to me as expressing the feeling I have regarding the memories I am taking away with me from this body. He said:

The remembrance of beauty, the beauty of a thing, or of personal relationships, or of a country, has always seemed to me the chief end of life. The present cannot be held; it slips through our grasping fingers, becomes immediately the past. The future may be neither beautiful nor worth remembering; certainly its beauty will be accompanied by ugliness and tragedy. But what has happened is ours and cannot be taken away from us; and the mind, like the gauze screen through which gold is run, transmutes in retrospect almost everything into loveliness. Remembrance is the one sure immortality we know.

As I leave my colleagues in the House I am taking with me many memories, remembrances of each of you, which I shall cherish as long as I live.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

MR. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the resignation of **BOB RAMSPECK** to become executive vice president of the Air Transport Association is to me personally, and to every Member of Congress, the cause of deep regret. I will lose the legislative associations of a close personal friend. Congress loses a valued and devoted colleague. The Nation will be deprived of the services of an able legislator and exemplary public official.

Bob has served with me in the House since October 2, 1929. During the last 3 years he has been the Democratic whip. These years of close association have given me the privilege of personal contact with a man who through his invaluable and unselfish devotion to the high duties of his office has indelibly imprinted upon me as upon all deep regard for his sterling qualities as a friend, adviser and leader among men.

He has worked unceasingly during his long service to strengthen the Administrative machinery of the Government. As chairman of the Civil Service Com-

mission he has been a staunch defender of the rights of Government employees under civil service and a vigorous protagonist of a stronger and greater Government through civil service.

Besides his arduous duties as Democratic whip, and chairman of the Civil Service Committee, he has been active and untiring in his efforts during the war to develop and maintain, as a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, an American merchant marine adequate for the purpose of our national defense in war as well as in peace. He has exhibited unusual vision in the performance of this office both in protecting the American shipowner and in safeguarding the rights of the American seaman. He has as a member of the Committee on Labor endeavored with sincerity and wisdom to establish and develop a national labor policy with a sole objective—the good of the country.

Few legislators have resigned from Congress who have experienced a more colorful background. His love for politics in the right sense is known to all. His strong and forcible motives have been evident in his every word and act, whether for his friends, his country, or his fellow man. There has been no time or place in his life for complacency, self-sufficiency, or indifference to existing conditions. Bob always looked ahead. In a world at war, with shifting concepts of government and social obligations, he was positive in his opposition to known abuses and a vigorous advocate of known improvements. Few men have been so fitted by talent and temperament to carry the heavy burdens of public office which have been his. His ready grasp of daily problems, his great capacity for the mastery of the intricacies of government, his extraordinary power of simple statement, his genial smile of friendliness, united with a long-sustained intellectual effort and a tireless zeal for the full performance of any task he has undertaken have ever marked his brilliant career.

Now, as he lays aside the mantle of the legislator, with a natural and sincere feeling of regret, I unite with his colleagues and his country, in paying tribute to his public service, whose duties he has so wisely comprehended and so ably performed. He carries with him the good wishes and high hopes of all who have been fortunate to know him.

To **BOB RAMSPECK**, service delayed has meant service denied. With painstaking care and unflagging energy, he has always pressed forward in his work for his fellow man. As a progressive legislator and diplomatic statesman, his has been a work of love for duty and its fulfillment. During the years no resentment has every marked our association, no differences of opinion have hindered our work. He has been single-minded in his devotion to the duties of his office. We have witnessed the spectacle in the last few days of two of the outstanding Members of the House addressing us in probably their final speeches in this body, one a man with 16 years of honorable and constructive service, and the other a man with 23 years of honorable and constructive service. Personal ne-

cessity, their obligation to themselves and families, compel them to resign and deny to this body, to their districts, to their States, and to the Nation, the full benefit of the great capacities that they possess, capacities increased as a result of their years of service. They retire voluntarily due to economic pressure. There are many other Members of this body confronted with the same problem. I may take the House into my confidence and say that I at the present time could resign from the House and accept a position paying each year a very substantial salary. It is a tremendous pressure when I realize that the journey of life is passing and that some time in the not too remote future my years of productivity will be over so far as a return to civilian life is concerned. We do not expect the salary or compensation that private employ can pay. Government should not pay that, and none of us expect it. On the other hand, it is for the best interests of the people of the country to see that Members of Congress, their public officials, are at least paid that compensation which gives them a reasonable minimum security in accordance with the position they occupy and the responsibilities devolving upon them.

Few people realize that we are subject to the income tax. Most people think we are not, but we are. Few people realize that our expenses here in the Capitol city are not a deductible item. Our actual living expenses for living quarters—never mind food—most people think is a deductible item from our gross income—it is not. A businessman coming to Washington can deduct all his expenses as a part of his business expenses, and properly so. But few people realize that Members of Congress who have to maintain their own home, come down here and all of their expenses, even for their actual expenses of living quarters, are not deductible from their gross income. Few people realize that the telephone bills of Members of Congress are greatly in excess of any allowance—in fact, we have no allowance for telephone bills. If I might make a personal reference, my telephone bill last year was \$1,878. Eighty-eight percent of that was for official calls in connection with my work as a Member of Congress. I do not say this for sympathy because I do not want sympathy. I would like to continue to render public service. That is what most of us are here for. Of course, we sought it, but we like to render public service. Someone has to do it. On the other hand, it is for the best interests of the people of a constituency and of the country to retain in office men who have stood the test, men who are qualified, men who are able, men who are experienced, and men who have courage. We regret to see these two men go. On this occasion, we regret to see **BOB RAMSPECK** go. But out of this may come a lesson. Through this occasion a message may be conveyed to the people of the country as to the reasons which compel these men to depart from public service, thereby taking from this body two outstanding legislators and statesmen to the detriment of the best interests of the people. I hope

we face the task. On three occasions in public life I have had the opportunity to vote for an increase in salary for myself. On two occasions, as a member of the Legislature of Massachusetts, and once, indirectly, as a Member of this body. I have never yet failed to vote for an increase. I welcome the opportunity. As a matter of fact, instead of \$15,000, we ought to increase the salary of Congressmen to \$20,000; but in any event it should be \$15,000.

We regret these two men leaving, but out of their leaving may come good for the people. It may awaken public opinion to the realization of what faced these two outstanding legislators and prompted them to retire from Congress, and which also faces all Members of this body, and will face public officials in the future. It is for the best interests of the country to at least give their public officials economic security, not only for the present but in the future when their productive years have gone by.

BOB RAMSPECK, you leave here with the affection and esteem of all your colleagues of today and of yesterday, who have served here with you. You have left the imprint of decency, the imprint of ability, service, courage, the imprint of a man who came here with love of the Constitution and of every provision of the Constitution, whose every word and every act during your service has been an exemplification of that fact.

We are sorry to see you go, but in our regrets there goes with you our congratulations and our best wishes for the maximum of success possible for you and your wife and your family, down through the journey of life.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute of the recognition of service to a distinguished Member of this House who is about to leave us.

During the 9 years I have had the honor of serving on the Civil Service Committee of the House, of which ROBERT RAMSPECK is chairman, I have never seen a more tireless and ardent worker than our colleague, ROBERT RAMSPECK.

Although we have not agreed at all times with respect to legislation that came before us, I want to say, as ranking minority member, I have found him to be considerate of those of us who were not always in accord with his views.

Employees in the Federal Government have had no better friend in Congress. He has at all times been loyal to the civil-service employees in Government.

I had the honor last evening of attending a testimonial dinner given in honor of the distinguished chairman of the Civil Service Committee. This dinner was sponsored by our various organizations of Government employees. I say to you it was a most inspiring event.

I do not know of any man who has carried a heavier load of legislation during the past few years in this House than the distinguished Member we honor today. It is a full time job to be chairman of the House Committee on the Civil Service.

In addition thereto, he has been an active member of other committees. He has also held the office of majority whip of this House. I want to say, too, that as

majority whip he has been fair to Members on both sides of the aisle and so I join with other Members of the House, BOB RAMSPECK, in wishing you the best of luck. You and your family have our kindest wishes. We wish you Godspeed. Do not forget that for you the latch string is always out at the House of Representatives.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, ability, industry, integrity, courage, personality and, last but not least, forthrightness have made BOB RAMSPECK a power in the House. The late Speaker, Champ Clark, once said that Congressmen are made, not born. BOB RAMSPECK has made his way from a clerkship in the House to a position of leadership as a Member. This was no mere accident and every step in the climb has been deserved. In this great democratic group, Members are, generally speaking, impartially appraised by an impartial jury. One can only progress if, in the opinion of his colleagues, he merits advancement. BOB RAMSPECK has always been one of the working Members of the House. Therefore, he has been advised as to legislative proposals throughout his entire service. He possesses a wealth of information about Congress. He is a loyal Democrat, usually voting with his administration, but never offensively partisan. It has been my good fortune to know him well, especially on the floor of the House. As the majority whip and oftentimes as the acting majority leader, we of the minority know that his word is as good as his bond.

It is unfortunate for the Congress to lose his type of leadership. However, I am sure we all join in wishing him success, happiness, and a life of usefulness in his future activities.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, during my almost 13 years of service in this House I have been privileged to share the friendship and the working contacts with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], who leaves this body voluntarily on December 31. I labored next to him on the Civil Service Committee, over which he has presided for many Congresses in such splendid fashion. I have served beside him also on the Labor Committee, where his fine leadership has meant much in solving vexing problems.

I know of no Member of this House who is more highly esteemed and genuinely beloved than BOB RAMSPECK. I believe we have been steadiest by his counsel and strengthened by his courage. Personally I shall miss him very much as he leaves Capitol Hill to undertake most important activities in the growing field of air transportation.

To BOB RAMSPECK is given freely from the membership, not only our continuing respect, but also our confidence that in private industry he will use the same attributes of ability, intelligence, and integrity which have made him most effective in public business. It has been a happy opportunity to serve with this

splendid citizen. He has given much to the Congress and to the Republic.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, to hear BOB RAMSPECK talk, those who have not had the privilege which has been ours might be led into the mistake of regarding him as a patriarch instead of what he is, a youthful patriot.

Or, even if old friends appraise the rich content of his experience, the extent of his service, and ponder the depth of his ripe wisdom, they might think that he had seen the first Trojan horse, yet lived to serve until the day before the latest model of that ancient wooden beast is to be demolished in the Rose Bowl while the defeat of the four horsemen of Troy is being accomplished.

Be that as it may, today we are dedicating another panel of the Wailing Wall, where we lament almost daily the loss of invaluable Members of Congress.

Thus, on this occasion Alabama joins her tears with those of Georgia, both States proud to have been at one time parts of Virginia, whose distinguished son we honored yesterday.

Today a grateful Nation bewails the voluntary retirement of BOB RAMSPECK from this scene of his labors, for he has graced, as well as honored and strengthened, this body.

There are few men who have had bred into them the power of his native sunshine, and fewer still who have put such power into the service of his district, State, and Nation so quietly or more brilliantly. He has fought tirelessly and effectively in the cause of righteousness with selfless devotion. His life and character merit the query—

And what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, BOB RAMSPECK carries with him, in his new and important field of service, our best wishes for success. His outstanding service and usefulness here in the House for more than 16 years is greatly appreciated by his loyal constituents, his State, and his country.

He is one of the most popular and beloved Members of the House. As a young lawyer, as a member of the Georgia Legislature, as a Member of Congress, and in every walk of life, he has always been held in the highest esteem and had the confidence of everyone. On all great problems, you knew where he stood; he never evaded an issue or made excuses. He was never happier than when helping some Member of this Chamber. He is capable and broadminded, and one never loses his friendship by differing with him. His unselfishness, his love for men and for fair play, his brilliant mind, great energy, and tact, all contributed largely to his success as Democratic whip of the House and one of the leaders of his party.

It is regrettable that we have to lose such a valuable man from Congress during these days of emergency.

We members of the Georgia delegation appreciate the high and deserved compliments paid here today to our colleague, **BOB RAMSPECK**.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. **SABATH**].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to know the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. **RAMSPECK**] who is about to leave this body to lend his vast and successful experience to private industry, when he was recognized as one of the most efficient secretaries on Capitol Hill. During the succeeding years I have observed with pleasure and satisfaction his leadership in party councils.

It is indeed regrettable that with his passing we are losing a third outstanding southern gentleman, whose character and ability we know so well and value so highly, during this session of Congress. We have lost the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Satterfield, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. **WOODRUM**], and now the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. **RAMSPECK**].

Mr. Speaker, I wish I had a facility of expression that allowed me to convey appropriately my own complete judgment on the important and illimitable services of this outstanding statesman, faithful and sincere Representative, and, above all, at all times a gentleman.

The three southern gentlemen have built up in this Congress a record and a reputation of which they and their constituencies may be justly proud. I hope that the few other Members representing the great and beautiful Southland, the mother of so many illustrious statesmen, will in the future recognize some of their defects, exchange their intolerance for a broad-minded tolerance, and thereby establish for themselves as enviable and as great a reputation, as was made by the subject of these remarks, a record that will be a credit to themselves, an additional credit to the Southland, and of the remainder of our country.

As I have stated, Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have not at my command the words necessary to express adequately my high evaluation of the worth and work of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. **RAMSPECK**]; but let me say that I wholeheartedly subscribe to and endorse what has been beautifully and truthfully said by our majority leader and others who have preceded me with respect to the praiseworthy achievements and admirable record of this lovable servant of the Republic that the House of Representatives is about to lose. Our loss is the gain of private enterprise.

We shall enduringly miss him not only in our trying and important work in this Chamber but also in deliberative councils where he has come to be known for his fairness, logic, and persuasiveness, and conciliatory qualities. May the future hold for him nothing but happiness and contentment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. **LAFFOLLETTE**].

Mr. LAFFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise largely because I am apparently the second ranking Member on the minority side of this committee. We have had a

lot of casualties on the minority side and we have had a dreadful lot of them on the Committee on the Civil Service.

Primarily, however, I want to pay my respects to a man who made it much easier for me to attempt to do something in this Congress. I doubt if there was ever a more ill-at-ease, frightened, worried man who came into this body than I when I came in in 1943. **BOB RAMSPECK** made it easy for me to understand that if I was seriously trying to do a job, I could do it in his committee. I want to thank him for that and say that is a quality in a chairman that well can be developed and continued in this body.

Finally I want to point this out that people generally get that which they pay for, and in connection with the leaving of Mr. **RAMSPECK**, Mr. **WOODRUM**, and Mr. Satterfield and others I should point out to the public that you get diamonds at Tiffany's and you get cut glass at Kresge's.

The people will continue to lose able men from their Congress until we set a standard of value on our services, which will cause the people to respect the job of being a Member of the Congress of United States and deter private enterprise from hiring away the people's best qualified representatives in the people's most important branch of government, the Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. **BIEMILLER**].

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that I see **BOB RAMSPECK** leave this House. I think the Congress and the Nation are losing the services of one of the finest citizens this country has ever known. I feel a deep sense of obligation to **BOB RAMSPECK** who helped me immeasurably when I came here this year for my first term in the Congress. His patience with young Congressmen and the help he has given all new Members in getting acquainted with the rules of the House, both written and unwritten, is truly remarkable, and I feel I owe him a great debt of gratitude.

I also feel I owe a great debt of gratitude to **BOB RAMSPECK** because I was for about 3 years an employee of the Federal Government. I know of the splendid work he has done in protecting the rights of Federal employees and in making the Federal service attractive to the best people we have in this country. His name is revered by all Federal employees.

The gentleman from Georgia leaves a great void in this House by his resignation. He has sensed and understood the great social and economic forces that are at work in our land far better than many other Members. His fairness to all, his splendid liberal spirit, his devotion to duty, are all characteristics every Member might well emulate.

I wish **BOB RAMSPECK** every happiness in the world and success in his new enterprise and earnestly hope that he will visit us from time to time and give to us his sage counsel and advice.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. **DE LACY**].

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, it is just a few days short of a year that I first walked into the office of **BOB RAMSPECK**.

I met there a quiet, pleasant, friendly person who has left on me an indelible mark, a mark of leadership, a mark of friendship, a mark of a man that we need in this House. With unmistakable evidence of division developing in the country, we need men of his caliber, men we all trust, men we all like and feel we can all count on in the pinches. It is a deep personal regret to me to see him feel compelled to leave this body. I join with others in regretting his departure and wishing him well.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. **MILLER**].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, as one of the newer members of the Committee on the Civil Service, I have a great debt to pay to **BOB RAMSPECK** for his courtesy, his understanding, and his ability to lead and guide a new Member through the labyrinthian ways of this House without appearing officious or overbearing. It must be a great sense of satisfaction to him to terminate his public duties with the knowledge that throughout the width and breadth of this land he has contributed more to the "little people" who work for the Government than any one man. Through his efforts the standards of life and living of Federal employees have been raised. He has gone into their homes, and the blessings of these "little people" whom he has helped will follow him through life—a tribute to be envied by all who serve here.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. **HOOK**].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I want to endorse everything that has been said by the previous speakers in behalf of our good friend **ROBERT RAMSPECK** of Georgia. Every word that was said is deserved. I have known **ROBERT RAMSPECK** now close on to 12 years. All during that time I have welcomed his counsel. He has been constructive in his thinking and progressive in his views. As one who has fought for a liberal program for benefit of the average citizen of this Nation so that his standard of living will be such that real democracy will prevail, I know that at times in a spirit of trying to do things for the underprivileged I sometimes go beyond the bounds of calm deliberation and approach in my enthusiasm. **BOB RAMSPECK** has steadied me many a time with his calm manner and kindly advice. I wish him well. We hope that more men will come to the House of Representatives of the caliber of **BOB RAMSPECK**. Good-by, Bob.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. **FOLGER**].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, this is an occasion which is highly important. I do not know that we can add to or detract from the future accomplishments of **BOB RAMSPECK** by what we may say here today, but to my mind this is an hour when we should not become impatient or restive lest this time should not have been well employed. I think it is worth a great deal to the Members of the House. I think it is worth a vast deal to

the country to know that by his intellectuality, devotion to duty, hard work, and kindness of disposition BOB RAMSPECK has endeared himself to every Member of this body. What I get from it is that it is a pattern to me and to others that if we would actually justify the same opinion of ourselves we must work for it. In the 4½ years I have been here I have found that BOB RAMSPECK has taken most seriously the responsibilities which membership in this body imposes upon each one of us, and has acted his part well. He is entitled to go from here with the highest esteem and respect of every Member of this body and with the thanks of the Nation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, in the nineteenth century, shortly after the War Between the States when the Southland was suffering from the devastation of a conflict which ravished our land and destroyed our economy, there came forth from the State of Georgia a great leader, man of excellent vision who, in the face of destruction and misery, saw a vision and a new hope for the South. He traveled eastwardly, and in a series of addresses called The New South set the pattern of what the South hoped to do in the rebuilding of the Southland in a new era. He expressed the aims and ambitions of a reborn people. That man was Henry Grady. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that in this twentieth century the man who is leaving the House of Representatives shortly may be likened unto that great man, Henry Grady. In my opinion BOB RAMSPECK has represented the new spirit and the best progressive leadership and the liberal vision of the Southland. Not only are the people of his district losing an excellent Representative in the House of Representatives, but we in Tennessee and throughout the Southland feel we are losing a fine and capable Representative who stands for the highest ideals of our people.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the South are not reactionary and backward. The South is progressive, virile, and on the march to a great era of advancement. The work here in Congress of BOB RAMSPECK should be an inspiration to other young men of ability and confidence in our future to enter and do their best in public life. I regret exceedingly that BOB RAMSPECK feels he must leave and bring to a close his very useful career as a Member of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NORRELL). The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, just a moment will I take. The gentleman from Georgia, BOB RAMSPECK, in my opinion is as fine a type of legislator as I have ever known. He has the things that make for competence in legislation. First, he has integrity—unsullied. Next, he has more than usual ability. Next, he has energy. I might say to you as I say many times to schoolgirls and schoolboys when I talk to them, there is not so much difference in the abilities of peo-

ple. If one person has good common sense, and uses it, he is just as smart as anybody because that is all the sense there is. It is what you do with it that counts. Energy is about 75 to 90 percent of the battle.

When I have wanted to know what was going on before any committee of which the gentleman from Georgia, BOB RAMSPECK was a member, I could find out talking to him because he kept up with the business of the committee. I deeply regret his going from a personal standpoint because he and I have been close personal friends. I want to take this opportunity of thanking him from the bottom of my heart for his helpfulness to me in trying to do a very difficult, a very arduous, and a very onerous job. He has never failed me. The great State of Georgia appeals to me and always did. I read about it as a boy. I have visited it as a man. It has contributed tremendously to the welfare and glory of these United States through its outstanding men, both past and present, who have made the history of Georgia great and who have been helpful in making and keeping this country great. I could say of the gentleman from Georgia, BOB RAMSPECK, as I said of another colleague of ours the other day, you can take from the beginning of Georgia to now, Stephens, Toombs, Lamar, Crisp, and a score of others who have been outstanding men in history in the service that they have rendered—the gentleman from Georgia, BOB RAMSPECK in my opinion is their equal.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, there must come to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] an exquisite sense of joy that arises out of the consciousness that he holds securely the full confidence of his fellows and the country. It has pleased me that so many of his colleagues have sought the opportunity to testify to his high character, his very great ability, and to his general excellence. He is deserving of it all, for he has made it a habit of his life to live the Golden Rule and to do well his every appointed task. No confidence ever reposed in him was misplaced, for he never betrayed a trust, and no honor was ever bestowed upon him which excited the least envy in others or threatened to spoil that sweet humility always exhibited in his daily life. I pronounce him to be very much of a man—a model man. It is well that many honors have been justly bestowed upon him, but it is not the stamp of the king that determines the fineness or weight of a metal. I have seen our friend, BOB RAMSPECK, time and again subjected to all the tests on the floor of this House with the result that he always came out pure gold and full measure. We shall miss him and though regretting to see him go our affections and our best wishes go with him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, we shall all miss our good friend, BOB RAMSPECK. He has endeared himself to us by his genial nature and his outstanding service. Many difficult problems have come to him for solution, but he has met them patiently and efficiently. Length of legislative service and experience makes men correspondingly valuable in this body. We always part with regret from any Member eminently qualified in this regard to perform legislative tasks and duties. This sentiment is accentuated in the case of BOB RAMSPECK because of the abiding affection we have come to feel for him.

I have served with BOB RAMSPECK since he came to the Congress. I have been specially impressed with his exemplification of one unusual virtue in particular, and that is his tolerance of the opinions of those who disagree with him on public questions. He has always graciously accorded to each of his colleagues the right and privilege of individual judgment. Both personally and officially he leaves us with our respect and admiration. May good fortune attend him all along his way.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I was reminded of olden days while listening to the remarks of our good friend, BOB RAMSPECK, who is about to leave this body. I, too, was a secretary when Bob was in the office of Congressman Sly Howard, of Georgia.

As our good friend told us, there is a vast difference now than over 30 years ago, and there will continue to be an increase in the office work of the representatives in Congress.

Bob is blessed with an outstanding personality, and as a result you cannot find a man or woman in this House who would not call him their friend. As it has been properly said by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], his loss to this House is one that is going to be felt. I will miss his companionship and I want to join with all in wishing him a long, happy, and successful career in his undertakings.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress it was my privilege to serve as a member of the Committee on Civil Service under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]. Service under him was always a pleasure.

I have watched him during the 9 years I have been a Member of this body. I have never known anyone to approach legislation more intelligently, to analyze it more honestly, and to fight more earnestly for his convictions than BOB RAMSPECK.

His leaving Congress is a loss to the whole country. At this time we can ill afford to lose from the public service such men as BOB RAMSPECK and CLIFF WOODRUM.

May his future be bright and may success continue to reward his efforts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I regret to see men of the caliber of CLIFF WOODRUM, of Virginia, and BOB RAMSPECK, of Georgia, leave this House. Both have risen to their present high place by reason of their integrity and by hard work. I have had opportunity to be associated more closely with Mr. RAMSPECK than with Mr. WOODRUM. By his quiet, friendly understanding he has been a help and an inspiration to me, a new Member of this House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RESA].

Mr. RESA. Mr. Speaker, the departure of Mr. RAMSPECK from the Congress of the United States brings to all who knew him a keen realization of the extent to which a man's characteristics can exert an influence upon his fellow men. The breadth and accuracy of Mr. RAMSPECK's knowledge of legislative matters, the quiet thoroughness with which he applied this knowledge in his work, and the clarity, simplicity, and straightforwardness of his speech, as well as the soundness of his thinking, will always be remembered by his colleagues against the background provided by his unflinching kindly and gracious manner. It is only a well-merited compliment to his qualifications that business has beckoned to him to assume a role in the world of commerce where the rewards for his services will be more commensurate with their worth. I deem it a great privilege to join with others in wishing him continued happiness and success.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I personally very greatly regret the retirement from the House of my dear friend BOB RAMSPECK. As a Member of the House for many years he has been industrious and most efficient. He has rendered unusual service to his district and to the country. He was trained in routine congressional work and he has grown in political stature and wisdom as he has reached a high place in the legislative history of the Republic. BOB RAMSPECK is able, capable, honest, and courageous. As a diligent student of public problems he has exerted a wide influence in shaping and enacting legislation.

He has been the most successful and satisfactory democratic whip within my recollection. As the majority whip during the greatest of all wars he has been of inestimable assistance not only to the members of his party, but to the House. His advice and counsel have been sought and followed by his colleagues.

BOB RAMSPECK was one of the most efficient committee chairmen in the House. His committee work was thorough. He was remarkably successful as a legislator.

BOB RAMSPECK is a loyal friend. He has been faithful to every trust. He retires from the House with the universal esteem of his colleagues and with a rec-

ord of outstanding achievement. He will not only be missed in the House, but the country is losing one of the ablest Members of the House of Representatives as he leaves public life.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a privilege little less than a duty to express my appreciation of the services of our colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]. I have had the privilege of knowing many fine men who have served in this House in the 29 years I have been here. Many of these men had superior qualities which were well recognized by its membership. If it were possible for me to do so, I might attempt to prepare a list of men whom I have regarded as among the most useful in each Congress since 1916. It would be a difficult task to attempt to discriminate justly as to the qualities and worth of the Members of this House or of any previous Congresses. If I did attempt to prepare even a limited list of men who have performed the most useful service here, I would include our colleague from Georgia in that list.

I have observed his work for the 16 years he has been in this House. He is a combination of industry, energy, patience, understanding, common sense, and fine ability. He has made many contributions to the improvement of legislation that has passed through this House. He has done a fine service for the Congress and for the country. As he completes his services here, it is creditable to ourselves that we should pay him a deserved tribute. The membership of the House, as well as his State, can justly feel a pride in the service he has given the country. Our country could well welcome many more like him to this House to serve in the years ahead, which now seem to be so pregnant with importance to the Nation and to the world.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. of Massachusetts. When a good man retires from Congress it is cause for universal regret and this is particularly so when a man leaves with the outstanding ability of BOB RAMSPECK. During his 17 years' service in Congress has rendered conspicuous service. He has been responsible for legislation being enacted which brought material advancement in the lives of millions of Federal workers. He has been a tireless champion of the cause of Civil Service. We can ill afford to lose men of the ability, integrity, and character of BOB RAMSPECK. That the future shall unfold to him many years of happiness and prosperity is the sincere wish of all of us who have been privileged to enjoy his friendship.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK].

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, what is happening to our good United States Congress? Too many Congressmen are going away, voluntarily going into other fields. As if they were marching out in

a single platoon we see BOB RAMSPECK, CLIFF WOODRUM, SAMMY WEISS, SAM DICKSTEIN, and half a dozen more. Not one of these shall we miss more than BOB RAMSPECK. He is my legislative neighbor and warm, close, personal friend. I shall feel his loss even more keenly than many of the rest of you. You have no idea how much BOB RAMSPECK has been worth to us fellows who came up from our section of the country after he got to Congress.

Perhaps we call many a man noble when the adjective is too big for the man but never in my life was I more sure of my ground than when I say ROBERT RAMSPECK, of Georgia, is a truly noble man. What a help he has been around these halls! We selfishly hate to have to bid him good-by.

Each is given his bag of tools,
A shapeless mass, a book of rules;
And each must make, ere life is flown,
A stumbling block or a stepping stone.

BOB RAMSPECK is a natural born placer of stepping stones. I know, for I have enjoyed the security of the footing he has helped to provide. As a Democrat, I want to say that I am very happy that he is still with us, a good, stanch, valuable Georgia gentleman and Democrat, as kindly in spirit as Georgia's soft climate and as stanch in democracy and character as Georgia's marble hills.

I notice it seems to be the habit of Congressmen to drop in a little poetry on such occasions as this—especially when a beloved Member passes to other fields. This is a practice I never indulged a great deal on the floor of Congress, but here are the closing lines from Henry Van Dyke's poem, *Work*, and they fit BOB RAMSPECK like a cap for his fine head:

To suit my spirit and to prove my powers
Then shall I cheerful greet the laboring hours,
And cheerful turn when the long shadows fall

At eventide to play and love and rest,
Because I know for me my work is best.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I first observed the influence of the gentleman from Georgia 10 years ago when my work with the Department of Agriculture brought me in contact with his fellow Georgians. "BOB RAMSPECK represents a city district," they said, "but he knows the farmers' problems." His vision and sympathies have always been broad. He has demonstrated in his 16 years in the House a devotion to the welfare of all the people that has endeared him not only to the State of Georgia but to great numbers of Americans who recognize his worth and his service to the Nation. His career has strengthened the public service and has added to the prestige of Congress. His example of industry, kindness, and loyalty will continue to be an inspiration to us.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on December 18, 1945, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

On December 18, 1945:

H. R. 4649. An act to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on 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 I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the 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 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 pro-

vision 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 right 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, 48, 54, 59, 88, and 103.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMETT O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
PAT MCCARRAN,
C. WEYLAND BROOKS,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 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, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendments Nos. 1 to 9, inclusive, relating to the Senate: Appropriates \$83,500 for sundry objects; reappropriates an unobligated balance of the 1945 fiscal year mileage appropriation; fixes the rate of compensation of two employees, and provides for the installation of intercommunication facilities, all as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Provides for payment of salaries by Senate and House disbursing officers falling due on a Saturday to be made on the preceding workday, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$1,183.47 for expenses incurred in connection with the National Memorial Stadium Commission, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Validates compensation payment over an 80-day period to an employee of the Joint Committee on Printing, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 13, 14, and 15, relating to the Architect of the Capitol: Appropriates an additional \$19,000 for Capitol buildings, fiscal year 1946, as proposed by the Senate, and strikes out the appropriation of \$25,000 proposed by the Senate for the erection of a statue of George Washington on the Capitol Grounds.

Amendment No. 16, relating to the Judiciary: Appropriates an additional \$20,000 for salaries of clerks, fiscal year 1946, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates an additional \$750,000.00 for UNRRA, fiscal year 1946, as proposed by the Senate. It is understood that the appropriation is subject to all of the provisos attached to section 201 of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Participation Act, 1945.

Amendments Nos. 19, 20, and 21, relating to the Bureau of the Budget: Appropriates for the fiscal year 1946 an additional amount of \$56,800 for salaries and expenses and \$5,000 for printing and binding, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22, relating to the Office of Alien Property Custodian: Provides for a further draft of \$50,600 upon agency funds for administrative expenses, fiscal year 1946, instead of \$101,200, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23, relating to Office of Defense Transportation: Appropriates \$165,000 additional for salaries and expenses, fiscal year 1946, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24, relating to the Civil Service Commission: Appropriates an additional amount of \$600,000 for salaries and expenses, fiscal year 1946, instead of \$1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25: Restores the limitation proposed by the House upon the use of funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for administrative expenses for salary payments to persons engaged in making loans for construction purposes which have not been specifically authorized, amended to except loans of \$500,000 or less, and applications or loans approved or made prior to December 15, 1945.

Amendments Nos. 26, 27, 28, and 29, relating to the Federal Power Commission: Appropriates for salaries and expenses, fiscal year 1946, an additional amount of \$250,000, instead of \$300,000, as proposed by the Senate, and \$200,000, as proposed by the House, with proportional adjustments of amount limitations, and appropriates an additional amount of \$25,000, fiscal year 1946, for flood-control surveys, instead of \$50,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates \$181,575 for plans and specifications for construction at Howard University, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 31, 32, 33, and 34, relating to the Public Health Service: Provides for an additional expenditure from available funds of \$80,000 for rehabilitating the Neponsit Beach Hospital, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates an additional amount of \$320,000 for foreign quarantine service, fiscal year 1946, instead of \$601,540, as proposed by the Senate, and \$70,000, as proposed by the House and appropriates an additional amount of \$950,000 for operating expenses, National Institute of Health, fiscal year 1946, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$875,000, as proposed by the House, and makes the appropriation available for purchase and issue of certain compounds for use in research projects, as proposed by the Senate.

The amount agreed upon for the foreign quarantine service contemplates the procurement of surplus federally owned X-ray

equipment and reimbursement (not to exceed \$50,000) therefor.

Amendments Nos. 36 and 37, relating to the Social Security Board: Appropriates an additional amount of \$1,766,625, fiscal year 1946, for salaries, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, instead of \$1,850,750, as proposed by the Senate, and \$1,682,500, as proposed by the House, and appropriates an additional amount of \$132,500, fiscal year 1946, for miscellaneous expenses, instead of \$140,000, as proposed by the Senate, and \$125,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 38 to 41, inclusive, and 43 and 44, relating to the Federal Works Agency: Appropriates an additional amount of \$12,500,000, fiscal year 1946, for public-works advance planning, as proposed by the House, instead of \$23,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; restores the House provision barring loans for the construction of projects, plans for which have been wholly or partly financed by the appropriation, public-works advance planning; appropriates an additional amount of \$1,216,210, fiscal year 1946, for Virgin Islands public works, instead of \$554,000, as proposed by the House, and \$1,878,420, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates for damage claims, Public Roads Administration, \$473,528.31, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$296,867.45, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 45, 46, and 47, relating to the Interstate Commerce Commission: Appropriates an additional amount of \$266,000 for general administrative expenses, fiscal year 1946, instead of \$206,000, as proposed by the House, and \$306,000, as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates an additional amount of \$82,000 for motor transport regulation, fiscal year 1946, instead of \$164,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49, relating to the National Labor Relations Board: Appropriates an additional amount of \$300,000, fiscal year 1946, for salaries and expenses, National Labor Relations Board, War Labor Disputes Act, for reimbursing the appropriations "Salaries" and "Miscellaneous expenses", fiscal year 1946, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50, relating to the Veterans' Administration: Modifies, as proposed by the Senate, existing limitations applying to the appropriation "Administrative, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services" with respect to passenger-carrying vehicles, visual educational information and descriptive material, newspapers and periodicals, and attendance upon meetings and conventions associated with the welfare of veterans, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 51, 52, 53, and 55, relating to the District of Columbia: Strikes out the appropriation of \$4,600 for plans and specifications for a building for employees' living quarters at the Glenn Dale Tuberculosis Sanatorium, proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$70,000 for constructing a third floor and permanently roofing the hospital and administration building at the District Training School, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the appropriation of \$5,000, fiscal year, for motor-vehicle parking agency, proposed by the Senate, and strikes out the appropriation of \$15,000, fiscal year 1946, proposed by the Senate, as a special emergency fund in connection with public recognition extended to returning military or naval personnel or visiting dignitaries.

Amendments Nos. 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, and 63, relating to the Department of Agriculture: Appropriates an additional amount of \$187,500, fiscal year 1946, for salaries and expenses, foreign plant quarantine, instead of \$125,000, as proposed by the House, and \$250,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates an additional amount of \$300,000, fiscal year 1946, for national forest protection and management, as proposed by the Senate; increases from \$275,000 to \$373,700, as proposed by the Senate, the amount which may be expended for the agricultural wage

stabilization program under the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, War Food Administration, 1946," and appropriates \$25,000,000 for the supply and distribution of farm labor for the period ending December 31, 1946, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$14,000,000, as proposed by the House, and provides, as proposed by the Senate, that any official determination of the cessation of hostilities in the present war shall not hinder the admission into the United States of agricultural labor required for the conduct of the farm labor supply program.

Amendments Nos. 64 to 69, inclusive, relating to the Department of Commerce: Appropriates \$300,000 for declassification and technical services, fiscal year 1946, instead of \$250,000, as proposed by the House, and \$344,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$2,435,000 for compiling census reports, and so forth, fiscal year 1946, instead of \$1,970,000, as proposed by the House, and \$3,295,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates an additional amount of \$182,000, fiscal year 1946, for establishment of air-navigation facilities, as proposed by the Senate, and strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate an additional amount of \$350,000, fiscal year 1946, for departmental salaries and expenses, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and an additional amount of \$30,000, fiscal year 1946, for field-office service, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

The additional amount of \$465,000 pertaining to the Bureau of the Census is intended to cover a sample census of population and statistics respecting commodities shipped on vessels engaged in foreign trade.

Amendments Nos. 70 to 87, inclusive, and 89 to 92, inclusive, relating to the Department of the Interior: Appropriates \$111,630 for payment of Sioux Indian claims, as proposed by the Senate. Appropriates under Bureau of Reclamation, as follows: For salaries and expenses (other than project offices), \$500,000, instead of \$200,000, as proposed by the House, and \$800,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates for general investigations, \$1,000,000, instead of \$500,000, as proposed by the House, and \$1,500,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates for the Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada, \$5,900,000, instead of \$5,000,000, as proposed by the House, and \$6,800,000, as proposed by the Senate, the increase being toward construction of the proposed second Phoenix-Tucson line; strikes out the appropriation of \$197,000, proposed by the Senate, for the Kings River project, California; appropriates for the Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado, \$5,750,000, instead of \$5,000,000, as proposed by the House, and \$6,500,000, as proposed by the Senate, \$500,000 of the increase being for the Brush-Sterling Holyoke transmission lines; appropriates for the Columbia Basin project, Washington, \$10,275,000, instead of \$10,050,000, as proposed by the House, and \$10,500,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates for the Colorado River development fund (expenditure account) \$1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$250,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates for the Fort Peck project, Montana, \$800,000, instead of \$480,000, as proposed by the House, and \$1,335,000, as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates for the Missouri River Basin \$10,780,300, instead of \$10,269,100, as proposed by the House, and \$11,402,300, as proposed by the Senate, the increase of \$511,200 being for functions in connection with the project of the Office of Indian Affairs and Geological Survey. Provides for the procurement of 100 additional passenger automobiles, as proposed by the Senate. Appropriates additional amounts, as proposed by the Senate, under the Geological Survey, as follows: Topographic surveys, \$13,900; geologic surveys, \$800; gaging streams, \$321,103, and classification of lands, \$800. Strikes out the appropriation of \$485,000, proposed by the Senate, for the drainage tunnel, Leadville, Colo. Appropriates \$111,-

650 for national parks, instead of \$100,000, as proposed by the House, and \$123,300, as proposed by the Senate. Appropriates an additional amount of \$20,000, fiscal year 1946, for control of predatory animals and injurious rodents, as proposed by the Senate. Appropriates \$150,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$100,000, as proposed by the House, for defraying the deficit in the treasury of the municipal government of St. Croix, V. I.

Amendments Nos. 93 and 94, relating to the Department of Justice: Appropriates an additional amount of \$29,350, fiscal year 1946, for Office of the Assistant Solicitor General, as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates \$37.50 for damage claims arising out of activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 95, 96, and 97, relating to the Department of State: Appropriates an additional amount of \$23,000, fiscal year 1946, for representation allowances, foreign service, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates an additional amount of \$4,385,000, fiscal year 1946, for foreign service auxiliary (emergency), instead of \$4,000,000, as proposed by the House, and \$4,770,000, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates an additional amount of \$2,750,000, fiscal year 1946, for international conferences (emergency), instead of \$2,500,000, as proposed by the House, and \$3,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 98, relating to the Treasury Department: Appropriates an additional amount of \$1,000,000, fiscal year 1946, for Division of Disbursement salaries and expenses, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 99, 100, and 101, relating to military activities, War Department: Appropriates \$274,127.43 for damage claims, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$118,144.91, as proposed by the House, and strikes out the proposal of the Senate to modify the text of the current appropriation for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps with respect to technical units.

Amendment No. 102, relating to civil functions, War Department: Appropriates for flood control, general, \$84,659,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$81,759,000, as proposed by the House, the increase being accounted for as follows:

Additions:

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Conemaugh River Reservoir, Pa..... | \$3,000,000 |
| Hulah Dam, Okla..... | 1,000,000 |
| Sangamon River, Ill..... | 400,000 |
| Elimination: Mansfield Hollow Reservoir, Conn..... | 1,500,000 |

Amendments Nos. 104 to 127, inclusive, relating to judgments and authorized claims: Appropriates \$6,632,194.10, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,432,946.59, as proposed by the House.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Pursuant to clause 2, rule XX, the managers on the part of the House and Senate have agreed to recommend to their respective Houses concurrence in amendments of the Senate as follows:

Amendment No. 18, relating to an addition to the Executive Mansion and appropriating \$1,650,000 in connection therewith: That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 35, relating to public health services, Philippine Islands, and appropriating \$1,000,000 in connection therewith: That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 42, providing for a Federal office building, Nashville, Tenn., and appropriating \$5,575,000 therefor: That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate.

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.

Amendment No. 54, providing for the engagement of technical services for conducting a survey for city relief sewers, District of Columbia: That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 59, making available an additional amount of \$15,000,000 for the school-lunch program: That the House concur with an amendment, making available an additional amount of \$7,500,000.

Amendment No. 88, appropriating \$15,000 for services and expenses incident to the Arkansas River compact: That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate.

ACTUAL

Amendment No. 103, relating to the Gar- rison (North Dakota) Reservoir.

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

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this bill as it passed the House carried appropriations aggregating \$1,434,732,379.12. As it passed the Senate it had been increased to a total of \$2,409,090,755.98, an increase over the House figure in round numbers of a billion dollars. To be specific, \$974,318,376.86.

The greater part of the increase was contained in two items, \$750,000,000 for UNRRA and \$191,900,000 for housing.

The Senate receded from an amount totaling \$20,889,125, and we submit the conference report today with complete agreement on everything we could have agreed on except for technical obstacles. Under section 2, of rule XX, it was necessary to bring back to the House for separate vote eight amendments, which involve a total of \$197,490,000. We shall take them up in their turn when we have disposed of the conference report.

Apart from UNRRA and veterans' housing, the Senate added a number of amendments of general interest and of considerable importance.

One provides \$1,000,000 for enabling the Public Health Service to assist the public-health organizations of the Philippine Islands in reconstituting and reactivating public-health services in the Philippine Islands.

Another increases the amount available for the popular school-lunch program. The Senate proposed to increase the amount now available from \$50,000,000 to \$65,000,000. The conference committee agreed to increase the amount to \$57,500,000.

For the farm labor supply program, the House provided \$14,000,000. The Senate increased the amount to \$25,000,000, and the conference report is in agreement with that action. The farm-labor outlook is not encouraging, and it would be a catastrophe if help were not available for planting and harvesting.

For gathering essential statistical data by the Bureau of the Census, the House

allowed \$1,970,000. As we bring the bill from conference, the amount is increased to \$2,435,000.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations in the last 4 years has reported more legislation than ever has been reported by any other committee in the history of the House. It is appropriate, therefore, to review briefly in the closing hours of 1945 the war record of the committee. In these 4 years, under the pressure of wartime legislation, we have introduced time- and money-saving innovations. We have materially increased the efficiency of the routine of the committee. We have established a system of investigation which has contributed to the economy of administration of the departments and has saved billions of dollars in appropriations. We have developed a routine which has reduced the time of the hearings; confined the testimony to the items before the committee and greatly reduced the amount and cost of printed material in the published hearings. We have standardized committee procedure to eliminate unnecessary delay and diversions and to expedite consideration of the departmental estimates from the time received from the Bureau of the Budget until reported to the House.

We have incorporated in our bills provisions under which continuing studies have been made of all appropriations, and under which reports have been filed at regular intervals, showing the status of appropriations, contractual authorizations, expenditures, commitments, and unexpended balances.

Acting on the information thus obtained, the committee has secured the enactment of bills rescinding appropriations and contractual authority in excess of \$56,000,000,000 more than \$52,000,000,000 in one bill, the largest sum ever disposed of in any way, in any bill, in the history of governmental budgets.

And we have similarly included in this bill, and in this conference report, legislation in restraint of Federal expenditure which should exert a profound and salutary influence on both State and National finances during the reconstruction period on which we are just entering.

These provisions prohibit the making of loans by Federal agencies to States or subdivisions of States and are discussed in the conference report under Senate amendments 25 and 40.

The first will be found on page 2 of the report and as perfected in conference and finally submitted to the House for approval is 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.

The second was proposed to be amended by Senate amendment No. 40, but the Senate conferees receded in conference and the provision is retained in

the bill and submitted in the conference report in the language originally passed by the House as follows:

Provided, That no loans shall be made or participated in by any Federal agency for the construction of any public works, plans for which have been wholly or partly financed out of this appropriation, except in pursuance of a specific authorization.

There seems to be a general impression throughout the country that, now that the war is over, the Federal Government will resume the free handed practice which obtained during the depression, of making loans and grants, either matched or unmatched by sponsors, for the construction of local facilities and improvements. Everywhere aggressive and enterprising commercial clubs, chambers of commerce and luncheon organizations are industriously planning the construction of water and sewage systems, court houses, airfields, hospitals, libraries, streets and curbing, stadiums, parks, playgrounds, and what not, to be financed wholly or in part by Federal loans or contributions, preferably by grants or loans to be repaid in the millennium. Although there is yet no notable lack of employment, they are preparing to corner local labor and all available building materials and construction equipment for ambitious public improvements to be undertaken as soon as they can get funds from Washington.

This impression that the Federal Government is going to start another WPA program in which it will distribute largess to cities and political subdivisions and States all over the Union has been heightened by the fact that we have provided money for planning purposes, and that any municipality or other unit can make application for money with which to employ engineers and architects, conduct surveys, and make the blueprints for public construction of the character as in prewar days. The law which authorized these appropriations specifically states that the Government is not obligated to provide construction funds, and that we expect the community to pay the planning money back when they start construction; in other words, it was not proposed to give a dollar to anybody or a dollar to any community under this activity. We merely advance money to make plans, and when those plans are made and construction is started, the money is to be paid back to the Federal Government. We specifically included the statement that the Federal Government was not, and is not, obligated to contribute one dollar either in loans or grants for construction or any other purpose. Notwithstanding that unequivocal notification, we are daily in receipt of inquiries as to when we are going to begin to give money away.

For example, I am in receipt of the following letter:

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY
ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK,
December 4, 1945.

HON. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CANNON: The capital budget for the city of New York, as recently submitted to the city council for adoption, proposes total expenditures of \$535,688,000 for the

coming calendar year. The budget anticipates that the Federal Government will contribute \$217,218,000 in grants for these capital improvements.

This association believes that the expectation on the part of the city to receive this amount is overly optimistic and entirely out of line with congressional policy, and has so expressed itself.

We will have a representative at the public hearing before the city council on the budget to be held early next week, and would appreciate a statement setting forth what, in your opinion, is the certainty that the Federal Government will contribute any such extensive amounts to the localities for the construction of public-works projects.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS JEFFERSON MILEY,
Secretary.

In response to this inquiry I telegraphed:

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION,
New York, N. Y.:

Re letter, of course no one can speak for the Congress or for the future but any program involving contributions by the Federal Government to States and municipalities in another PWA program is so impractical under our changed financial status as to appear prohibitive. When we have settled all war accounts, interest on the public debt alone will exceed entire average prewar budget. Any State or municipality in the Union is in better financial condition than the Federal Government. While there may be sporadic incitement to spending sprees, and in event of serious unemployment 3 or 4 years hence the necessity for moderate road, flood control, and public building programs, the practical business sense of the American people will prevent further unessential expenditures and gratuities inviting inflation and repudiation.

Every day we are in receipt of inquiries from counties and cities asking how much the Federal Government will contribute to the construction of hospitals, schools, and other utilities.

Some of them write with sensible candor and say if the Federal Government is not planning to assist in the erection of such facilities they propose to issue their own bonds and build them themselves; that if the National Government is not planning to assist in such construction they will proceed on their own credit and responsibility, but if there is to be another Federal construction program they do not want to spend their own money and then see their neighbors get the same advantages from Federal funds. Such inquiries are practical and pertinent and are entitled to a dependable answer. The country should have an authoritative statement on the future policy of the Government in this respect, and the legislation in this bill is intended to point as accurately as we are in a position to point at the present time in the direction which the Congress proposes to proceed under existing conditions.

There is every reason for restricting such loans and grants. The most obvious reason is the stupendous magnitude of any such program carried to its ultimate conclusion. There are more than 3,000 counties and innumerable cities and towns in continental United States, not to mention the insular possessions, which would want to be included in such a program. If provision is made for one or for one class, provision must in all fairness be made for all. And the composite sum which would have to be provided

would be staggering even if we did not owe a dollar of national indebtedness.

And when we take into consideration the fact that the Nation owes already the greatest debt in history, any such program becomes wholly impracticable. The only way to stop it is to stop it before it begins. And the only time to stop it is now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will take an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we are printing money today at a furious rate. We are trying to borrow money by selling bonds, and we are having a harder time to sell those bonds than ever before. There used to be a saying, current among the money brokers of my community. "Well, Smith & Co. have got too much paper out." That meant that Smith & Co. had been borrowing more money than their financial statement warranted. Whenever they decided a borrower had too much paper out, they waited for him to pay some of his debts before they lent him any more.

Mr. Speaker, Uncle Sam has got too much paper out. That is why it is no longer possible for him to borrow money with the ease with which he used to borrow it. When a man has too much paper out and the holders of his notes go to the bank to discount this paper, it takes heavier and heavier discounts, to get the banks to take his paper over. When a man's credit is sound, and he is not over-borrowed in proportion to his assets, the banks will discount his paper at a reasonable percentage, but if he has too much paper out, if he owes so much money that the time and amount of its liquidation is doubtful, his paper has to bear a heavy discount.

Uncle Sam has too much paper out in the form of bonds and paper currency. When business opens up, in the period of reconversion, a great many of these bondholders will bring their paper, their bonds, in to be discounted by the local banks. The danger is that the same thing will happen that happened after the last war—that Uncle Sam has so much paper out that people who hold his bonds may have to take 86 cents on the dollar. That is what Uncle Sam's paper sold for after the last war. You took a \$100 bond to the banker to cash it in, and instead of paying you the \$100 you lent the Government on that bond they gave you only \$84.

Every bank, every life-insurance company, every investment concern in this country, is loaded with Government bonds. If they fall only a few points, much less 16 points, as they fell after the last war, financial catastrophe will follow. There is only one way to keep this paper good, and that is to balance the Budget and to begin to pay our debts and stop spending unnecessarily. If we enter upon another program of WPA, if we begin to finance every school, hospital, airport, sewer system, and courthouse in the country, we will not even be able to borrow the money to do it, much less pay it back.

In order to guard against such a contingency the committee has taken this

decided step. We have put into this bill the above provisions.

The effect of these provisions is to take control of such funds out of the hands of departmental agencies and place it in the hands of the Congress. Under the Constitution the people control the purse strings of the Nation through their elected representatives, and these provisions shift control of large lump sums from Federal bureaus and corporations to the direct control of Congress, and with control of the money control of the policies under which such vast sums are disbursed.

Such control also carries with it control of remedial measures for unemployment. One of the stock arguments advanced by all applicants for Federal grants and loans today is that they will reduce unemployment. They ignore the obvious fact that there is not now, and will not be for some time, any extensive unemployment requiring drastic Federal advances.

The country is in need of every character of consumer goods. You cannot buy a shirt, a typewriter, a suit of clothes, an automobile. The most ordinary necessities are unobtainable. The shelves of the merchants are bare, the warehouses are vacant, the pipe lines are empty.

We have the factories; we have skilled workmen; we have the raw material to manufacture these goods, and we are going to start right away to produce them. That is going to require all the labor of the country for 3 or 4 years to come. But when we reach the saturation point and the warehouses are full and the shelves of the retail stores are filled, then, if at all, is going to come the economic shock which may be expected to follow the war. Then, if at all, unemployment will develop. When it comes, if it comes, we will have spent under this loan and grant program all the money we have to spend to relieve any possible unemployment situation. We will have spent the money on these projects which these States and municipalities want to build now. If we ever expect to spend any money to relieve unemployment and take up the slack in employment, we should wait until the time when we have saturated the consumer-goods market of the country and all the factories must slow down to normal rates of production.

There is another disadvantage in rushing ahead with such a construction program at this time. The great bottleneck in housing reconstruction today is in the lack of materials. There is not a community that is not clamoring for housing. But they cannot get the lumber. They cannot get the hardware. They cannot get the sewer pipe. If we encourage every community to start full speed ahead today on federally fostered construction, we defer the day when the man who wants to build a home, when the veteran returning from the war and must have shelter for his new family, can get it.

In order to give priority for the construction of dwellings, we must defer such a public building spree as is proposed in the loan and grant programs prohibited by the provisions of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, by way of résumé, much has been made of the action of the House in overriding recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations on three items in this bill. Such comments overlook the fact that the items on which the committee has been overruled are infinitesimal in comparison with the recommendations of the committee which in the last 4 years have been adopted by the House and the Congress.

As time recedes and the history of the war is seen in its final perspective, the policies and recommendations of the committee, 99 percent of which have been adopted by this House, will be found to have influenced in no small degree and, it is to be hoped, not disadvantageously, the fiscal policy of the Nation and the financial stability of the United States Government.

Mr. PITTENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman. He has made some very alarming statements. I am in favor of some of the provisions of this bill, like building veterans' hospitals, river and harbor projects, and so forth; but it is not true that this House passed this deficiency bill and appropriated money for UNRRA which had already been authorized in an authorization bill. Then the bill went to the other body and, out of a clear sky, \$750,000,000 more on top of what had been authorized was appropriated in the other body, even before any hearings, and even before any authorization bill for that purpose was passed.

Then, I want to ask the gentleman if the conferees have approved of what I understand is an irregular and almost unheard-of procedure if these different steps are true. Is that \$750,000,000 in this bill?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to give a brief résumé of the situation with reference to UNRRA.

We recently passed House Joint Resolution 266, appropriating an additional \$550,000,000 for UNRRA. The original authorization was \$1,350,000,000, and only \$550,000,000 of that authorization was left. However, you will recall that it was represented to this committee and to the House and to the country that the original authorization was insufficient; Starvation and death, which are stalking throughout Europe today, are of such magnitude and such urgency that the first authorization would not take care of it. So the House immediately entered upon the discussion of a bill for further authorization of \$1,350,000,000. The Senate, after that authorization had been passed by the Senate and House, included in this bill we have under consideration an additional \$750,000,000 for UNRRA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself three additional minutes.

It is unnecessary for us to discuss UNRRA at this late day. This is the

fifth time it has been before the House. It first came before the House in a bill to authorize \$1,350,000,000, and the House passed it by a large majority. It again came before the House in the form of a bill to appropriate \$800,000,000 to discharge our obligations, and again this House, by an overwhelming vote, approved of UNRRA and appropriated the \$800,000,000. It came before the House a third time in the form of an appropriation bill to provide \$550,000,000 for UNRRA. Again the House approved UNRRA almost unanimously and voted the appropriation. Then it again came before the House the fourth time, in the form of a bill reported by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom] from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, authorizing a second \$1,350,000,000, approved UNRRA almost unanimously—by the passage of that bill—or at least by a very large majority. Four times it has been before the House and each time the House has approved it; and now it is before the House for the fifth time.

Everything has been said on the subject that can be said. Everybody has made up his mind, and talk at this time would not change a single vote. So I do not propose to discuss it further. It has been amply debated and everybody understands it, and you have before you the proposition of putting Europe again upon its feet, of saving millions of lives, and of providing for the future prosperity of the world, including the prosperity of America.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman mentioned the limitation of \$500,000 on RFC. That also will apply in regard to the proposed loan to Britain, will it not, and to China, and Russia, or any other nation?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no connection whatever. This is a loan for the construction of local facilities.

Mr. JENSEN. I understand that, but will the gentleman take the same position relative to foreign loans?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Let us not cross that bridge until we come to it. The gentleman wants to talk politics and we are not talking politics now, we are talking business.

Mr. JENSEN. I am not talking politics at all; I am asking for information.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I cannot yield further to the gentleman. If he wants to ask some question about the bill, I shall be glad to answer him, or anybody else, but this is not a time to indulge in partisanship. It is a matter in which partisanship should not enter.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rose to ask for information.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will take two additional minutes in order to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. When we understand and appreciate the emergency

which confronts us with the authorization of the second billion for UNRRA, having in mind the emergency, the procedure that was adopted in the Senate of adding \$750,000,000 to the deficiency bill, the House conferees concurring, it certainly is justified by the circumstances; and in an emergency is not unusual, it has happened before where emergency conditions existed with reference to other appropriations. Furthermore, I understand the Appropriations Committee, by a majority vote, voted that we request the Senate to take this action. Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The subcommittee voted unanimously to take that action.

And the gentleman's statement is concurred in by a large majority of the House. On four different occasions, on four aye-and-nay votes, the House has approved the gentleman's position. I am glad to have the position of the House on the subject so clearly and so effectively stated by our distinguished majority leader.

May I ask how much time the gentleman from New York desires?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I should like 10 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot conscientiously support—

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CLEVENGER. With \$1,000,000,000 added to this bill I believe there should be a quorum present to hear the discussion. A billion is still a lot of money.

Mr. TABER. It used to be.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GORE). The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-two Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 210]

| | | |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Abernethy | Combs | Hébert |
| Adams | Courtney | Hedrick |
| Allen, Ill. | Daughton, Va. | Heseltun |
| Andersen | Dawson | Holifield |
| H. Carl | Dickstein | Horan |
| Andrews, N. Y. | Dingell | Jackson |
| Auchincloss | Drewry | Jennings |
| Barden | Ellis | Johnson, Okla. |
| Barry | Elsaesser | Jonkman |
| Bell | Ervin | Kee |
| Bender | Fernandez | Keefe |
| Bennet, N. Y. | Flannagan | Kilburn |
| Boren | Gallagher | Kirwan |
| Boykin | Gathings | Knutson |
| Brehm | Gearhart | Latham |
| Brown, Ohio | Geelan | Lewis |
| Buckley | Gillespie | McGehee |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Granger | McGlinchey |
| Camp | Gregory | McGregor |
| Cannon, Fla. | Gross | McKenzie |
| Carlson | Gwinn, N. Y. | Maloney |
| Celler | Gwynne, Iowa | Mathews |
| Clippinger | Halleck | May |
| Cole, Kans. | Harless, Ariz. | Morrison |
| Colmer | Hart | Murdock |

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| Norton | Robertson, Va. | Stevenson |
| O'Hara | Rockwell | Sumner, Ill. |
| Peterson, Ga. | Roe, Md. | Summers, Tex. |
| Pfeifer | Roe, N. Y. | Sundstrom |
| Phillips | Rooney | Talbot |
| Powell | Russell | Tarver |
| Rains | Schwabe, Okla. | Taylor |
| Ramey | Sheridan | Vursell |
| Reece, Tenn. | Short | West |
| Reed, Ill. | Smith, Va. | Wood |
| Rich | Snyder | |
| Rizley | Somers, N. Y. | |

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 327 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a New York school teacher.

FIRST DEFICIENCY BILL 1946— CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate to the fullest the things which the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has said with reference to the condition of the Treasury. It is worse, I believe, than he has painted it, because there are in addition to the direct debt, contingent liabilities which are estimated as high as \$300,000,000,000. This means our total debt including contingent obligations at the present time is close to \$600,000,000,000.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. The contingent liabilities and the debt combined total \$636,000,000,000.

Mr. TABER. I cannot go along with this conference report. The Senate raised the amount carried in the bill by practically \$1,000,000,000 and brought the total up to \$2,300,000,000.

I have just as much sympathy as anyone with starving people; on the other hand, I must have some sense of obligation to the people of the United States. We are presented today with a request for \$750,000,000 for UNRRA and, as far as I can see, if they use any sense in the disbursement of the funds they will have \$296,000,000 left after they have given all that they want to provide through the month of July. Five hundred million dollars would be sufficient. I cannot go along with this report. I would be willing to go along with it if it provided \$500,000,000 but I cannot go along with it when it provides \$750,000,000.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I have just had some telephone calls from mills in Kansas City, Mo., which are working at full capacity right now and they tell me that last night without any warning at midnight the Commodity Credit Corporation reversed its policy by which that Corporation had been selling wheat to these mills. Unless they can get wheat from the Commodity Credit Corporation

they are going to have to shut down within 2 or 3 days.

I have just talked with Mr. Farrington, of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and inquired why the Corporation took this step which is going to close down these flour mills. He tells me it is because of his foreign commitments. I asked him if that included UNRRA, and he said that certainly UNRRA entered into it to a large extent.

I think most of us are in favor of supporting UNRRA and giving this necessary relief, but, at the same time, there is a certain amount of common sense, there is a certain amount of looking out for ourselves that should be gone into. I wonder if this additional \$250,000,000 that they are asking for may be reflected in this policy that is causing such an expansion that our domestic mills in Kansas City and elsewhere will have to shut down within the next 2 or 3 days?

Mr. TABER. I would not be surprised but what that were true. I want to give you the full picture.

I brought out these facts from Mr. Lehman and Commander Jackson when the chairman of the committee and I were alone in the room the other night when we were holding hearings. If they received this \$750,000,000, according to their own estimate, they would have \$850,000,000 left on the 1st day of February. Their February shipments are said by them to be \$254,000,000, and they will not be able to deliver those shipments to the starving folks until April. That would be for April use. That will leave \$596,000,000. Now they want \$230,000,000 to ship in March and it cannot be delivered until May.

A hundred million dollars is all they need when it comes spring. They should taper it off and get down to reason. They would have \$496,000,000 left then, and if they had a hundred million dollars in April to use in June, that would be sufficient. If they used another hundred million dollars for shipments in May, to be used in July, that would carry them to the 1st of August, and their crops should be in by that time.

I want to call attention to another thing and that is that the contributions of other nations have not been as rapid as our own. In the first block of contributions they will have funds that will let them carry through until the 1st of April without having another dollar, so that other nations' second pledge will not be touched until May.

As I stated, I was willing to go along with \$500,000,000, which, in my opinion, would carry them beyond any question to the 1st day of August; and I can see no sense in trying to carry them beyond that date and I can see no justification for my going back on the people of the United States and the Treasury of the United States by appropriating funds for an organization that does not need it.

I realize, frankly, that this is not a popular stand, but when a man takes an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States it is up to him to do what is right in view of the facts that are before us. I cannot conscientiously go along with this conference report. It would not be honest.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The other day I was called into a conference which was attended by a man who has charge of UNRRA in one of the European countries. He informed us that 90 percent of UNRRA goods are sold in that country through the merchants, the merchants receiving a 5- or 10-percent profit on the sale for handling it. He indicated that there was quite a balance in the state bank there of UNRRA money which eventually is going to be used for some rehabilitation or agricultural purposes. What I want to find out is if the gentleman's committee can inform the House what the balances of UNRRA are as the result of sales of UNRRA goods.

Mr. TABER. UNRRA has no balances resulting from the sale of goods that I have been advised of, and I do not believe they have any.

I feel obliged, I will state to the House, to oppose this conference report because of the situation presented. It is absolutely unjustifiable.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Ludlow].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me more than passing strange that anyone should be called upon to defend an appropriation to implement UNRRA when the House has so repeatedly and emphatically expressed its approval of the relief work of that Organization. We are today just carrying into effect what the House has repeatedly said it wants to have done. All of us during the prosecution of the war against tyranny and oppression, have voted, astronomical amounts of money to kill and destroy. It was necessary to do this, but to me and I think to millions of Americans it would be a welcome change to appropriate this relatively insignificant amount to cure and to heal. The urgency of making this appropriation now is shown by the palpable facts of the situation. If we are to extend the maximum relief to the people who need it and to get the maximum benefits from our beneficence, speed is necessary. We should see that they receive as soon as possible, in addition to money to relieve starvation, seeds, fertilizers, agricultural implements, and other contributions by which they may assist in their own rehabilitation. All of this means that orders exceeding \$700,000,000 must be placed within the next 3 months of the coming year. Time is of the essence.

To my mind it is a sufficient argument for this appropriation, and the only one that should be necessary, to say that unless it is passed, thousands of human beings, including a great many innocent little children, undoubtedly will soon die of starvation. The snows of Christmas now envelop the earth and there could be no more appropriate time than now to manifest our warmth of human sympathy in keeping with the spirit of the season by taking action to rescue and relieve these poor suffering people.

Let no one doubt that this is the will of the people of America. Every Member of Congress has received hundreds of communications asking that we support the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration in its humanitarian effort. I dare say that the number expressing an opposing view has been negligible. There can be no doubt that the heart of America is in this legislation that is before us today. We might well apply to the situation the words of Shakespeare—

The quality of mercy is not strain'd,
It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven
Upon the place beneath. It is twice bless'd:
It blesseth him that gives and him that takes.

Let us be merciful today to these poor starving people.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to let Governor Lehman make the remainder of my speech. I wrote to him asking him to tell me whether this appropriation of \$750,000,000 is necessary, and how necessary it is and how urgent it is. I know of no one who can speak with more impressiveness and more authority on that point. With the indulgence of the House, I shall now read Governor Lehman's letter, which was handed to me a few moments ago by a messenger. He says:

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND
REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., December 19, 1945.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUDLOW: In reply to your inquiry over the telephone yesterday, I am setting forth below a brief summary of the reasons why UNRRA urgently requires an appropriation of at least \$750,000,000 at this time:

1. By the middle of February UNRRA will have completely used up all of the supplies and services financed out of the first \$1,350,000,000 appropriation made by the United States. That includes the recent appropriation of \$550,000,000 which has just been made.

2. By the middle of March UNRRA will have completely consumed all the supplies and services financed out of the contributions made by other countries, now totaling approximately \$500,000,000.

3. In February, March, April, and May UNRRA plans to ship more than \$700,000,000 worth of supplies from the United States for which it does not now have the money. It is imperative that those shipments be made on schedule. If we are to bring this relief operation to an end, we must ship food and clothing to Europe and China quickly enough to get the people through the winter, and we must deliver enough seed, fertilizer, and agricultural equipment in time for the spring planting. In that way we hope to be able to get the needy countries back on their feet by fall. If we do not deliver these supplies on schedule, the next harvest may be as bad as the last one, and we may have to continue furnishing relief indefinitely.

4. In order to ship the scheduled \$700,000,000 worth of supplies in February, March, April, and May, UNRRA must order the necessary commodities at once. The Department of Agriculture and Treasury Procurement, which procure supplies on UNRRA's behalf, must be furnished with orders amounting to \$315,000,000 in the month of January alone, to be paid for out of money UNRRA does not now have. In February UNRRA must furnish the procurement agencies with orders amounting to an additional \$254,000,000. In March it must furnish orders amounting to \$230,000,000. That means that it must place orders exceeding

\$700,000,000 within the first 3 months of next year. It cannot place those orders until it receives the money from the Congress.

5. The money needed to pay for the shipments planned through next May is needed now because it takes from 4 weeks to 4 months between the time the Government procurement agencies receive an order from UNRRA and the time that the supplies are loaded on board ship. The procurement agencies have to find suppliers and sign contracts with them. The suppliers must obtain the goods, goods must be shipped to port, and at the port they must be loaded on board ships. All those things take time.

6. UNRRA plans to stop sending supplies to Europe at the end of December 1946 and to stop sending supplies to the Far East at the end of March 1947. Those cut-off dates were fixed on the assumption that by this spring UNRRA would be able to supply the essential materials, such as seed, fertilizer, trucks, and the like, which will be needed if the receiving countries are to get back on their own feet.

7. This is the crucial moment in the battle. Just as in military matters, speed is the essence of strategy. To delay making a substantial appropriation until a later date is to be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT L. LEHMAN,
Director General.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, there are just a few things I should like to allude to in the conference report. With respect to UNRRA, we recently authorized, and the President signed the bill for, another 1 percent of national income or \$1,350,000,000. He indicated in a message to the committee that three-quarters of that amount would be obligated before the 30th of June 1946, or roughly \$175,000,000 a month. The money is going to be spent, and I do not know if it makes so much difference whether at this time we give them \$500,000,000 or \$750,000,000. I think the important thing is to make it possible for them to keep their pipe lines filled and to keep a rather even flow of supplies moving in the direction of the distressed countries. You noticed how disagreeable it was outdoors this morning. Well, it is going to be infinitely more disagreeable in some of these distressed countries because there will be just as much snow but it will be a great deal colder; and there will be little or no fuel. I do not want to take any action that in any way whatsoever may choke off supplies at a time when they are needed. Winter begins earlier in some of these countries and lasts a great deal longer. So my interest is in the relief of distress at a time when distress, difficulty, and suffering and sacrifice is at its highest. We agreed in subcommittee that \$750,000,000 was about the right amount. That is the amount that is now carried in this bill.

I want to allude for a moment to one or two other items that are here. You may have noted that we boosted school lunches to \$57,500,000, assuming that the conference report is approved, which contains a compromise item of \$7,500,000.

For a good many years we have been providing \$50,000,000 for school lunches, but it was disclosed to us by the Secre-

tary of Agriculture, through the instrumentality of a letter to the Senate committee, that in January 3 States will be out of money; in February another 12; and then in the succeeding months other States will be unable to participate in the school-lunch program. The Senate, accordingly, wrote in an additional \$15,000,000, and in compromise it was made \$7,500,000.

Perhaps I should suggest to you that this amount is matched by \$90,000,000 in State funds, so that of the total amount the Federal Government shares one-third, the States share two-thirds; but I allude to it for the good reason that while we have been going on at the level of \$50,000,000 a year I am satisfied that this additional money for school lunches will mean an increase in that item in the regular supply bill in 1947, and perhaps further increases in future years.

We gave the Civil Service Commission an additional \$600,000, although they asked for more. The reason for it is that in the single month of November there were 336,000 veterans who made application to the Civil Service Commission informally as to their rights under the Veterans' Preference Act, and over 100,000 filed formal applications for benefits under the Preference Act. That means that at least 12,000 veterans every day took the trouble to inquire about their preference rights, and at least 3,000 veterans every day went to the trouble of filing a formal application. It may be that \$600,000 will not be sufficient to carry through, but that is a responsibility that this Congress imposed upon the Civil Service Commission, and I know of nothing else we could do except to vote additional funds.

You may observe also that where the House provided \$14,000,000 for farm labor, the Senate increased that to \$25,000,000, and shared \$7,000,000 for the extension services. One would think that with all the work, and with so many men coming back from overseas, there would be an abundance of farm labor, yet every farm organization and every man who is especially conversant with that situation in the different agricultural States in the Union came before the House Committee and testified that it is impossible to get men on the farms today, notwithstanding the fact that in some cases the monthly wage rate has gone up two and three fold. So we had no choice except to vote sufficient funds for the purpose of importing labor from other countries. This seems something like a paradox that with at least 1,300,000 veterans being demobilized every 30 days, that in New York and in Illinois, in the South, in the cotton area, in the sugar-beet area, and elsewhere, sufficient labor is not available to bring the crops from the fields.

I do hope this will be the last time that the Congress will have to vote funds for the purpose of importing labor from other countries in order to bring the crops from the fields.

There is one item in this bill that has been very generally overlooked, and that is this: The House Appropriations Committee adopted and the House approved a provision which cut back all of the

funds of the National Labor Relations Board for the enforcement of the Smith-Connally Act. You will remember that not so long ago we had House Resolution 3937 before us, and by a vote of 200 to 182 the rule for its consideration was defeated, largely because we were assured that the bill would not be called up.

The first part of that resolution dealt with the repeal of the Smith-Connally Act. Yet here is in a sense a very effective repeal, approved by the House and approved by the Senate, whereby no more funds will be made available after the effective date of this act, for the enforcement of any portion of the Smith-Connally Act that comes within the domain of the National Labor Relations Board. In other words, the day the President affixes his signature to the enrolled bill that goes down to him, the National Labor Relations Board will no longer conduct strike ballots as provided in section 8 of the Smith-Connally Act because there will be no money for that purpose, and they believe that when Congress has taken money out of that appropriation it is in the nature of a mandate that they should no longer conduct any strike ballots. So, for practical purposes, the provision that is contained in this bill is going to do exactly what the first two sections of H. R. 3937 purported to do, the bill on which the rule was defeated in this House earlier in the week.

There is one other item to which I should allude, that relates to the Garrison Dam up in the Dakotas. I think I should allude to it because the chairman is going to offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment that is agreeable to those who come from that near Northwest area.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great controversy and I believe some misunderstanding as to what is involved. It is a projected flood-control project that is going to cost a lot of money. A controversy arose as to the elevation of the pool of water that is to be maintained behind the dam. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE and Mr. ROBERTSON] and others of this body have a vital interest in this matter and are concerned about the water levels that may be maintained. What they are concerned about is the elevation of the water behind the dam. They insist that it should not be carried to an elevation of more than 1,830 feet, for if this pool goes up to 1,850 feet as some of the gentlemen in another body indicated it may, the city of Williston, N. Dak., with seven or eight thousand people, would be practically inundated and property values would be destroyed. It would cause probably 200,000 acres of land to be inundated, and if some restriction is not written into this bill it is just as sure as the sun coming up in the morning that they will go ahead with construction, and when the time comes years hence to fill up that pool they will fill it to a level that is indicated by the War Department engineers unless the

restriction is inserted by the Congress. Some fine morning those folks out there will wake up with a notice in their hands to the effect that they can get out and that they can make suitable claim for damages to the Federal Government for whatever damage is caused by the 1,850-foot level. I do not believe that authority and that power to interfere with the livelihood of many thousands of people out there ought to be vested in the hands of the War Department engineers without further study.

It is a question of policy, and there is no reason why it should not be resolved by the Congress. When the chairman offers the amendment to concur with an amendment setting that level for the elevation of the water in the pool, I hope the House will vigorously support the amendment and therein also support the Members of this body who have been working insistently day in and day out to protect the welfare of their people back home.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired, all time has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, during the original consideration of this bill the amount of the appropriation for temporary housing for veterans under discussion was \$24,500,000, confined to expenditures for paneling small, temporary homes. I spoke at some length concerning this entire subject of housing for veterans. Today, as we come from the conference with the Senate, the amount for veterans' housing has been increased to \$191,900,000, but the scope for the expenditures has been considerably widened. The amount now available for carrying out the purposes of title V of the Lanham Act is based upon the following conditions:

- (1) That an emergency program is clearly required because no long-term activity can affect the supply of new housing to become available in the next few months when the housing shortage is most acute;
- (2) That in order to avoid diverting materials from badly needed permanent construction, only existing federally owned war housing and other facilities and no new structures be used to meet the needs of applicants eligible under title V to occupy such housing; and
- (3) That there should be substantial local participation in the reuse of these structures.
- (4) That the emergency program should be limited by the supply of Federal structures available for this purpose and by the capacity of the Federal Government to get the housing under way in the next few months.

Within this framework it has been estimated that solely by the reuse of federally owned structures 100,000 family dwelling units can be provided which will be available for occupancy during the calendar year 1946.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes, 83, noes, 25.

So the conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 18: Page 7, line 7 insert the following:

"Addition to the Executive Mansion: For an addition to the Executive Mansion; for alterations, improvements, and furnishings, and for improvement of grounds, to be expended as the President may determine, notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, to remain available until expended \$1,650,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is submitted to the House in compliance with the requirements of section 2 of rule 20. The disagreement is a mere technicality and the amendment is considered separately in order to comply with the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 and agree to the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 35: Page 13, line 18, insert the following:

Public-health services, Philippine Islands: To enable the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, fiscal year 1946, to assist the public-health organization of the Philippine Islands in reconstituting and reactivating public-health services and programs in the Philippine Islands, including personal services in the District of Columbia; personal services outside the District of Columbia without regard to the civil-service or classification laws; purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of 25 passenger automobiles and 10 aircraft; travel; printing and binding; purchase of supplies, materials, and equipment without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; and packing, unpacking, crating, uncrating, drayage, and transportation of personal effects of commissioned officers and transportation of their dependents on change of station, \$1,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this is likewise the technical submission of an amendment under the Rules of the House, and I therefore move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 42: Page 16, line 24, insert the following:

"PUBLIC BUILDINGS ADMINISTRATION
"Federal office building, Nashville, Tenn.: For the acquisition of a site in Nashville, Tenn., by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, and the construction thereon of a new Federal office building for the use and accommodation of the United States, including the Veterans' Administration, \$5,575,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard on this amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this item calls for \$5,575,000 for a public building in Nashville, Tenn. It is the only item of public buildings involved in the bill. It is the setting up of a special privilege for a building that is not authorized by law; therefore, it had to be brought back in disagreement for a separate vote of the House.

Maybe we have \$5,575,000 kicking around that we can throw into this kind of a deal; but I cannot go along with that method of procedure. We owe some obligation to the people of the United States to keep down the expenditure of public funds.

I hope that this item will be defeated. There is no more reason for a building at this point than there is at a thousand other places in the United States. There is no more emergency there than anywhere else. It is absolutely unnecessary for use to go into that kind of a thing now. What we ought to do at this time is to put an embargo on buildings of this sort in order that the construction of dwelling houses and apartment houses may go forward so that people who are without housing can move in. This is directly an antihousing proposal and I hope the motion of the gentleman from Missouri will be rejected.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. This item would be in conflict with the program to try to get equipment and materials to build houses for our returning veterans, would it not?

Mr. TABER. Absolutely.

Mr. DONDERO. What kind of a building is this?

Mr. TABER. A great big public building.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from New York that this is the only appropriation authorized for public buildings, but I disagree with the gentleman from New York to a considerable degree in his statement that there is not an emergency existing in this case that does not exist in hundreds of other places. There are other emergencies, no doubt, but that does not make the situation any the less urgent.

This item was put in this bill primarily to meet a situation that exists in Tennessee in reference to the regional headquarters for the Veterans' Administration.

The regional headquarters of the Veterans' Administration in Tennessee has been located at a mental hospital not in the capital city; a hospital that is removed from the main arteries of transportation, and it has been extremely inconvenient for the veterans to reach that place for consideration of their claims.

The Veterans' Administration has ordered the establishment of a regional office in Nashville. The Administration

has made surveys and frequent attempts to find adequate space to house this regional office. It has been utterly impossible up to this time to find suitable space in the city. The Federal offices in Nashville require about 110,000 square feet and the Veterans' Administration needs 81,000 square feet, and they need this amount of space as quickly as possible.

A temporary solution has been found by placing the regional office temporarily at Thayer General Hospital, an Army hospital located in the suburbs of the city and the regional office will move to those quarters shortly. This amendment would appropriate a sufficient amount of money to take care of the Veterans' Administration regional office and a Federal building to replace the old customs house that is far too small and far from adequate in taking care of other Federal offices. I might say also in reply to the gentleman from New York that I can appreciate his feelings, and I can appreciate the attitude of any other Member of the House who might have a situation similar to that existing in his district. A letter was sent to the White House today by the Bureau of the Budget approving this item, and recommending that it be submitted to the Congress, and it has been submitted. It comes to us now in the form of this amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure my colleague will bear me out in the statement that practically all of this item is for the care of the veterans. The Members of the Tennessee delegation, including the two gentlemen on the minority side, have been working for months and months to get the regional office of the Veterans' Administration for Tennessee located in Nashville. The difficulty has been that they could not find space for it. It is an extreme emergency matter and one that should be promptly approved.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank my colleague from Tennessee. He and all other Members of our delegation both in the House and in the Senate have been extremely interested in this situation.

I do not believe it is economy for us simply to delay these matters when it is a pressing emergency situation. I am in favor of going ahead as quickly as possible and doing this thing. I hope the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri will be agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if there are no further requests for time, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the House divided; and there were—ayes 62 noes 60.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 172, nays 151, answered "present" 1, not voting 108, as follows:

[Roll No. 211]

YEAS—172

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Allen, La. | Gore | O'Toole |
| Andrews, Ala. | Gorski | Outland |
| Bailey | Gossett | Pace |
| Baldwin, Md. | Granahan | Patman |
| Barden | Grant, Ala. | Patrick |
| Barrett, Pa. | Green | Patterson |
| Bates, Ky. | Hagen | Peterson, Fla. |
| Beckworth | Hare | Philbin |
| Biemiller | Harris | Pickett |
| Bland | Hart | Price, Fla. |
| Bloom | Havener | Price, Ill. |
| Bradley, Pa. | Hays | Priest |
| Brooks | Healy | Quinn, N. Y. |
| Brown, Ga. | Hébert | Rabaut |
| Bryson | Heffernan | Rabin |
| Bulwinkle | Hendricks | Ramspeck |
| Bunker | Hinsaw | Randolph |
| Burch | Hobbs | Rankin |
| Burgin | Hoch | Rayfiel |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Holfield | Rea |
| Cannon, Mo. | Hook | Richards |
| Carnahan | Huber | Riley |
| Celler | Izac | Rivers |
| Chapman | Jarman | Robinson, Utah |
| Chelf | Johnson | Roe, Md. |
| Clements | Lyndon B. | Rogers, Fla. |
| Cochran | Kefauver | Rowan |
| Coffee | Kelley, Pa. | Ryter |
| Cooley | Kelly, Ill. | Sabath |
| Cooper | Keogh | Sadowsky |
| Cox | Kerr | Sasser |
| Cravens | Kilday | Savage |
| Crosser | King | Sheppard |
| D'Alesandro | Kirwan | Slaughter |
| Daughton, Va. | Kunkel | Sparkman |
| Davis | Lane | Spence |
| De Lacy | Larcade | Starkey |
| Delaney | Lea | Stewart |
| James J. | Lemke | Stigler |
| Delaney | Lesinski | Sullivan |
| John J. | Link | Thom |
| Domengeaux | Lyle | Thomason |
| Douglas, Calif. | Lynch | Tolan |
| Douglas, Ill. | McCormack | Torrens |
| Doyle | McMillan, S. C. | Traynor |
| Earthman | Madden | Trimble |
| Eberharter | Manasco | Vinson |
| Engle, Calif. | Mansfield | Voorhis, Calif. |
| Fallon | Mont | Walter |
| Feighan | Mansfield, Tex. | Weaver |
| Flood | Marcanthonio | West |
| Fogarty | Miller, Calif. | White |
| Folger | Mills | Whitten |
| Forand | Monroney | Wickersham |
| Fulton | Morgan | Winstead |
| Gallagher | Murray, Tenn. | Woodhouse |
| Gardner | Neely | Worley |
| Gary | O'Brien, Ill. | Zimmerman |
| Gordon | O'Brien, Mich. | |

NAYS—151

| | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Anderson, Calif. | Cole, N. Y. | Hale |
| Andresen | Corbett | Hall |
| August H. | Crawford | Edwin Arthur |
| Angell | Cunningham | Hall |
| Arends | Curtis | Leonard W. |
| Arnold | D'Ewart | Halleck |
| Baldwin, N. Y. | Dirksen | Hancock |
| Barrett, Wyo. | Dolliver | Hand |
| Bates, Mass. | Dondero | Harness, Ind. |
| Beall | Dworshak | Henry |
| Bennett, Mo. | Eaton | Herter |
| Bishop | Elliott | Hess |
| Blackney | Ellsworth | Hill |
| Bolton | Elston | Hoeven |
| Bonner | Engel, Mich. | Hoffman |
| Bradley, Mich. | Fellows | Holmes, Mass. |
| Brumbaugh | Fenton | Holmes, Wash. |
| Buck | Fisher | Hope |
| Buffett | Fuller | Howell |
| Butler | Gamble | Hull |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Gavin | Jenkins |
| Campbell | Gerlach | Jensen |
| Canfield | Gibson | Johnson, Calif. |
| Case, N. J. | Gifford | Johnson, Ill. |
| Case, S. Dak. | Gillespie | Johnson, Ind. |
| Chenoweth | Gillette | Jones |
| Chipperfield | Gillie | Judd |
| Church | Goodwin | Kean |
| Clason | Graham | Kearney |
| Clevenger | Grant, Ind. | Kinzer |
| Clippinger | Griffiths | LaFollette |
| Cole, Mo. | Gross | Landis |

| | | |
|----------------|---------------|------------------|
| Lefevre | Pittenger | Stockman |
| Luce | Ploeser | Taber |
| Ludlow | Plumley | Talle |
| McConnell | Poage | Thomas, N. J. |
| McCowan | Reed, N. Y. | Tibbott |
| McDonough | Rees, Kans. | Towe |
| McMillen, Ill. | Robison, Ky. | Vorys, Ohio |
| Mahon | Rodgers, Pa. | Vursell |
| Martin, Iowa | Rogers, Mass. | Wadsworth |
| Martin, Mass. | Schwabe, Mo. | Wasieleski |
| Mason | Scrivner | Welch |
| Mathews | Shafer | Whittington |
| Morrow | Sharp | Wigglesworth |
| Michener | Simpson, Ill. | Wilson |
| Miller, Nebr. | Simpson, Pa. | Wolcott |
| Mundt | Smith, Maine | Wolfenden, Pa. |
| Murray, Wis. | Smith, Ohio | Wolverton, N. J. |
| Norrell | Smith, Wis. | Woodruff, Mich. |
| O'Konski | Springer | |
| O'Neal | Stefan | |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Winter

NOT VOTING—108

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Abernethy | Gearhart | Peterson, Ga. |
| Adams | Geelan | Pfeifer |
| Allen, Ill. | Granger | Phillips |
| Andersen | Gregory | Powell |
| H. Carl | Gwinn, N. Y. | Rains |
| Andrews, N. Y. | Gwynne, Iowa | Ramey |
| Auchincloss | Harless, Ariz. | Reece, Tenn. |
| Barry | Hartley | Reed, Ill. |
| Bell | Hedrick | Rich |
| Bender | Heseltun | Rizley |
| Bennet, N. Y. | Horan | Robertson |
| Boren | Jackson | N. Dak. |
| Boykin | Jennings | Robertson, Va. |
| Brehm | Johnson | Rockwell |
| Brown, Ohio | Luther A. | Roe, N. Y. |
| Buckley | Johnson, Okla. | Rogers, N. Y. |
| Camp | Jonkman | Rooney |
| Cannon, Fla. | Kee | Russell |
| Carlson | Keefe | Schwabe, Okla. |
| Clark | Kilburn | Sheridan |
| Cole, Kans. | Knutson | Short |
| Colmer | Kopplemann | Sikes |
| Combs | Lanham | Smith, Va. |
| Courtney | Latham | Snyder |
| Curley | LeCompte | Somers, N. Y. |
| Dawson | Lewis | Stevenson |
| Dickstein | McGehee | Sumner, Ill. |
| Dingell | McGlinchey | Sumners, Tex. |
| Doughton, N. C. | McGregor | Sundstrom |
| Drewry | McKenzie | Talbot |
| Durham | Maloney | Tarver |
| Ellis | May | Taylor |
| Elsaesser | Morrison | Thomas, Tex. |
| Ervin | Murdock | Weiss |
| Fernandez | Murphy | Welch |
| Flannagan | Norton | Wood |
| Gathings | O'Hara | Woodrum, Va. |

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Courtney for, with Mr. Auchincloss against.

Mr. Hedrick for, with Mr. Sundstrom against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Knutson against.

Mr. Gregory for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Stevenson against.

Mr. Dickstein for, with Mr. Gwynne of Iowa against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Bender.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Gathings with Mr. Schwabe of Oklahoma.

Mr. Doughton of North Carolina with Mr. Short.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Rich.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Ellis.

Mr. Kee with Mr. Cole of Kansas.

Mr. Wood with Mr. Adams.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Heseltun.

Mr. Roe of New York with Mr. Elsaesser.

Mr. Tarver with Mr. Carlson.

Mr. Murdock with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Robertson of Virginia with Mr. Lewis.

Mr. Lanham with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Ramey.

Mr. Maloney with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Camp with Mr. Horan.

Mr. McGlinchey with Mr. Jennings.

Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. McGregor.

Mr. Ervin with Mr. Rockwell.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Jonkman.

Mr. May with Mr. Gwinn of New York.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 48: Page 19, strike out lines 20, 21, and 22 as follows: "Veterans' housing: To enable the National Housing Administrator to carry out the purposes of title V of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, \$24,500,000," and insert:

"Veterans' housing: To enable the National Housing Administrator to carry out the purposes of title V of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1501), \$191,900,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, without regard to the provisions of any other law, but subject to the removal provisions of section 313 of said act, said Administrator may transfer, for such consideration and subject to such terms and conditions as he deems feasible under the circumstances, any temporary housing (intact or in panels suitable for reuse) under his jurisdiction to any educational institution, State or political subdivision thereof, local public agency, or nonprofit organization, for use or reuse in providing temporary housing for families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, or, in the discretion of the Administrator, for single veterans attending educational institutions."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 54: Page 30, line 2, after "\$320,000", insert ", and in conducting a survey for city relief sewers the Commissioners are authorized to employ engineering and other professional services by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and civil service and classification laws."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 59: On page 32, after line 23, insert the following:

"SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM"

"The limitation of \$50,000,000 for the objects and for the purposes of the item 'School lunch program' contained in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946, is increased by \$15,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 59 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount of "\$15,000,000" named in such amendment, insert "\$7,500,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 88: On page 43, after line 4 insert the following:

"Arkansas River compact: For payment of the compensation, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, including time performed in travel, and expenses, including travel, of the person appointed by the President, pursuant to Public Law 34, Seventy-ninth Congress, to participate as the representative of the United States in the negotiation of a compact between the States of Colorado and Kansas relative to the division of the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries, to be available until June 30, 1947, \$15,000: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law to the contrary, the President is authorized to appoint a retired officer of the Army as such representative without prejudice to his status as a retired Army officer who shall receive such compensation and expenses in addition to his retired pay."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 103: On page 56, line 25, strike out "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for constructing the Garrison (N. Dak.) Reservoir beyond dimensions which would provide for a higher pool elevation than 1,830 feet or for constructing dikes or levees which would provide for a higher pool elevation than 1,830 feet for operating such dam", and insert "*Provided*, 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. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 103 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "*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."

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. CANNON of Missouri, a motion to reconsider the votes

by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the conference report may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

REVENUE ACT OF 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to House Document No. 383. It contains questions and answers with regard to the Revenue Act of 1945. I think you will find it very useful not only for yourselves but for your constituents. Copies of this document will be available in the document room beginning about tomorrow.

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. BLOOM submitted the following conference report and statement on 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:

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.

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

Managers on the Part of the House.

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

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the 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, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: Both the Senate bill and the House amendment provided for the designation of representatives of the United States for sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations. The House amendment also contained a provision authorizing the appointment of alternates, which was not in the Senate bill, and provided that no Member of the Senate or House of Representatives or officer of the United States designated as a representative or alternate for the General Assembly should be entitled to receive any compensation for his services in such capacity. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 2: Both the Senate bill and the House amendment authorized the President to appoint other persons to represent the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and required that some of these persons could be designated only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Senate bill contained a requirement, which was not in the House amendment, that the principal representative in specialized agencies established by the United Nations Organization should be confirmed by the Senate. The conference agreement omits this provision, but does require Senate confirmation for the representative of the United States in any commission that may be formed by the United Nations with respect to atomic energy or any other commission of the United Nations upon which the United States is entitled to representation. The House amendment contained a provision, which was not in the Senate bill, authorizing the designation, without the advice and consent of the Senate, of any officer of the United States to act, without additional compensation, as the representative of the United States in the Economic and Social Council or in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations at specified meetings in the absence or disability of the regular representative, or in connection with a specified subject matter at any specified meeting, in lieu of the regular representative. This provision is retained in the conference agreement.

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

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill S. 1580.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

Mr. MARTIN of Mass. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman explain the changes in the bill and the difference between the House and the Senate bills?

Mr. BLOOM. The only change is that the Senate asks that a new paragraph be inserted in the bill. All of the amendments in the bill as passed by the House yesterday remain the same. The new paragraph is rather short and is 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.

That is to say that in case the United Nations shall appoint a commission for atomic energy or anything else as important as that, the representative on that commission will have to come back and be confirmed by the Senate. That is the only change.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DENTAL CARE FOR PERSONNEL OF UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 715) to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the proper recognition of the Dental Corps in the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery of the Navy. A similar bill passed the House some 6 or 8 months ago, but was not enacted into law by the Senate. During this session of Congress, the Committee on Naval Affairs had the matter up again. We think the bill is in somewhat of a more improved form than it was when it passed the House during the last session of Congress. It simply gives to the

Dental Corps the recognition which the Dental Corps feels it should have in the Medical Corps of the Navy.

The bill is presented by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], the author of the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that all Members of the House are aware of the splendid performance record which has been compiled by the dentists who have served with our armed forces during the war.

It is impossible to pay too high a tribute to the dentists who have served with our Navy during the great struggle. These great men are continuing to perform the duties assigned them. As long as America's warships cover the seas of the world, there will be the finest of the dental profession ministering to the needs of our fighting men.

This measure, S. 715, aims at providing to the men of the dental profession serving with our Navy the position which is justly their due. This measure is by no means intended as an award for the services the dentists have performed. It is but a recognition of the need for a dental division to be supervised and manned by dentists. It is, in short, an expression of the intention of Congress that the men in our Navy shall receive the best possible dental care.

The members of the Navy Dental Corps have all been educated in the science of their profession. Their skill is a specialized one. In order that this profession may render the best possible service in the Navy it is essential that it receive intelligent consideration and attention from men who know and understand the details of the profession. Dentistry, in civilian life, is no longer considered a mere adjunct of the medical profession. It is an independent science which is playing a role of ever-increasing importance in the lives of everyone. It is now common knowledge that the skill of the dentist can frequently minimize or eradicate the incidence of ailments which in former days have been thought to be ills which could respond only to the touch of the medical profession.

It is of utmost importance that we provide within the Navy the greatest possible freedom of action for the members of this profession in order that Navy men may have all the advantages which such autonomy will make possible.

There is the question of morale of dental officers and dental personnel. This is worthy of serious consideration. These men have most important functions to perform. In the performance of those functions it is of the utmost importance that they receive the sympathetic consideration of commanding officers who understand their problems. The morale of these dental officers and personnel affects all the men in the service to some degree.

The passage of this act will go far to improving that morale. It will promote efficiency in the operation of the Dental Corps. It will promote economy since it will do away with procurement and operations by men—though well-meaning—who lack the essential knowledge without which it is impossible to understand the needs of the dental profession.

It is immediately apparent from the report on this measure that the ground has been well covered. The committees of the Senate and the House have gone into the matter thoroughly. Both committees have been impressed by the need for action here. Your interest in the men in the service—for whom I know you want the best of everything—requires that you support the passage of this essential measure.

During the hearings on this bill it was suggested that the Navy could work out the reorganization of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in such a manner as to resolve all the objections there are to the present set-up. By such a proposal—from the Bureau itself—there is an admission that something is wrong—that at least some of the complaints of dental officers are well-founded. The Bureau has admitted there is need for change—for improvement in the present organizational set-up of the Bureau. But, the Bureau argues, if you will give us time we shall correct all these existing injustices. I submit to you gentlemen, there has been plenty of time. There has been years of time. Since the original of this bill was introduced there has been a lot of time to make the necessary changes.

We have frequently been accused of doing harm through delaying action. Let us not fail again to take the steps which are proven necessary.

The Bureau of Medicine and Surgery admits the situation now is not good. It proposes to elevate the Dental Corps to a position which is proper—to provide it with a certain amount of autonomy in its operations. We appreciate that attitude on the part of the Bureau but let us assist the Bureau in its noble efforts by enacting this measure and demonstrating to the Bureau how we want it to proceed in its reorganization, at least insofar as the Navy Dental Corps is affected.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery shall be reorganized so as to provide for greater integrity of the Dental Service in accordance with the provisions hereof.

SEC. 2. The dental functions of such Bureau shall be defined and prescribed by appropriate directives of such Bureau, and by any necessary regulations of the Secretary of the Navy, to the end that the Dental Division of such Bureau shall study, plan, and direct all matters coming within the cognizance of such division, as hereinafter prescribed, and all matters relating to dentistry shall be referred to the Dental Division.

SEC. 3. The Dental Division shall (1) establish professional standards and policies for dental practice; (2) conduct inspections and surveys for maintenance of such standards; (3) initiate and recommend action pertaining to complements, appointments, advancement, training assignment, and transfer of dental personnel; and (4) serve as the advisory agency for the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery on all matters relating directly to dentistry. An officer of the Dental Corps of the Navy shall be detailed as the Chief of the Dental Division. Such officer, while so serving, shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a rear admiral.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Navy shall provide by regulations for establishing on ships and on shore stations dental services to be under the senior dental officer who shall be responsible to the commanding officer of such ship or shore station for all professional, technical, and administrative matters in connection therewith: *Provided,* That this section shall not be construed to impose any administrative requirements which would interfere with the proper functioning of battle organizations.

All laws and parts of laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed, and nothing contained herein shall act to reduce the grade or rank of any person.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 417 was laid on the table.

INDUSTRIAL USE OF SILVER OWNED BY THE UNITED STATES

MR. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4590) to authorize the use by industry of silver held or owned by the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to sell or lease for manufacturing uses, including manufacturing uses incident to reconversion and the building up of employment in industry, upon such terms as the Secretary of the Treasury shall deem advisable, to any person, partnership, association, or corporation, or any department of the Government, any silver held or owned by the United States at not less than 71.11 cents per fine troy ounce: *Provided,* That at all times the ownership and the possession or control within the United States of an amount of silver of a monetary value equal to the face amount of all outstanding silver certificates heretofore or hereafter issued by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be maintained by the Treasury.

SEC. 2. This act shall expire 2 years after the date of its enactment.

MR. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this bill merely continues the authority that the Secretary of the Treasury now has under Public Law 137, of the Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended, which authority expires on December 31 of this year. It provides that the Secretary of the Treasury may sell a portion of the unallocated free silver owned by the Treasury for industrial purposes, in order to speed up reconversion.

It provides that he cannot sell this silver at a less price than 71.11 cents per ounce. The Secretary of the Treasury desires the authority. It was reported by the committee without objection and without a record vote.

I include with my remarks the report on the bill as follows:

USE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED SILVER BY INDUSTRY

MR. SPENCE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4590) to authorize the use by industry of silver held or owned by the United States, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

This bill will authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, during the period of 2 years from the date of its enactment, to sell or lease for manufacturing uses, including those incident to reconversion and expansion of employment in industry, silver held or owned by the United States. Sales may be made to any person, partnership, association, or corporation or to Government departments, and the price must be not less than 71.11 cents an ounce.

The effect of this bill is to extend in somewhat modified form the act of July 12, 1943 (57 Stat. 520), as amended (31 U. S. C. Sup. IV, 734c), under which the Secretary of the Treasury has sold and leased silver for use in the prosecution of the war. Since its enactment, war and civilian industries have consumed all available supplies of silver, both imported and domestically mined, and at no time have these supplies proved sufficient to meet the industrial demand in full. During the first year this act was in effect, more than 40,000,000 ounces of silver were sold by the Secretary of the Treasury to meet the deficiency in the supply of imported and domestically mined silver. During its second year of operation, the sales increased to 68,000,000 ounces and during the past 5½ months there have been sales in excess of 42,000,000 ounces. Without this additional source of supply, it is clear that silver-consuming industries would have had to curtail their production.

The quantity of silver which industry will consume during the next few years will be affected by numerous factors, many of them unpredictable. Everything that bears upon the level of industrial activity, the number of persons gainfully employed, and the quantity of goods available for sale will have its effect on the industrial consumption of silver. Nevertheless, it is obvious that there is not at the present time enough silver coming into the market to meet the demand of legitimate industry and, should the supply fall short of that demand, reconversion will be interfered with and a serious obstacle will be placed in the way of achieving high levels of production.

We should not permit unnecessary shortages of materials to delay conversion from a wartime to a peacetime economy nor to hold down the level of production. Enactment of H. R. 4590 will assure the industries that use silver of a continued source of supply during the next 2 years and thus permit them to go forward with plans for expansion to meet the backlog of orders now in their hands.

The Secretary of the Treasury has leased 877,715,117 ounces of silver to the War Department and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for nonconsumptive use in war plants. More than half of this silver is in the atomic bomb plant in Tennessee, and the balance is used in bus bars located in aluminum and magnesium plants throughout the country. The enactment of this bill will also permit the extension of these leases if technical difficulties involved in the return of the silver make redelivery impossible during the period fixed in the present law.

As of December 13, 1945, the Treasury held approximately 1,580,000,000 ounces of silver as security for silver certificates, and 436,776,875 ounces of free silver. One hundred and seventy-three million ounces of the free silver are to be monetized under an authorization of the Secretary of the Treasury of July 5, 1945, leaving 263,776,875 ounces available for coinage and for industrial uses.

Enactment of this bill has been recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury in a letter to the chairman of the committee as follows:

DECEMBER 6, 1945.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter of December 5, 1945, requesting a report on H. R. 4590, to authorize the use by industry of silver held or owned by the United States.

Enactment of the bill will enable the Treasury to continue selling silver to American industry for manufacturing uses. It is unlikely that domestic production of silver and imports of silver will be sufficient to satisfy the demands of industry for a considerable period of time. A shortage of silver for industrial use would interfere with reconversion and the maintenance of high levels of production and, accordingly, authority for the Treasury to sell silver to industry would greatly assist in the adjustment from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

With respect to leases, the bill would permit the extension, if necessary, of two leases which are now outstanding and which will terminate 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President. The War Department holds nearly 475,000,000 ounces under lease and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation holds slightly more than 400,000,000 ounces. The silver is used in bus bars located in aluminum and magnesium plants throughout the country and in the War Department's atomic bomb plant in Tennessee.

For the reasons stated above, the Treasury Department recommends that H. R. 4590 be enacted.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Very truly yours,

FRED M. VINSON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE: On page 1, line 10, after the words "not less than," strike out "71.11 cents" and insert "\$1.2929."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in offering this amendment I am guided largely by the present situation in the use of silver that has been obtained by the Government.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment will raise the price of Government-owned silver to be sold to the jewelers and manufacturing trade to the value of the silver in the standard silver dollar. The people of this country have accepted, and there is now in use, over \$2,000,000,000 in silver money in the form of silver dollars and silver certificates at the coinage value of \$1.29 per ounce.

The Treasury has recently lend-leased 600,000,000 ounces of silver to the British Empire, practically all of which the British have proceeded to coin and put into circulation, in most cases at a coinage value higher than the price this amendment proposes to establish, as you will note from the following table obtained from the Treasury Department:

Value of ounce of silver in silver currency in the British Empire

| | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Australia | \$1.1146 |
| Indian rupee ($\frac{1}{16}$ fine) | .8728 |
| Indian rupee (0.500 fine) | 1.5950 |
| Canada | 1.6666 |
| Egypt | 1.2797 |
| Ireland | 1.4790 |
| New Zealand | 2.0688 |

Every ounce of silver that the Government owns should be put into circulation as money which will reduce the amount of bonds our Government must sell to pay current expenses and the added interest by that much.

If the manufacturing and jewelry trade must buy Government silver, why should not they pay as much for it as the people who accepted the United States or British money in exchange for their goods and services? If there is any industry that has profited during the war period and are making enormous profits now, it is the jewelry trade. Step into any jewelry store and compare prices now with those before the war, and you will easily verify this statement. Jewelry stores have increased by the thousands since the war began, and the price of all kinds of silver jewelry and silverware has gone up.

Let me quote from an article I have just read today in the Pathfinder, dated December 19, 1945:

PRICES AND PLAIN TALK

On New York's swank Fifth Avenue the casual shopper could pay \$32.50 for a child's linen suit; \$150 for men's pajamas and matching robes; \$95 for nightgowns; \$155 for a woman's slack suit (sweater extra); \$1,936 for a silver fish platter.

Think of \$1,936 for a silver fish platter. Price silver jewelry anywhere and you will find the price all out of line and way higher than the coinage value of the good old American silver dollar. The last time I was in New York, I was surprised to find a lot of the ordinary run of old-style silver dollars bearing the head of the Goddess of Liberty prominently displayed in the shop windows at \$2 each. I was at a loss to understand how an ordinary silver dollar could be sold for \$2 even in New York when any holder of a dollar silver certificate can have it redeemed and obtain a silver dollar in exchange. The image of the head of the Goddess of Liberty on the old-style silver dollar, hard to obtain in New York, may have been the reason for the inflated price.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield briefly.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have examined this bill and I note it comes from the Committee on Banking and Currency. The distinguished gentleman from Idaho is chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures to which this type of legislation should be referred. I would like to know why the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures did not have this bill for consideration.

Mr. WHITE. I think the bill is entitled to come to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. By a long line of precedents, that committee has always had legislation of this kind, with the exception of the fact that when the price of silver was set that legislation was referred to the Ways and Means Committee, due to the tax feature in the silver legislation. This bill does not contain a tax feature, and I do not understand why the bill was not referred to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

This is such an important piece of legislation that I cannot understand the policy of the leadership in rushing a bill of this kind through the House without consideration. This subject takes more explaining than I can make to the House in the brief 10 minutes at my disposal.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman will recall that he has in mind a country-wide investigation to determine the uses to which silver may be put economically. Would not that be in line with this bill?

Mr. WHITE. That would be right in line with this bill. This bill should have been referred to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, so we could have investigated the situation of silver, a subject that is often misunderstood and at best but little understood by the people of the country and the Members of the House. Under the law today there is no price set at 71.11 cents for silver. The law provides that when a miner brings his silver to the mint it will be minted into silver dollars, that the Treasury will retain 45 percent of those dollars and give back to the miner 55 percent.

Since the Silver Purchase Act was passed in 1934, the Government has obtained 506,125,000 ounces of domestic silver, for which it has paid \$362,196,000.

According to information just obtained from the Treasury which is inserted here:

DECEMBER 19, 1945, 10:45 A. M.

Mr. Neff, Treasury, dictated the following on purchases by the mints and assay offices of newly minted domestic silver:

| Year | Ounces | Dollars |
|------|---------|---------|
| 1934 | 21.8 | 14.1 |
| 1935 | 38.0 | 27.3 |
| 1936 | 61.1 | 47.3 |
| 1937 | 70.6 | 54.6 |
| 1938 | 61.6 | 42.2 |
| 1939 | 60.7 | 40.1 |
| 1940 | 68.3 | 48.5 |
| 1941 | 70.5 | 50.1 |
| 1942 | 47.9 | 34.0 |
| 1943 | 5.5 | 3.9 |
| 1944 | 125 | .096 |
| 1945 | 506.125 | 362.196 |

NOTE.—The ounces and dollars are in the millions, for example the first 21.8 is 21,800,000, etc.

| | Prices | Cents per ounce |
|---------------------------------|--------|-----------------|
| 1934 to Apr. 9, 1935 | 64.64 | |
| Apr. 9 to Apr. 23, 1935 | 71.11 | |
| Apr. 23, 1935, to Dec. 31, 1937 | 77.57 | |
| Dec. 31, 1937, to July 1, 1939 | 64.64 | |
| July 1, 1939 | 71.11 | |

Mr. Neff said he would call back to give ounces and dollars for the 11 months in 1945. These amounts are negligible.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a further observation?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We all recognize the gentleman as one of the great silver experts of the country and we are sorry his committee did not have an opportunity to consider this bill so he could have elucidated more fully to us what the silver situation is.

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the smiling chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this bill came to the Committee on Banking and Currency in the ordinary processes of reference of legislation. We did not seek it.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. SPENCE. We had no intention of interfering with the gentleman's jurisdiction, but the bill having been referred to our committee and we having assumed jurisdiction we believe we are entitled to present it in the House; and I want to see the bill passed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further.

Now it is proposed by this bill that we take the silver that has been accumulated by the Government, and by every right should be put in circulation as money, and hand it over to the jewelers, a class that has made more money during the war than any other, at a price of 71.11 an ounce.

My amendment calls for this silver to be sold at the coinage price of silver, at \$1.29. I hope the committee will support my amendment and that the money of the taxpayers that is invested in silver may not be used to let the jewelers make a profit represented between the 71.11 price and the \$1.29 monetary value of the silver to the people who accept silver certificates. We have 200,000,000 silver certificates in circulation at \$1.29 and I see no reason at this time when the taxpayers are overloaded with debt why we should make a concession to the jewelers and silversmiths by selling this silver to them at 71.11.

I ask that the committee support my amendment to make the sale price of this silver \$1.29.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho. We all understand he is one of the great monetary experts of the country and we would not dare dispute him upon monetary questions. But this is not a monetary question, it is a business proposition; it is a question of trying to do something to get silver into the hands of industry to help in a little measure solve the unemployment problem next year. It is inconceivable we would let huge quantities of silver lay idle in the Treasury and force many thousands of people out of work. Silver factories, jewelry factories, watch-case factories and many kindred industries. The motion-picture industry is also interested. The silver-mining interests would stand in their own light if they permitted these customers to be destroyed. I do not believe the Congress wants at this time to set prices which would be contrary to the Treasury.

I am in favor of this bill and hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The purpose of this bill is to get this metal into the

hands of the silversmiths. The monetary question is not involved. This is merely a continuance of existing law which expires at the end of this month.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We have already passed this bill three times in the House by unanimous consent.

Mr. McCORMACK. This has to do with the OPA ceiling prices and if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho is adopted, this particular line of activity might as well go out of business?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is true.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITE) there were—ayes 4, noes 160.

So the amendment was rejected.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

House Resolution 465 was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS TO SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on 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, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the 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 out-patient 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 out-patient 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 VIII 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 thirty 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 cus-

tomary 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:

"6. 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 increases 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 personality 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 operation 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 used 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 benefits 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.

J. E. RANKIN.

A. LEONARD ALLEN,

JAMES DOMENGEAUX,

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

PAUL CUNNINGHAM,

Managers on the Part of the House.

WALTER F. GEORGE,

TOM CONNALLY,

ED C. JOHNSON,

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.,

E. D. MILLIKIN,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3749) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill strikes out all of the House bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment, and that the Senate agree to the same.

The substantial differences between the House amendment and the proposed conference substitute are noted in the following statement.

PROCEDURE

The House bill provided that the Veterans' Administration should have the same authority and discretion as the War and Navy Departments and the United States Public Health Service in the appointment of civil-service personnel, and provided that the provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 as to priorities for materials should apply to any State institutions to be built for the care or hospitalization of veterans. The bill as agreed to in conference omits this provision.

The Senate amendment amends section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act so as to make permanent the authority of the Administrator under that section to procure necessary space for administrative, clinical, medical, and out-patient treatment purposes, by lease, purchase, or construction of buildings, or by condemnation or declaration of taking. Under existing law this authority is limited to the present war and

6 months thereafter. The House bill omitted this authority entirely. The bill as agreed to in conference includes the Senate provision.

The House bill liberalized the provisions of section 104 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to insure ample authority governing the procurement of prosthetic appliances and services in connection therewith to disabled veterans, including necessary travel expenses. There is no corresponding provision in the Senate amendment. The bill as agreed to in conference retains the House provision.

The Senate amendment contains a provision amending section 200 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to authorize the Administrator at his discretion to furnish necessary space, suitable office facilities and stenographic assistance for the use of paid full-time representatives of veterans' organizations, with reimbursement on an actual cost basis. The section as agreed to in conference authorizes the Administrator, in his discretion, to furnish space and office facilities, if available, but omits the requirement for reimbursement.

Section 302 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act was amended in the House bill to permit review boards to review action of boards of medical survey. The Senate amendment adds authority to review findings and decisions of disposition boards. Both of these amendments are retained in the conference agreement.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

The Senate amendment eliminates the requirement in the law that veterans show that education was interrupted by service; retains the provision in the House bill that extended the time from 2 to 4 years to initiate a course and the time within which education or training may be afforded from 7 to 9 years after the termination of the war; and strikes out the 25-year-age limitation on presumption of interruption of education. The bill as agreed to in conference retains the Senate changes.

The Senate amendment strikes out the references in the law to a refresher or retraining course and in effect provides that the veteran will be afforded approved education or training for a period of 1 year plus the time he was in active service, not to exceed a total of 4 years. The bill as agreed to in conference contains this amendment.

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment contain provisions authorizing short intensive courses under contracts with approved institutions. The Senate amendment, however, strikes out the word "vocational" limiting the training courses provided for and the conference agreement also omits this limitation. It is also made clear that the cost of any such course may not exceed \$500.

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment provided for instruction by correspondence courses. The House bill added correspondence schools to the list of approved institutions but provided that the Government should pay for these correspondence courses quarterly as the course is completed and that no correspondence school should be approved unless it was already in existence. The Senate amendment provides for instruction by correspondence courses subject to contracts as to rates, charging one-fourth of the elapsed time used in following such courses against the veterans' period of eligibility; and further limits the total amount payable for a correspondence course or courses to \$500. Both the House bill and the Senate amendment precluded payment of subsistence allowance while pursuing a correspondence course. The bill as agreed to in conference follows the Senate provision.

The Senate amendment amends existing law to permit the Administrator to make an adjustment of fees in the case of public institutions if he finds that customary

charges are insufficient to permit the furnishing of education or training to eligible veterans, by agreement with each institution on an over-all plan and based on a showing of need of assistance to meet the educational demands under the Federal program. The bill as agreed to in conference retains the Senate provision, with an amendment permitting the estimated cost to be fixed (by regulation if desirable) instead of the actual cost (only by agreement) and further permitting a veteran to elect to foreshorten his period of eligibility by having all customary charges in excess of \$500 paid.

The House bill increased subsistence allowances from \$50 to \$60 per month in the case of veterans without dependents and from \$75 to \$85 per month in the case of veterans with dependents. The Senate amendment increases these amounts to \$65 and \$90, respectively. The Senate rates are retained in the conference agreement.

The Senate amendment provides for approved combination of courses under part VIII (education and training) and part VII (vocational rehabilitation) of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), with the proviso that the total period of combined courses must not exceed the maximum period or limitations under the part affording the greater period of eligibility. This provision is included in the bill as agreed to in conference.

The Senate amendment adds a proviso to section 4 of Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, which was added by section 402 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, authorizing the release of returned books, supplies, or equipment to educational or training institutions for credit, or the disposition thereof otherwise, without regard to limitations on disposition of surplus property generally. The conference agreement retains this provision.

The Senate amendment permits the Administrator to approve courses under Public Law 16, relating to vocational rehabilitation, beyond the 4-year period fixed in existing law and also extended from 6 to 9 years after the end of the war the time within which training may be furnished, to conform to the amendments made in part VIII. These provisions are retained in the bill as agreed to in conference.

The Senate amendment contains an amendment revising paragraph 3 of part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended (Public Law 16, 78th Cong.) to provide that the disabled veteran, while pursuing training and for 2 months after his employability is determined, will be paid the amount of subsistence allowance specified in paragraph 6 of part VIII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended (the education provisions). It establishes a minimum rate of \$105 for a veteran without dependents, \$115 with a dependent, and \$10 additional for a child and \$7 for each additional child and \$15 for a dependent parent. Under existing law, while a veteran may receive additional pension while pursuing a course of training, the amount payable cannot exceed the rates for total temporary disability. The effect of the amendment is to permit the disabled veteran to receive subsistence allowances at the sums payable under part VIII relating to education and training plus whatever pension he is entitled to under existing law, but with a prescribed minimum, to protect the disabled veterans with a low rate of pension. The bill as agreed to in conference retains this amendment.

LOAN PROVISIONS

The House bill extensively revised title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. It extended the time within which application for a loan might be made, from 2 to 6 years after separation from the military or naval forces or after termination of the war, whichever is the later date, but in no event more than 8 years (now 5 years) after the termination of the war. It further provided that

the eligible veteran may apply to any of the established lending agencies set forth in the bill for a loan for the purposes specified in title III in any amount that may be agreed upon between the lender and the veteran, and when the loan is made by the lender he would be automatically guaranteed up to 50 percent of the loan by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. It was provided that the aggregate amount guaranteed should not exceed \$2,000 and that no loan should be renegotiated until 30 days after the veteran's discharge. The House bill provided that an honorable discharge should be the veteran's certificate of eligibility to apply for a guaranteed loan, and veterans who have a discharge other than honorable or dishonorable would receive from the Administrator upon request after discharge a certificate of eligibility. Upon making the loan the lender would endorse upon the back of the discharge or certificate, in lieu of discharge or certificate of eligibility, the date and amount of the loan and would transmit to the Administrator a statement setting forth the name and serial number of the veteran, amount and terms of the loan, and the legal description of the property. No approval of the loan would be required by the Administrator. The House bill, in connection with loans for homes, farms, or business property, substituted for "reasonable normal value thereof as determined by proper appraisal," contained in the present law, the language "reasonable value thereof as determined by the lender's appraisal." In the event the veteran defaulted in payment of his loan and after suit or foreclosure and sale the deficiency was determined, then upon notification from the lender, the Administrator would pay to the lender its guaranty not in excess of \$2,000 and not in excess of the deficiency, and be subrogated to the rights of the lender to the extent of the amount paid on the guaranty. It was provided that prior to suit or foreclosure the lender was to notify the Administrator and within 30 days thereafter the Administrator might at his option pay the lender the unpaid balance of the loan plus accrued interest and receive an assignment of the loan and security and thereafter sue or foreclose in the name of the Veterans' Administration.

The Senate amendment, while preserving the existing procedure under the loan provisions, also makes substantial changes in existing law. It permits a veteran to apply for guaranty of a loan within 10 years after the termination of the war; authorizes the Administrator to pay an amount equivalent to 4 percent on the amount originally guaranteed rather than payment of interest for the first year; extends the maturity limitation from 20 to 25 years generally, and in the case of loans on farm realty to 40 years; makes clear that the veteran may purchase a lot out of the proceeds of a loan designed to finance the construction of a home on that lot; omits the word "normal" from the phrase "reasonable normal value" in connection with appraisals; broadens the present language of the act so that loans can be made for every ordinary farming purpose; broadens the business loan provisions to permit any normal business enterprise to be financed initially; broadens the refinancing of existing indebtedness to cover all types of loans, but with restrictive provisions; extends the powers of the Administrator to perform functions under the loan provisions, principally with respect to suits, payment of claims, compromises, property administration and the like; and adds a plan permitting the Administrator to insure loans for business purposes on a plan similar to that provided for modernization and repair loans under title I of the Housing Act (such insurance to be issued in lieu of a guaranty, to be issued direct to the lending institutions under procedure giving them not to exceed a 15-percent coverage, and to be issued only to supervised lending institu-

tions or financial institutions purchasing such loans from the original lending institution).

The bill as agreed to in conference seeks to combine and integrate the two procedures set out in the House bill and the Senate amendment, respectively. It liberalizes the title substantially in accordance with the Senate provisions, but in place of the present predetermination of the Veterans' Administration that a proposed loan may be guaranteed it provides that a loan is automatically guaranteed by virtue of the lender and the veteran having consummated a loan in full compliance with the specific provisions of the title, one of which is that the purchase price or cost does not exceed the reasonable value as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The Veterans' Administration upon determining that a loan has been automatically guaranteed is authorized to issue a certificate of guaranty. Loans to be made by private lenders must be approved in advance by the Veterans' Administration in order to be guaranteed. More specifically, the conference agreement contains the following provisions:

Section 500: Any loan made by an eligible veteran within 10 years after the end of the war in compliance with the terms and conditions of the title is automatically guaranteed in an amount not in excess of 50 percent of the loan. The aggregate amount of guaranty in the case of a non-real-estate loan may not exceed \$2,000 and in the case of a real-estate loan \$4,000, or a proportionate amount in combination loans. The interest may not exceed 4 percent. The maturity of amortized loans on real estate may not exceed 25 years, or in case of farm realty 40 years, and the maturity on non-real-estate loans shall not exceed 10 years. The guaranteed loans may be made by any ordinary lending agency which is subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State or Territory, including the District of Columbia. Restrictions of Federal laws are removed as to certain institutions subject to Federal supervision with respect to the following:

- (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;
- (5) Percentage of assets which may be invested in real estate loans.

As noted above, lenders not of one of the specified classes may make guaranteed loans only in the event the loan is approved in advance by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Sections 501, 502, and 503 are amended to conform to the principle established in section 500, and the latter two sections are broadened materially in accordance with the Senate version.

Section 504, authorizing the Administrator to make necessary regulations, is retained, with limitations conforming to the procedure adopted.

Section 505, relating to secondary loans, is retained with amendments to conform to the new procedure, but the provision that the rate of interest on the second loan shall not exceed that on the principal loan by more than 1 percent is omitted.

Section 506, relating to procedure on default, is retained substantially as in the House bill.

Section 507 is the Senate provision respecting loans for the payment of defaulted indebtedness or delinquent taxes, but with an amendment to conform to the remaining provisions of the title.

Section 508, respecting the insurance of loans made by supervised lending agencies, is taken from the Senate amendment with an amendment authorizing the insurance of any loan which otherwise might be made

under the amended title III, the Senate provision having confined this to loans under section 503.

Section 509 is the provision in the Senate amendment extending the powers of the Administrator to perform functions under the loan provisions, and is retained with minor clarifying amendments.

Section 510 is designed to protect contractual rights under loan guaranties issued under the original act and to authorize the approval of applications filed at any time within 90 days after the effective date of the amended act, in order to permit the continued processing of loan applications pending the issuance of necessary instructions and regulations under the amendatory legislation.

MISCELLANEOUS

The House bill provided that any proposed regulation to carry out the purposes of the act other than interagency administrative rules or orders should, before becoming effective, be submitted to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House of Representatives. If neither committee acted within 15 days the rule or order would become effective and if approved by either committee it would become effective immediately upon such approval; and if disapproved by either committee it would not be issued. In the event of conflicting committee actions the earlier action would govern. There is no corresponding provision in the Senate amendment. The bill as agreed to in conference omits this provision.

The Senate amendment limits the application of section 1505 of the law, relating to charges and deductions against benefits under any adjusted compensation law, to benefits received by or paid for a veteran under title III of the act, relating to loans. The House bill left the law unchanged. The conference agreement repeals section 1505 in its entirety.

The Senate amendment extends to persons who served in the active military or naval service of Allied Governments and who were citizens of the United States at the time of entrance into such service, the benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act as well as the vocational rehabilitation provisions of Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, to the same extent as in the case of persons who served in our own armed forces. It is provided, however, that these benefits will be extended only to persons who are residents of the United States at the time of filing claim and who are not receiving similar benefits from the government of the Allied Nation concerned. There was no corresponding provision in the House bill. The bill as agreed to in conference includes this provision.

The Senate amendment also extends the benefits of titles II and III of the act and of Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, to persons while on terminal leave or while hospitalized pending final discharge, with provision that no subsistence allowance would be paid in such cases under title II of the act or Public Law 16. This section is made effective as of June 22, 1944, the date of enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. There was no corresponding provision in the House bill. The bill as agreed to in conference includes this provision.

AMENDMENT TO TITLE

The title of the bill as amended by the Senate reads "An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes." The House recedes.

JOHN E. RANKIN,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
JAMES DOMENGEAUX,
EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in order that Members may understand just what this bill does, or what changes it makes in the present law, I desire to explain it briefly.

This measure, H. R. 3749, contains some very important changes in the so-called GI bill of rights, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, including changes in Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, pertaining to the rehabilitation of persons disabled in service since September 16, 1940.

Briefly, the important changes are:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The act makes permanent the authority of the Administrator to procure necessary space for administrative, clinical, medical and out-patient treatment purposes, by lease, purchase, or construction of buildings, or by condemnation or declaration of taking. Under existing law this authority is limited to the present war and 6 months thereafter.

ARTIFICIAL LIMBS, OTHER APPLIANCES, AND RELATED SERVICES

Provision is made to insure ample authority governing the procurement of prosthetic appliances and services in connection therewith to disabled veterans, including travel expenses.

SPACE FOR SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

The Administrator is 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 veterans' organizations specified in section 200, Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 29, 1936, and such other national organizations recognized by the Administrator thereunder, in the presentation of claims under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

DISABILITY RETIREMENT

The present provision permits review of findings and decisions of retiring boards of the War or Navy Departments. The new act clarifies the intent by including findings and decisions of boards of medical survey and disposition boards.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Extension of time: The act extends the time from 2 to 4 years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the war whichever is the later, to initiate a course; and extends the time within which education or training may be afforded from 7 to 9 years after the termination of the war.

Requirement of showing of interruption of education by service removed: The new act eliminates the requirement in the law that veterans show that education was interrupted by service, and because of such change, it strikes out the 25-year age limitation on presumption of interruption of education.

Reference to refresher or retraining course removed: There are stricken from the present law the references to a refresher or retraining course, and in effect the new act provides that the veteran will be afforded approved education or training for a period of 1 year plus the time he was in the active service, not to exceed a total of 4 years.

Short intensive courses: There are authorized short intensive courses under contracts with approved institutions, with pro rata acceleration, or foreshortening, of period of eligibility, but the cost of any such course may not exceed \$500.

Correspondence courses: Provision is made for instruction by correspondence courses, without subsistence allowances, subject to contracts as to rates, charging one-fourth of the elapsed time used in following such courses against the veteran's period of eligibility. The total amount payable for a correspondence course or courses is limited to \$500.

Adjustment of fees to public institutions: The Administrator is authorized to make an adjustment of fees in the case of public institutions, if he finds upon application by the institution that customary charges are insufficient to permit the furnishing of education or training to eligible veterans or inadequate compensation therefor, on an over-all plan and based on showing of need of assistance to meet the educational demands under the Federal program. The estimated cost may be fixed—by regulation if desirable—instead of the actual cost—only by agreement—and the veteran may elect to fore-shorten his period of eligibility by having all customary charges in excess of \$500 paid. Since section 1505 is repealed there is thereby removed the chief obstacle to the proper operation of these provisions.

Subsistence allowances increased: The monthly subsistence allowances are increased from \$50 to \$65 in the cases of veterans without dependents, and from \$75 to \$90 in the cases of veterans with dependents.

Combination of courses: Provision is made for approved combination of courses under part VIII—education and training—and part VII—vocational rehabilitation—of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, except that the total period of combined courses must not exceed the maximum period or limitations under the part affording the greater period of eligibility.

Return of books, supplies, or equipment: There is authorized the release of returned books, supplies, or equipment, to educational or training institutions for credit, or the disposition thereof otherwise, without regard to limitations on disposition of surplus property generally.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION, PUBLIC LAW 16, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Extension of time: The Administrator is permitted to approve courses under Public Law 16, relating to vocational rehabilitation of service disabled, beyond the 4-year period fixed in existing law and there is also extended from 6 to 9 years after the end of the war the time within which training may be furnished, to conform to the amendments made in part VIII.

Monthly rates under Public Law 16 increased: The new act provides that the disabled veteran, while pursuing training and for 2 months after his employability is determined, will be paid the amount of

subsistence allowance specified in paragraph 6 of part VIII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended—the education and training provisions, title II, supra. It establishes a minimum rate of \$105 for a veteran without dependents, \$115 with a dependent, and \$10 per month additional for a child, \$7 for each additional child and \$15 for a dependent parent. Under existing law, while a veteran may receive additional pension while pursuing a course of training, the amount payable cannot exceed the rates for total temporary disability—such rate for a veteran without dependents being \$92.50 per month. The effect of the amendment is to permit the disabled veteran to receive subsistence allowances at the sums payable under part VIII relating to education and training plus whatever pension he is entitled to under existing law, but with a prescribed minimum, to protect the disabled veterans with low rate of pension.

GUARANTY OF LOANS FOR HOMES, FARMS, AND
BUSINESS PURPOSES

This title of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act is revised materially, the most important changes being as follows:

First. Any loan made by any of the prescribed lending agencies to an eligible veteran within 10 years after the end of the war in compliance with the terms and conditions of the title is automatically guaranteed in an amount not in excess of 50 percent of the loan. In place of the present predetermination of the Veterans' Administration that a proposed loan may be guaranteed it provides that a loan is automatically guaranteed by virtue of the lender and the veteran having consummated a loan in full compliance with the specific provisions of the title, one of which is that the purchase price or cost does not exceed the reasonable value as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The terms of the loan may be as agreed upon by the lender and the veteran subject to the provisions of the law and regulations adopted pursuant to law. The Veterans' Administration upon determining that a loan has been automatically guaranteed is authorized to issue a certificate of guaranty. Loans to be made by lenders other than those supervised by State or Federal agencies must be approved in advance by the Veterans' Administration in order to be guaranteed.

Second. The aggregate amount of the guaranty in the case of a non-real-estate loan may not exceed \$2,000 and in the case of a real-estate loan, \$4,000, or in a proportionate amount in combination loans or in two loans of either type.

Third. The interest may not exceed 4 percent.

Fourth. The Administrator is authorized to pay an amount equivalent to 4 percent on the amount originally guaranteed rather than payment of interest for the first year.

Fifth. The maturity on amortized loans on real estate may not exceed 25 years, or in case of farm realty 40 years, and the maturity on non-real-estate loans shall not exceed 10 years.

Sixth. Makes clear that the veteran may purchase a lot out of the proceeds of a loan designed to finance the construction of a home on that lot.

Seventh. Omits the word "normal" from the phrase "reasonable normal value" in connection with appraisals.

Eighth. Broadens the act so that loans can be made for every ordinary farming purpose.

Ninth. Broadens the business-loan provisions to permit any normal business enterprise to be financed initially.

Tenth. Broadens the refinancing of existing indebtedness to cover all types of loans, with restrictions.

Eleventh. Extends and declares the powers of the Administrator to perform functions under the loan provisions, principally with respect to suits, payment of claims, compromises, property administration, and the like.

Twelfth. Adds a plan permitting the Administrator to insure any loan made by supervised lending agencies which otherwise might be made under title III, as amended. Such insurance will be issued in lieu of a guaranty, to be issued direct to the lending institutions under procedure giving them not to exceed a 15-percent coverage and to be issued only to supervised lending institutions or financial institutions purchasing such loans from the original lending institution. The Administrator is authorized to prescribe, by regulation, terms and conditions and to establish the interest rate not to exceed 3 percent discount or a flat equivalent rate.

Thirteenth. The guaranteed loans may be made by any ordinary lending agency which is subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State or Territory, including the District of Columbia. Restrictions of Federal laws are removed as to certain institutions subject to Federal supervision with respect to the following—as to any loan at least 20 percent of which is guaranteed under the title, and, of course, limited to such governmental loans: (a) Ratio of amount of loan to the value of the property; (b) maturity of loan; (c) requirement for mortgage or other security; (d) dignity of lien; and (e) percentage of assets which may be invested in real-estate loans.

Fourteenth. Lenders not of one of the specified classes may make guaranteed loans only in the event the loan is approved in advance by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Fifteenth. The provisions pertaining to secondary loans, section 505, are modified to conform to new procedure, and the provision that the rate of interest on the second loan shall not exceed that on the principal loan by more than 1 percent is omitted.

Sixteenth. Provision is made to protect contractual rights under loan guaranties issued under the original act, and to authorize the approval of applications filed at any time within 90 days after the effective date of the new act, in order to permit the continued processing of loan applications pending the issuance of necessary instructions and regulations under the amendatory legislation.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Section 1505, relating to deductions from any future adjusted compensation repealed: Section 1505 of the law relating to charges and deductions of benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act against benefits under any adjusted compensation law is repealed.

Citizens of United States who performed active military or naval service with Allied governments: The new act extends to persons who served in the active military or naval service of Allied governments and who were citizens of the United States at the time of entrance into such service, the benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act as well as the vocational rehabilitation provisions of Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, to the same extent as in the case of persons who served in our own armed forces. It is provided, however, that these benefits will be extended only to persons who are residents of the United States at the time of filing claim and who are not receiving similar benefits from the government of the Allied nation concerned.

Persons on terminal leave or hospitalized pending final discharge: There are extended the benefits of education and training and guaranty of loans, and vocational rehabilitation under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, to persons while on terminal leave or while hospitalized pending final discharge, with provision that no subsistence allowance would be paid in such cases under title II of the act or Public Law 16. This section is made effective as of June 22, 1944, the date of enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

With practically all of these changes I agree. Many of them are most salutary, and should have been included in the original act.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is one phase of this conference report that I do not agree with and for which I cannot take responsibility.

Under the bill as passed by the House and the Senate last year, in other words, under the present law, the money supplied to ex-servicemen for school purposes or the money lost by reason of loans to them, or the money paid as unemployment compensation, was to be deducted from any future adjusted compensation. That provision was eliminated in the conference, over my protest. I disagree with it most violently, because it will probably double the compensation paid to men who come home and do nothing, get on the pay roll as unemployed, and draw \$1,040 for 1 year, for 52 weeks, and then probably later when an adjusted compensation bill is passed they will get not only the \$1,040, but in addition as much as is paid to men who came home and went to work, or get as much in addition as the man who borrowed nothing or who did not get to go to school.

In other words, I think it is a discrimination against about 90 percent of the servicemen of this country coming out of this war. If we pay any adjusted compensation at all, there is nothing that can be done about it unless the House desires to vote down this conference report. If they do that, then I have an amend-

ment to offer to restore that provision and to accept the balance of the conference report. I make this statement to you because it is going to be said, "Oh, this bill does not bind any future Congress."

That is not an answer to anything. No bill ever binds a future Congress. Congress can change the law at any time, but the chances are that it will not be changed, and the further chances are that this discrimination will face every Member of Congress from now on every time he meets an ex-serviceman who has done his duty in this war and who came back and asked for nothing but went home, stripped off his uniform, and went to work.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Do I correctly understand the gentleman to mean that one veteran may come home and take advantage of the opportunity under the GI bill to go to school for 4 years at Government expense, and another boy may come home and perhaps go back on the farm or into his little business and get no Government assistance? Then when an adjusted compensation bill comes along they would both be paid the same under that bill? In other words, one boy might get several thousand dollars through his education while the other boy would get nothing, yet when an adjusted compensation bill was passed they would both draw the same?

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I agree with the gentleman that it is a rank discrimination against the great majority of the men coming out of the service.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I think the gentleman's position is perfectly sound. I believe if we want to be fair with the veterans we should reject the conference report and then the gentleman could offer his motion, and it should be accepted by the House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It seems to me that this money for education or for unemployment should not be charged up against any future bonus. I am receiving no protests from the men who do not plan to ask for an education, but I do hear that if it is to be charged up against the men at some future time they will not take their education. I feel very strongly that this conference report ought to be accepted. We are recessing Friday or Saturday until the 14th of January. I believe the Senate conferees are very insistent upon this provision. I fear we will get no amendment to the GI bill of rights if this conference report is not accepted. Many men want to take their education, want to start their courses early in January, and want to take advantage of the \$4,000 guaranty on loans

on homes and on farm land. I can see no discrimination.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, the gentleman from Massachusetts cannot see that there is any discrimination, because she offered this motion, but I can show the gentleman discrimination and I can show it very plainly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think others agreed with me heartily. The gentleman signed the report of the conferees. I think everybody else agreed with me. I have always felt it was an unjust discrimination to demand payment in the future when the men may need the money, if a bonus is paid.

Mr. RANKIN. It was well known to the conferees that I did not agree with it. I am not willing to underwrite such a discrimination against the vast majority of the servicemen.

This unemployment compensation provision, if this measure goes through, will encourage men to stay unemployed. It is causing a great deal of trouble in some sections now. Remember this, the servicemen in the factories where these strikes are going on are not getting any of this benefit at all and they will not get any if this bill goes through.

If this conference report is voted down, what I propose to do is offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment that will simply restore that provision of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I hope, in compliance with the request of the chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, that this report is voted down and that the amendment he will propose is adopted. I think it is the opinion of the vast majority of the members of this committee that this provision should stay in this law. It was known at its inception as the equalizer amendment because we knew of instance after instance where a man living at a certain house went into the service and on the same day a youngster from next door went in, in the same organization. The older man, possibly a little more fortunate, due to his years and experience, may have a business or employment to which he can return. He will have no occasion to ask for the \$1,040 unemployment-readjustment allowance. He has a home, either paid for or substantially paid for. He will have no occasion to ask any agency for the guaranty of a portion of a loan. He also has completed his education and will have no occasion to ask for any of the benefits which may very easily in many cases run as high as \$5,000 or \$6,000 on a 4-year educational program. He has served in the same outfit and on the same fronts with the youngster. They come home on the same day. There have been a lot of proposals already for adjusted compensation. That is a matter that must be seriously discussed, worked out, thought out, and given a great deal of prayerful and careful consideration. This older man comes home. Assume that this amended bill becomes law, and that a bill granting \$2,500 adjusted compensation is passed. The older man can make his application for the \$2,500 adjustment

compensation. The younger man can make an application for it. That \$2,500, with \$1,040 for unemployment allowance, \$6,000 for education, plus a \$4,000 loan, the younger man could receive benefits approximating \$11,000 to \$13,000 as compared to \$2,500 adjusted compensation for the older man. I have received scores of letters on this bill. At no time for any man who has been in the service has there been any objection by any of them to this provision of the bill. The objection is coming—where from? Why, it is coming from some of the schools who thought perhaps they might not get as many students as they want if the veteran exercised the prerogative which he should exercise as a mature man as to whether he was going to work or going to school. It is coming from one or two men down at the Veterans' Administration who say this is complicating some of the school reports—and the reports are complicated. But the trouble there is due to the fact that they have written administrative regulations which are not in conformity with the spirit, the intent, and purpose of this bill as originally passed.

I firmly believe that section 1505 is not anything except an act of real justice and it eliminates discrimination and prevents any one person from getting more benefits than someone else who has served at the same time and at the same place and for the same period of time.

Mr. Speaker, one provision of the amended measure, too long delayed, is that increasing allowances to the veterans with service-connected disabilities requiring education to make it possible for him to take his rightful place as a self-supporting citizen. However, this increase should have been separately considered as an amendment of Public, 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, and not in connection with the Readjustment Act.

One other beneficial amendment is one which, I am sure, will be discussed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], that simplifies loan procedures—a reform needed for some months—due to complications arising under burdensome regulations.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret to be in disagreement with the distinguished chairman of this committee. I usually find myself in agreement with my chairman. I have a high regard for him. I am forced to take this position, because I fear that if you vote down this conference report, you will kill this bill. You might as well face that fact. I was firmly convinced, as a member of the conference committee, that the Senate was not going to change its position on section 1505 as now desired by the chairman. The Senate wanted to strike out section 1505 as to everybody except the veteran who is getting a loan.

In other words, they propose not to charge it up to the veteran receiving an education; not to charge it up to the veteran getting unemployment compensation, but to charge it up to the veteran

getting neither of those benefits but who gets a loan. I do not see the justice of it. I took the position in conference that section 1505 ought to stay in the bill as a whole or take it out entirely. Either charge it up to everybody or take it out with respect to everybody. I do not see how you can justify applying it to one man and not to another. I just do not see how you can do that. Therefore, I took the position that it ought to stay in the bill as to everybody and the person who receives a loan on which a loss occurs or who get educational benefits, or who gets unemployment compensation should all be subject to section 1505, or section 1505 ought to be stricken from the law entirely. It was apparent that the Senate conferees would not change their position. I repeat they took the position section 1505 either ought to come out of the bill or else cover only the loan feature of the law. I could not reconcile that position and, therefore, so far as I am concerned, the only thing I could agree to do under these circumstances was to take it out of the law entirely. Now I do not know what you are going to do. If you vote the conference report down, as the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi wants you to do, you may kill this bill. I ask you not to do that. I want the bill out. We are ready to leave here and want this bill passed.

We want the benefits of this bill. We want the liberalized benefits for the veterans. These liberalized benefits cover education and loans. We propose in this bill to increase benefits as to loans so that we may guarantee up to \$4,000 on loans secured by real estate. That helps the veteran at the forks of the creek. It also helps the veteran in the towns. Only about 700 farm loans have gone over. I want you gentlemen from the farming sections to know that if you vote this conference report down you are making it difficult for the farm loans to go over. They are not going over now. The figures show it. We are trying to remedy that situation in this bill. To increase the guaranty up to \$4,000, we hope, will help. To lengthen the duration of the loan will help. To simplify the loans will help most. We are trying to do all of that.

They may not work with this amendment, but we believe the loan feature of the law will be considerably better.

Also, this conference report includes the amendments on the education feature of the law. We increase the subsistence allowance from \$50 per month for men without dependents to \$65, and for those with dependents it is increased from the present \$75 to \$90 per month. I tried hard to get it increased above those figures, but could not. But this will help considerably. The age limitation is also removed so that as the amendments stand, any person may get educational benefits from 1 to 4 years, if he had 90 days' service. There are other features in the amendments which make this a better law. There are some amendments that did not meet with my full approval, but we have to reach an agreement with the other body to get a final bill.

I urge the Members of this House not to vote down this conference report. I

want this bill out. I want it passed. I want to get through with it before this Christmas recess. We are right at the Christmas time. It is a mighty good time to pass this bill. It will be a great Christmas present to these men and women who have served in this war. I urge you with all the sincerity of my soul not to make the mistake of killing this bill. If the conference report is voted down, it may be tantamount to killing the bill. Certainly it will greatly delay it and there is no telling when, if ever, these desirable amendments will be passed.

The distinguished chairman of the committee says the Senate will back-track, in effect. He thinks the Senate conferees will agree on his motion to reinstate section 1505 in full as it is. There is not a chance in the world, in my opinion, that any such thing will be done. I know the Senate conferees, and you know them—the distinguished Senator from Georgia, Senator GEORGE; the distinguished Senator from Texas, Senator CONNALLY, and those other distinguished Senators. I know how strong a position they took on this question. Frankly they wanted section 1505 out of the law entirely. They did agree to leave only the loan feature in section 1505. I have pointed out how unsatisfactory it would be to leave only the loan feature in and take out the others. From what I conceive the Senate position to be, I do not think there is any chance for them to agree to the contention of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

They changed their position on the loan feature. They made the discharge certificate the certificate of eligibility. That is the thing the House has been fighting for all the time. That is the thing we wanted. We wanted to simplify the loan feature so that the loans will go over. The Senate conferees reluctantly agreed with us and went along with us. They asked us to go along with them on section 1505 by striking out that section entirely. To have insisted that that remain in the law in full meant no agreement and no bill, and I think that is the situation still existing.

The gentleman from Mississippi wants you to vote down the conference report so that he can offer a motion to reinstate section 1505 in its original full form and that is exactly the thing the Senate conferees have repeatedly and unanimously refused to do. So, if you do that, we get nowhere. As I understand my chairman's position, that is what he would like to do, but in view of the situation that obtains, I am forced to oppose his move. Let us vote approval of this conference report. I think it is the only way to get a bill through at this time and the only way to get these badly needed amendments in the GI bill of rights.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] is unduly excited.

In the first place, the Senate conferees agreed to a compromise that involved only the educational features. If the gentleman from Louisiana had stayed with me, in my opinion we would have

got that solution. But now we have got over 300,000 men on the unemployment rolls. You leave this out, and you are paying them \$1,040 each, more than you pay the man who goes home and goes to work.

Now, the gentleman talks about Members of the House dissenting. This will go back to the Senate, and, in my opinion, it will be approved in 30 minutes. If the conference report is voted down, I expect to offer an amendment to put this provision back in the bill in order to eliminate this discrimination which the bill as now written would bring to more than 90 percent of the ex-service-men.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, nothing has been said as yet about other provisions of the bill. I think they should be before you before you make up your mind about 1505.

This conference report first broadens the power of the Administrator in giving aid to the amputees who need the use of prosthetic appliances. Next it broadens the power of the Administrator and the Board of Review in regard to veterans who have to go before that Board to have their discharges reviewed and changed if they think any injustice has been dealt them.

Next it gives to the representatives of veterans' organizations recognition in that they can put into the veterans' hospitals and the veterans' facilities a representative to act as a sort of liaison agent between the boy in the bed and the veterans' organizations.

In regard to the education title it increases the subsistence of a single veteran from \$50 to \$65 per month and of one who is married or has a dependent from \$75 to \$90 per month. It completely removes the limitation of age 25 in order to have the veteran qualify for education. In other words, any veteran who served more than 90 days between September 16, 1940, and the termination of the war or discharge will be eligible to all the provisions of the education title.

Next it adds a provision that veterans may take a course in an approved correspondence school. The limitation there is not to exceed \$500 no matter how many years he takes the correspondence course.

Again in the education title the tuition is made cumulative in this way: A veteran, we will say, had 2 years at a medical school, law school, or an engineering school at the time he went into the service. Because of his length of service he is entitled to 4 years' schooling, but he only needs 2 years to get his degree and be able to go to work at his profession. We have provided that, if for instance, the tuition is \$700 a year, \$200 above the \$500 originally allowed, that the boy, having a credit of \$2,000 for 4 years' service, may, if he wants to go to school 2 years instead of 4, draw on his accumulated credit and receive \$700 each year for tuition for 2 years as long as he does not exceed the \$2,000 total.

Passing now to the loan title, the loan title has been amended in that on all loans secured by a mortgage on real es-

tate the guaranty is raised to \$4,000. The guaranty remains \$2,000 on all unsecured loans.

As has been stated by the gentleman from Louisiana, the honorable discharge certificate is now the certificate of eligibility and that will cover approximately 90 percent of all veterans. Those who do not have an honorable discharge certificate can go to the Veterans' Administrator and get a certificate of eligibility provided they were not dishonorably discharged.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I merely want to comment that this one particular feature simplifies the loan.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If the gentleman will permit me to proceed I am sure I will cover it.

As to section 1505, in order to get these other provisions, improvements in the loan title, it was necessary to adopt the Senate provision, taking their view of 1505 or take it out of the bill entirely.

In the matter of the automatic guaranty, it applies to loans made by national banks, State banks, credit unions, building and loan associations, mortgage companies and insurance companies that are authorized to do business and have complied with the State or local statutes setting them up. They may make the loans and there is an automatic guaranty in this bill provided they do not loan more than the value of the property as fixed by an appraiser designated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. They are not bothered with any further red tape, that is the end of it, the loan is automatically guaranteed if made in accord with the terms of the law. The honorable-discharge certificate is the certificate of eligibility.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In addition to that we have removed the word "normal" from the phrase "reasonable normal value" and now the property is appraised at the reasonable value today, and not "the reasonable normal value" which has been one of the bones of contention in the administration of the loan title.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the House is about to agree to the conference report on H. R. 3749. I believe the House and Senate conferees have improved the bill granting additional benefits to the veterans which they richly deserve. These are amendments that I wanted to get into the bill when it was before the World War Veterans' Committee.

The Congress on December 19, 1945, approved and sent to the President, H. R. 3749, an act containing very important changes in the so-called GI bill of rights, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, including changes in Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, pertaining to the rehabilitation of persons disabled in service since September 16, 1940.

Briefly, the important changes are:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The act makes permanent the authority of the Administrator to procure necessary space for administrative, clinical, medical, and out-patient treatment purposes, by lease, purchase, or construction of buildings, or by condemnation or declaration of taking. Under existing law this authority is limited to the present war and 6 months thereafter.

ARTIFICIAL LIMBS, OTHER APPLIANCES, AND RELATED SERVICES

Provision is made to insure ample authority governing the procurement of prosthetic appliances and services in connection therewith to disabled veterans, including travel expenses.

SPACE FOR SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

The Administrator is 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 veterans' organizations specified in section 20, Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 29, 1936, and such other national organizations recognized by the Administrator thereunder, in the presentation of claims under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

DISABILITY RETIREMENT

The present provision permits review of findings and decisions of retiring boards of the War or Navy Departments. The new act clarifies the intent by including findings and decisions of boards of medical survey and disposition boards.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Extension of time: The act extends the time from 2 to 4 years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the war, whichever is the later, to initiate a course; and extends the time within which education or training may be afforded from 7 to 9 years after the termination of the war.

Requirement of showing of interruption of education by service removed: The new act eliminates the requirement in the law that veterans show that education was interrupted by service, and because of such change, it strikes out the 25-year-age limitation on presumption of interruption of education.

Reference to refresher or retraining course removed: There are stricken from the present law the references to a refresher or retraining course, and in effect the new act provides that the veteran will be afforded approved education or training for a period of 1 year plus the time he was in the active service, not to exceed a total of 4 years.

Short intensive courses: There are authorized short intensive courses under contracts with approved institutions, with pro-rata acceleration, or foreshortening, of period of eligibility, but the cost of any such course may not exceed \$500.

Correspondence courses: Provision is made for instruction by correspondence courses, without subsistence allowances, subject to contracts as to rates, charging one-fourth of the elapsed time used in following such courses against the veteran's period of eligibility. The total

amount payable for a correspondence course or courses is limited to \$500.

Adjustment of fees to public institutions: The Administrator is authorized to make an adjustment of fees in the case of public institutions, if he finds upon application by the institution that customary charges are insufficient to permit the furnishing of education or training to eligible veterans or inadequate compensation therefor, on an overall plan and based on showing of need of assistance to meet the educational demands under the Federal program. The estimated cost may be fixed—by regulation if desirable—instead of the actual cost—only by agreement—and the veteran may elect to foreshorten his period of eligibility by having all customary charges in excess of \$500 paid. Since section 1505 is repealed there is thereby removed the chief obstacle to the proper operation of these provisions.

Subsistence allowances increased: The monthly subsistence allowances are increased from \$50 to \$65 in the cases of veterans without dependents, and from \$75 to \$90 in the cases of veterans with dependents.

Combination of courses: Provision is made for approved combination of courses under part VIII—education and training—and part VII—vocational rehabilitation—of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, except that the total period of combined courses must not exceed the maximum period or limitations under the part affording the greater period of eligibility.

Return of books, supplies or equipment: There is authorized the release of returned books, supplies, or equipment, to educational or training institutions for credit, or the disposition thereof otherwise, without regard to limitations on disposition of surplus property generally.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION, PUBLIC LAW 16, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Extension of time: The Administrator is permitted to approve courses under Public Law 16, relating to vocational rehabilitation of service disabled, beyond the 4-year period fixed in existing law and there is also extended from 6 to 9 years after the end of the war the time within which training may be furnished, to conform to the amendments made in part VIII.

Monthly rates under Public Law 16 increased: The new act provides that the disabled veteran, while pursuing training and for 2 months after his employability is determined, will be paid the amount of subsistence allowance specified in paragraph 6 of part VIII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended (the education and training provisions, title II, supra). It establishes a minimum rate of \$105 for a veteran without dependents, \$115 with a dependent, and \$10 per month additional for a child, \$7 for each additional child and \$15 for a dependent parent. Under existing law, while a veteran may receive additional pension while pursuing a course of training, the amount cannot exceed the rates for total temporary disability (such rate for a veteran without dependents being \$92.50 per month). The effect of the amendment is to permit the disabled veteran to receive subsistence allowances at the

sums payable under part VIII relating to education and training plus whatever pension he is entitled to under existing law, but with a prescribed minimum, to protect the disabled veterans with low rate of pension.

GUARANTY OF LOANS FOR HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PURPOSES

This title of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act is revised materially, the most important changes being as follows:

First. Any loan made by any of the prescribed lending agencies to an eligible veteran within 10 years after the end of the war in compliance with the terms and conditions of the title is automatically guaranteed in an amount not in excess of 50 percent of the loan. In place of the present predetermination of the Veterans' Administration that a proposed loan may be guaranteed it provides that a loan is automatically guaranteed by virtue of the lender and the veteran having consummated a loan in full compliance with the specific provisions of the title, one of which is that the purchase price or cost does not exceed the reasonable value as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The terms of the loan may be as agreed upon by the lender and the veteran subject to the provisions of the law and regulations adopted pursuant to law. The Veterans' Administration upon determining that a loan has been automatically guaranteed is authorized to issue a certificate of guaranty. Loans to be made by lenders other than those supervised by State or Federal agencies must be approved in advance by the Veterans' Administration in order to be guaranteed.

Second. The aggregate amount of the guaranty in the case of a non-real-estate loan may not exceed \$2,000 and in the case of a real estate loan, \$4,000, or in a proportionate amount in combination loans or in two loans of either type;

Third. The interest may not exceed 4 percent.

Fourth. The Administrator is authorized to pay an amount equivalent to 4 percent on the amount originally guaranteed rather than payment of interest for the first year.

Fifth. The maturity on amortized loans on real estate may not exceed 25 years, or in case of farm realty 40 years, and the maturity on non-real-estate loans shall not exceed 10 years.

Sixth. Makes clear that the veteran may purchase a lot out of the proceeds of a loan designed to finance the construction of a home on that lot.

Seventh. Omits the word "normal" from the phrase "reasonable normal value" in connection with appraisals.

Eighth. Broadens the act so that loans can be made for every ordinary farming purpose.

Ninth. Broadens the business-loan provisions to permit any normal business enterprise to be financed initially.

Tenth. Broadens the refinancing of existing indebtedness to cover all types of loans, with restrictions.

Eleventh. Extends and declares the powers of the Administrator to perform

functions under the loan provisions, principally with respect to suits, payment of claims, compromises, property administration and the like.

Twelfth. Adds a plan permitting the Administrator to insure any loan made by supervised lending agencies which otherwise might be made under title III, as amended. Such insurance will be issued in lieu of a guaranty, to be issued direct to the lending institutions under procedure giving them not to exceed a 15-percent coverage and to be issued only to supervised lending institutions or financial institutions purchasing such loans from the original lending institution. The Administrator is authorized to prescribe, by regulation, terms and conditions and to establish the interest rate not to exceed 3 percent discount or a flat equivalent rate.

Thirteenth. The guaranteed loans may be made by any ordinary lending agency which is subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State or Territory, including the District of Columbia. Restrictions of Federal laws are removed as to certain institutions subject to Federal supervision with respect to the following—as to any loan at least 20 percent of which is guaranteed under the title, and, of course, limited to such Governmental loans: (a) Ratio of amount of loan to the value of the property; (b) maturity of loan; (c) requirement for mortgage or other security; (d) dignity of lien; and (e) percentage of assets which may be invested in real estate loans.

Fourteenth. Lenders not of one of the specified classes may make guaranteed loans only in the event the loan is approved in advance by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Fifteenth. The provisions pertaining to secondary loans, section 505, are modified to conform to new procedure, and the provision that the rate of interest on the second loan shall not exceed that on the principal loan by more than 1 percent is omitted;

Sixteenth. Provision is made to protect contractual rights under loan guaranties issued under the original act, and to authorize the approval of applications filed at any time within 90 days after the effective date of the new act, in order to permit the continued processing of loan applications pending the issuance of necessary instructions and regulations under the amendatory legislation.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Section 1505, relating to deductions from any future adjusted compensation repealed; Section 1505 of the law relating to charges and deductions of benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act against benefits under any adjusted-compensation law is repealed.

Citizens of United States who performed active military or naval service with Allied governments: The new act extends to persons who served in the active military or naval service of Allied Governments and who were citizens of the United States at the time of entrance into such service the benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act as well as

the vocational rehabilitation provisions of Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, to the same extent as in the case of persons who served in our own armed forces. It is provided, however, that these benefits will be extended only to persons who are residents of the United States at the time of filing claim and who are not receiving similar benefits from the government of the Allied nation concerned.

Persons on terminal leave or hospitalized pending final discharge: There are extended the benefits of education and training and guaranty of loans, and vocational rehabilitation under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, to persons while on terminal leave or while hospitalized pending final discharge, with provision that no subsistence allowance would be paid in such cases under title II of the act or Public Law 16. This section is made effective as of June 22, 1944, the date of enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

Is it not very important that the age limitation has been removed so that older men whose education was interrupted may continue their education?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I have covered that.

Next we have a provision in here on private loans, on loans of individuals, only the guarantee in that case is not automatic; the loan must be approved in that case by the Administrator.

We have broadened the provision for loans on second mortgages.

Lastly, in regard to the provision there, it is now up to the lender to elect whether or not he wishes to lend his money under the guarantee provision or take insurance that he can get from the Veterans' Administration at a discount of 3 percent in lieu of the guaranteed loan. That was put in to make loans more available for the veterans.

We took out the 2-year limitation in which the veteran might apply for his loan after discharge or after the termination of the war and made it 10 years.

Now, coming to 1505, I want to say I agree with the chairman that I would much prefer to have it in the bill, but I want you to know that as we passed the bill in July of this year section 1505 was left in there as in the original law. It went over to the Senate and that body amended it by taking out everything except the loan title. In other words, the Senate removed all of 1505 except that portion that would apply to a loan.

Your House conferees took this position: How could we justify giving the exemption to all except those who get a loan in the event of a bonus in the future. Here is a lad who received a four or five thousand dollar education, and another boy who secured a loan with a guarantee of \$4,000, but he is unfortunate and loses his business or his farm. The Government has to make good and pay the guarantee for him. A bonus comes along and for the boy who got the loan it is deducted from his bonus but for the boy who got the education it is not deducted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the same thing would apply to a boy who would get up to \$1,040, \$20 a week for 52 weeks' unemployment compensation. A bonus would come along and that would not be deducted, the education part of it would not be deducted, but the poor boy who got a loan and could not pay it back would have it deducted.

We said to the Senate conferees that we could not stand for that discrimination. This is what happened: They came back and said that there is a distinction between a loan, compensation, and education. They said that education is something that builds up the community. They tried to make a fine-haired distinction, which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] will bring out in his question. Finally, they were opposed to this automatic guarantee, they were opposed to the honorable discharge certificate part of it, and it came down to the question that perhaps we would have had to report in disagreement. We either had to accept the Senate version of 1505, agree to take it out completely, or they would not agree to the provisions in the loan title.

Everything the gentleman from Mississippi has said is correct. As I stated, I would like to see it in, but in order to get a bill we had to agree to one of two alternatives, either accept the Senate provision or take out 1505 entirely. We were not unanimous, but the majority of the conferees on the part of the House agreed to take it out entirely and get the other provisions of the bill.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I would like to ask the gentleman's frank opinion on this: If at some future time there is voted by the Congress adjusted compensation for veterans, does the gentleman really think there will be deducted from that compensation any benefits veterans have received under the GI Act for whatever purpose?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I do not know. This Congress cannot bind a future one. Regardless of whether 1505 is left out, any future Congress can do as it pleases. The reason this has come up and is a problem now is that there was some evidence it was discouraging certain veterans from going to college without that being taken out or accepting the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]. He and I have agreed rather thoroughly on this legislation. I agree with the provision that he referred to and if this conference report is voted down and my amendment is adopted, it will not disturb a single one of them, except the one to which he referred.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] raised this question. Do you think that any future legislation will take any

of this out of the adjusted compensation?

What I am trying to do is restore that provision that is in the present law, and if it stays there, you will not have to legislate on it. Now the gentleman's statement is an admission that if this conference report is adopted, then you are going to discriminate against about 90 percent of the men who fought in this war.

Mr. JUDD. Oh, no.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes; you are. You are paying unemployment compensation, or you are paying extra money for schooling, or you are paying for losses on loans—to about 10 percent of the men in the service, and 90 percent of the men, just as good soldiers, sailors, and marines, as the world ever saw, men who came home to their families, stripped off their uniforms and went to work, you discriminate against to the amount of the extra pay these others receive.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, my only point is this: Are not the definite advantages of accepting this conference report and getting this bill passed now of much greater value to the veterans than any possible disadvantages or discrimination that the gentleman alleges might occur if at some future date adjusted compensation legislation is passed?

Mr. RANKIN. Do not get excited. The Senate will accept this amendment in 30 minutes, in my opinion. It will not go over to January. The Senate is still in session. They will not let this bill go over on this proposition.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, of course it is unpleasant to disagree with my distinguished colleague from Mississippi. Section 1505 should never have been put in the law and it should now be taken out. I do not believe that the Congress wants the veteran to pay his own unemployment compensation. It is no more discriminatory to the other veterans than it is under the social-security law to the millions of men who stay on the job working, and do not have to draw unemployment compensation. That is not discrimination. Neither do I believe this Congress intended that the veterans should have to pay for their own education. That is not what we promised them. We promised them when they went into the service, when they offered their lives in defense of their country, that when they came home, if they wanted it, they would have the opportunity of an education in any school or college or university in this country. Look at the injustice of this. If a veteran attends a college in his own State, the Government has to pay one tuition. If he wants to go to college in another State, they have to pay a higher tuition. Do you mean to tell me that that should be charged against that veteran? Do you mean to tell me that this Congress ever intended that the soldier or sailor himself had to pay his unemployment compensation when he came home and could not get a job. Do you mean to tell me that you want to tell the veterans of this country, "Yes, we have passed the GI bill of

rights; yes, we have provided an education for you, but we want you to know we are going to make you pay for it." I do not think this Congress and the people of this country ever intended such a thing, and you should adopt this conference report and thereby knock section 1505 out of the present law.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. That was in the law last year, and the gentleman from Georgia voted for it.

Mr. PACE. I voted for the GI bill because we had to vote for the conference report or else, and the gentleman knows it. It should never have been put in there, and this is our first opportunity to knock it out.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman knows, too, that the veterans who fought this war want this section 1505 stricken out.

Mr. PACE. Absolutely, they want it stricken out and it should be. I agree with my colleague thoroughly.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Practically everyone in my State does.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who has just spoken said we never intended that the veteran should pay for his own education or should pay for his unemployment compensation or should pay for a default on the loans. Of course, we did not, and we do not intend to in this bill. But who is going to pay for it? The 90 percent that do not take advantage will have to pay for it. That is exactly who will have to pay for it, because it has to come out of the taxes. So whether he pays or not, the 90 percent are going to be injured by this additional pay.

Mr. RANKIN. It took the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] a long time to get excited over this proposition, because it has been in the law for over a year, and he voted for it.

But the amount they get for education will probably amount to several times the amount of the adjusted compensation. Now, really all we propose to do is to provide that what he receives for education be deducted from his adjusted compensation, provided an adjusted compensation is paid later. Even then he would come out far better than his comrade who does not get to go to school; for the amount paid on his schooling will probably amount to many times the amount of his adjusted compensation.

We are not sure any adjusted compensation bill will be enacted, but I will tell the gentleman from Georgia now, and I will tell all the rest of you, that if you adopt this conference report I am going to do my best to make you vote on a bill to pay every one of these boys who served 90 days or more \$20 a week for 12 months, just what you are paying a man for doing nothing.

I want to say another thing to the gentleman from Georgia. Cotton is rotting in the field in Georgia, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, and other States because some people were taking advantage of this law who could have been in the field at work, and would have been if this provision were not in the bill.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. The only reply I can make is that in my State they are offering the veterans employment and, if they do not take it, they cannot get unemployment insurance.

Mr. RANKIN. I know how that is working. I know what is going on. I have the figures before me for every State in the Union, and I think the gentleman from Georgia has been misinformed.

I do not have to apologize for my services to the veterans. I have fought their battles here for more than 20 years. I fought their battles here when some Members of the House who are now clamoring so loudly ran out on them on the economy bill.

If this conference report is adopted in its present form, it is going to be a grave injustice to the veterans that you are going to have to answer for in the years to come.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I find in talking to the Members here on the floor that there is some misunderstanding. I wanted to be clear that the conference report has all of 1505 removed. In other words, if the conference report is adopted, there will be no inequality from one veteran to another. It is just out of the bill. Personally, I would rather have seen it stay in the bill. We either had to take it out or else leave it in for one portion of the veterans only and not all of them. As it is now, it is completely out. I say this, Mr. Speaker, simply to let them know what the provisions are.

Mr. RANKIN. My proposition is to restore that section of the present law.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. This seems to be a very highly controversial matter. I am just wondering what has been and is the attitude of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the DAV on this important question.

Mr. RANKIN. As far as I know, they have not expressed themselves on it.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. I intend to vote for this conference report, but it seems to me we are making a mountain out of a molehill. As far as this section 1505 is concerned, in the future if any adjusted service compensation bill is passed by this House, that provision could be re-instated in that particular bill. But on

the loan feature we are losing sight of one important fact, that while these lads are receiving their education at the expense of the Government, those who are borrowing money from the Government are paying 4 percent, when it is contemplated by our Government to loan foreign governments money at a much lower rate of interest.

Mr. RANKIN. If this conference report is adopted, will the gentleman support a bill to pay all the men who served 90 days or more \$20 a week?

Mr. KEARNEY. The same amount?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. KEARNEY. No; I will not. I will support a bill based on length and type of service.

Mr. RANKIN. This is not based on length and type of service. If I had my way, if this were an open rule, I would offer an amendment now to pay them all alike. This measure requires that the man must have served 90 days, because it is supposed that the mustering-out pay takes care of the first 90 days. I would offer an amendment now to make it apply to all men who have served 90 days. Then if later adjusted compensation were paid, that could be taken into consideration.

But I say this provision in the conference report is most violent discrimination against the man who comes home and goes to work and asks for nothing except to get his uniform off and get back into civilian life.

Mr. KEARNEY. I cannot see any justice, Mr. Speaker, in paying the same amount under an adjusted-service-compensation bill to a man who served 90 days in a camp in this country as compared to one who has been in the front lines for months and years.

Mr. RANKIN. That is what you are doing, except that you are leaving out the man who comes home, strips off his uniform, and goes to work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAVAGE].

Mr. SAVAGE. Is it not true that if a veteran is on compensation and is offered a job and refuses to take the job, he automatically is off the compensation roll anyway?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; but that does not happen very often. But I will tell you what it is doing. All these servicemen working in those factories that are on strike are getting nothing from the Government, and will get nothing under this conference report. That is all because they have not built up their reserves, as they call it. But the man who has been working all the time gets his unemployment compensation pay. A serviceman must stand there and get nothing, and he will stand there and get nothing if this conference report is adopted. But if we paid this \$20 a week compensation to all men who served the required length of time, then these men would be getting theirs, whether they worked or not.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I notice in the conference report the section relating to education has been materially changed from the provisions originally in the ed-

ucational feature in the Readjustment Act. I think one reason we have gone astray is because we do not call it by its proper title, which is the Serviceman's Readjustment Act. That is its purpose, to help them readjust themselves on their return. It was sold to the Congress and the American public on that premise, that we were taking every year a million or more young men of 18 years of age and depriving them of their opportunity to get an education. This was an attempt on our part under a system of readjustment to make them whole, as it were, and send them back to school with some maintenance so that those who wanted to could help themselves through. In this conference report all of that phraseology which said that they would be entitled to an education if it had been interfered with, impeded, or delayed, has been stricken out. The original bill said it would be automatically assumed that a man who went into the service under the age of 25 had had his education interfered with or impeded. Those words are all out. As I understand, as the conference report now has it, any man who was in the service can go to school whether his education was interfered with or not. My impression was that this was a bill for the benefit of veterans and not for the benefit of the educational institutions of this country.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I would like an explanation from the chairman as to why that change was made in the conference.

Mr. RANKIN. Simply because we had a raid of college professors or college presidents. Somebody said this ought to be dubbed "the bill for the relief of college professors." They made a drive on us here to get that law changed. As a matter of fact, whether the conference report is adopted or not, the man who goes to college will get his expenses paid. If no adjusted compensation bill is passed in the future, it will make no difference to him. But if one is passed, my contention is he should be willing to have taken out of that pay which is given him by the Government at least a portion of the money that has been supplied in that way.

I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. Therefore, since no Adjusted Compensation Act has been passed, the gentleman from Georgia is mistaken, is he not, in the belief that Congress is not keeping faith with that young boy who left college because the voting down of this conference report would not keep that boy from getting that education, would it?

Mr. RANKIN. No; he is being treated far better than the servicemen of the First World War were.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. With reference to the statement which has just been made, there is anticipated an adjusted compensation law because section 1505 anticipates that by its very wording. There should certainly not be any penalty imposed on the man who educates himself through the benefits under the bill so that he would have to pay for it out of any adjusted compensation bill later.

Mr. RANKIN. I appreciate the optimism of the gentleman from California, who is a new Member of the House. His argument shows it. A few years ago when I forced through my amendment to raise the base pay of the men in the armed forces to \$50 a month, I heard a similar argument. After the last war it was agreed by everybody in Congress that we owed the servicemen adjusted compensation. Do you know how long it took to get it? It took 17 years. We went through four elections and two depressions before they ever got that adjusted compensation.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. As I understand, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], do not agree about the effect of taking section 1505 out of the bill. The gentleman from Mississippi thinks it is discrimination. The gentleman from Iowa says it is not discrimination. I understand the gentleman from Iowa wrote this particular section in the first instance.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, no, the gentleman from Georgia misunderstood him. He said the Senate amendment would have brought about vast discrimination as between the men who go to school or draw unemployment pay and the ones who secure loans. But this measure, this conference report discriminates against the 90 percent of servicemen who neither go to school, borrow money, or secure unemployment compensation under the bill.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS. I would like to ask about the formula for the real estate loans. It appears a change has been made so that you determine it upon the reasonable value, rather than the normal value?

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. HAYS. I am sure that is an acceptable provision, but I do want to ask about the determination of the appraisal, because there is an impression that now the ceiling is off, and that the lender and the borrower can agree upon any sum, and the Administration is not bound thereby, but, as I read the conference report, that is not true, and I wanted to confirm that.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is correct.

My amendment, if adopted, would carry the very provision on that point that was agreed upon in conference.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi feel that the amount of the loan which will be insured is sufficient to allow a larger purchase of farms?

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes. We raised that to \$4,000 instead of \$2,000.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am in accord with many things the gentleman has said in the past, but I want to ask him if he does not feel that if future bonuses are earmarked on this college education question it will tend to discourage vocational training and college education of the veteran in the future?

Mr. RANKIN. No. Besides it is not a bonus. It is adjusted compensation.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 134, noes 23.

So the conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters.

Mr. ROWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks on the bill H. R. 4590 and to include a report.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks during consideration of the rule on the Palestine resolution.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects each.

Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks on the silver bill and include certain communications.

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KUNKEL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. JONES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech he made before the Ohio Chamber of Commerce on last Friday.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks on two subjects and include an editorial and a resolution.

PALESTINE JEWISH HOMELAND

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 466 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 113) relative to the opening of Palestine for free entry of Jews. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the concurrent resolution and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the concurrent resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the concurrent resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed gratified that the Members desire to consider the bill made in order by this resolution. So as not to delay its consideration, I shall use no further time unless the gentleman from Michigan wishes to be heard.

Mr. MICHENER. This is the Palestine resolution?

Mr. SABATH. This is a rule making that resolution in order.

Mr. MICHENER. Is it the understanding that if no time is taken on the rule the resolution will be explained by the committee reporting it?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; except that I am obliged to make an observation, but I will be brief.

Mr. MICHENER. I hope that committee will advise the House fully as to the attitude of the State Department on this most important piece of legislation touching this international subject.

I realize this is a concurrent resolution only and that it has no force or effect other than a moral one, but our country has always respected its moral commitments almost as much as it has its legal commitments.

I have no requests for time on this side, but I hope the matters I have suggested will be made clear to the House.

Mr. SABATH. I am satisfied they will be.

The Sixty-seventh Congress, on June 22, went on record as favoring the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine and providing that nothing be done to prejudice the religious rights of Christians and all other non-Jewish communities.

Every Member knows that I have abstained from, though I have been frequently urged, to speak on Palestine and on the unfortunate lot of the Jewish people of whom, as reported, nearly 6,000,000 have been ravaged, tortured, starved, and burned alive by the bestial, murderous "super-race" of Nazis. There are only about 1,250,000 Jews left in Europe, many of them still in camps on bare subsistence, and deprived of most of their belongings and their homes destroyed.

This resolution provides that the United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country but only

to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities. Thus they would be given opportunity for colonization and development so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

This resolution really expresses the views and the sentiments and the desire of our President, who is now endeavoring to secure the entry of about 100,000 of these persecuted, suffering people into their homeland. Within the last 35 years the Jews have turned the barren lands into extremely fertile soil by irrigation and have built modern cities and great institutions of science and learning. With extraordinary application and by hard work they have increased the value of all the surrounding property and lands, which are bound to inure to the benefit of the Arabs. Therefore, I cannot quite understand why there should be any opposition from them to the admittance of the Jewish people to what they consider their homeland, but, unfortunately, not only the Arabs but many Christian people have also from time to time shown, unjustifiably, their prejudice against them.

Have not the Jewish people given to the world the moral and ethical principles which are the foundation not only of their own religion but of Christianity itself? Have they not given the greatest Teacher for good, who advocated justice, charity, and brotherly love and whose teachings not only I, but the other Jewish people follow? In this country years ago there were some who charged that Jews controlled the international banking systems of the world, including the United States. That has been proven, I am sure, to be a falsehood, because that control is only about 5 percent. I know of only one outstanding banking institution in the United States in which there is Jewish participation and that is not controlled by Jews. That is the Kuhn, Loeb Co., which is controlled by Christians. That being disproved, now Jews have been charged by many unscrupulous bigots with being Communists. Surely they are not both financiers and Communists.

I fully appreciate that when they were driven from their fields and agricultural pursuits due to jealousy in years gone by and were herded into the ghettos, they were forced to devote themselves to commercial pursuits. This is the reason so many in this and other countries have not followed their cherished and much-loved agricultural pursuits. In years gone by discord and dissension have been propagated in various kingdoms to start anti-Jewish propaganda, but such is not the case in our beloved country. Why, then, do men try to utilize the Jew baiting and propaganda unless it is done to attain political and financial ends?

Mr. Speaker, knowing the membership as I do, I have the utmost confidence that the House will pass the resolution by an overwhelming and nearly unanimous vote.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution for the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine, now under consideration, should receive the unqualified support of all the Members of the Congress.

It is indeed regrettable that it becomes necessary to even consider legislation of this kind. It is a sad commentary on the efforts to secure international peace that one of our major allies in the last war has seen fit to break its pledged word. Liberty loving people everywhere are surprised to find the new British Labor Government in agreement with the policy of the British white paper.

The new British Government was enthusiastic in its campaign pledges for a solution of the Palestine problem, and it is now appalling to learn that it has rejected its former promise for the reestablishment of Palestine as a Jewish homeland.

We Americans have little use for double talk—the apparent language of British international diplomacy.

The ruthless persecution of the Jews in Europe has aroused the sympathies of the American people. As every Member of Congress knows, this persecution has not been of recent origin, but has extended down through the generations. In spite of this persecution, the Jewish mind and heart has grown with deep-seated affection to Palestine, the home of Jewry and the birthplace of Christendom. It is time that the world aid this minority race to establish a permanent homeland. The hour has come when justice must be done, when oppressions cease, and the doors of Palestine be opened as a haven to the millions who seek its shelter.

At the time of the Balfour Declaration, 23 years ago, the Sixty-seventh Congress went on record to establish a Jewish homeland in Palestine.

America's mind has not changed, but it is unfortunate that on account of political causes Great Britain has done an about face. Unless the British Government sees fit to carry out its former promise, Palestine will become a community surrounded by a wall of politics without the just protection of the nations of the world.

When world leaders gather about a peace table to draw up articles which should protect the world against future wars, their agreements will indeed be shallow if the principles of independence, democracy, and justice regarding Palestine are not included.

The issue is not between Arabs and Jews in Palestine—it is a political issue between the rulers of the other nations surrounding Palestine, a question of maintaining the traditional balance of power in that region.

I hope and trust this resolution will be unanimously passed by the Members of the House.

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Committee on Foreign Affairs for reporting this Concurrent Resolution 113 to the House for action today. I appeal to the membership to pass this resolution, as it is high time that we fulfill our obligations.

No nation can escape its share of the dreadful responsibility for what has hap-

pened in Europe. Millions upon millions of Jews were killed, many after horrible tortures, for no reason whatsoever except their religious belief. It was impossible for us even to believe or imagine that such dreadful acts could be perpetrated on such a large scale by maniacs led by a diseased mind. Today, we plead for the lives of a hundred thousand Jews who are no more than living skeletons, whom we have liberated in Europe. They can find no peace in the places they once called home. Germany, the Balkan countries, central Europe are not places of refuge for them. They look to Palestine, and what do they find?

In the face of this tragedy Great Britain dares to shut the gates to their immigration, in spite of its solemn promise. A promise was made by Great Britain to open the gates of immigration into the Holy Land so that Jews could establish there a national homeland. Had that promise been kept, then the thousands upon thousands of Jews whose bones litter the fields of Europe, and thousands upon thousands more whose ashes have been scattered to the four winds, might be living today in peace in Palestine.

Great Britain must not refuse to grant this request of our President for immigration certificates for these dying Jews of Europe.

We in the United States owe a duty. We in Congress must pointedly and frankly tell Great Britain we expect that nation to keep its solemn pledged word. We are determined that our voices shall be heard—even in London.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for the Flood resolution calling for free entry of Jews into Palestine. I call attention to the fact that this resolution does not propose a state which will exclude other parties which have a just claim to participate in the affairs of Palestine. The preamble of the resolution declares:

It being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected.

I have studied at first hand as a member of the Wickersham committee, the plight of the pitiful remnant of displaced Jews in Europe, and I see in this resolution a means of providing them with a haven and refuge in which they can rebuild their shattered lives.

No one who has beheld the abject misery in which they were living in Europe during the midsummertime and knows how their suffering would be intensified by the rigors of wintertime, could hesitate for a moment in demanding for them a more tolerable existence.

That more tolerable existence is ready for them in Palestine. Within a few days I was transported to Palestine and saw there what these persecuted people might be enjoying if only immigration restrictions now enforced could be lifted at once.

The Flood resolution now before us demands that Palestine be opened to "free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and

economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development." From what I observed in Palestine, I am convinced that the same initiative and energy which raised Tel Aviv out of the desert sands can provide other Tel Avivs in other parts of Palestine.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that we are having the opportunity to vote on House Concurrent Resolution 113. As long ago as 1922 the Sixty-sixth Congress unanimously passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected.

We in the United States on numerous occasions have publicly evidenced our sincere wish and desire to do our utmost to provide a national home for Jewish people in Palestine. This resolution will be an evidence of our intention to do all within our power to bring that about. This resolution merely provides:

That the interest shown by the President in the solution of this problem is hereby commended and that the United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development, so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

Mr. Speaker, the brief statement set forth in the report of the committee definitely shows the merits of this resolution, from which I quote as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 113) relative to the opening of Palestine for free entry of Jews, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the concurrent resolution do pass.

The plight of the Jews in Europe and the indefinite status of Palestine formed the subject of a number of resolutions introduced in recent years and referred to the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Your committee, while cognizant of the appointment of a joint Anglo-American committee of inquiry into the subject and while it commends the President for his interest in the matter, feels at the same time that it is appropriate and timely for the Congress to give expression to its views on the need for the restoration of Palestine as the Jewish national homeland.

Accordingly the Foreign Affairs Committee, by a unanimous vote, has decided to report favorably House Concurrent Resolution 113.

In the opinion of your committee the language of this resolution reflects a long series of authoritative expressions of American policy and the views of the American people on the subject of Palestine.

This policy and these views go back to January 21, 1919, when the following recommendation was made by the intelligence section of the United States delegation to the Paris Peace Conference:

"That the Jews be invited to return to Palestine and settle there, being assured by the Peace Conference of all proper assistance in so doing that may be consistent with the protection of the personal (especially the religious) and property rights of the non-Jewish population, and being further assured that it will be the policy of the League of Nations to recognize Palestine as a Jewish state as soon as it is a Jewish state in fact."

In harmony with this position, President Woodrow Wilson on March 3, 1919, declared: "I am persuaded that the Allied Nations with the fullest concurrence of our own Government and people are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish commonwealth."

In the course of recent years, this policy was repeatedly endorsed by numerous Members of Congress, notably in a petition addressed to the President of the United States on November 2, 1943, by 70 Members of the Senate and 194 Members of the House of Representatives, and, on July 2, 1945, by 54 Members of the Senate and 251 Members of the House of Representatives, as well as by the governors of 37 States.

This policy was also endorsed by the national conventions of the Democratic and Republican Parties meeting in Chicago in 1944.

It also received the personal endorsement of the late President Roosevelt on October 15, 1944, and, during the same week, of the Republican Presidential candidate, Mr. Dewey.

Passage of this resolution will also furnish the occasion for the Congress to express itself forthrightly on the horrible plight of the Jews of Europe, 5,700,000 of whom were victims of Hitler and his madmen, according to the indictment presented by the Allied War Crimes Commission. The war is over and the need for a Jewish homeland, where the Jewish survivors of these persecutions can live and breathe as free men and women, and where they can establish a free and democratic commonwealth is greater than ever. Your committee feels, therefore, that the time is at hand when the long-standing pledges to the Jewish people should be fulfilled.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this resolution will receive the unanimous support of the House as a Christmas good-will offering on the part of the American people to help provide a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, there being no further requests for time I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 113.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 113, with Mr. FOGARTY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the concurrent resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I believe that all of the Members of the House are very well informed with reference to this concurrent resolution. It is exactly the same resolution that passed the Senate the other day with only one dissenting vote.

The gentleman from Michigan asked a question, and that is about the only thing I want to talk about at this time, and that was whether we received any report from the State Department regarding this matter. May I say to the gentleman and to the Members of the House that when it comes to a simple resolution of this kind that has no effect of law, we do not ask the State Department for its opinion regarding such resolution. It is merely an expression of the Members of the House with reference to their ideas regarding the matter contained in the resolution.

The most important part of the resolution is that there should be permitted free entry of Jews into Palestine. The President has already requested of Great Britain that 100,000 Jews be permitted to enter Palestine immediately. That is the President's opinion and naturally the State Department takes its instructions with reference to our foreign policy from the President of the United States.

I would like to point out at this time that this resolution does not call for a Jewish commonwealth, a Jewish state, or anything of that kind which was included in previous resolutions that received the approval of the Congress. This resolution says only "a national home for the Jews." I would like to point out to the gentleman from Michigan that that is the law today. That is the same language contained in the Balfour declaration; it is exactly the same language as contained in the treaty of 1924 between the United States and Great Britain. There is no difference in the wording of it at all.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The thing I want understood, and I think the gentleman knows I inquired about it in the Rules Committee, is as to the attitude of the State Department in reference to this purely international matter which is of concern to the diplomats of the country and the President. I would like to have the gentleman tell the committee whether or not the State Department and the administration have expressed an opinion to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, so that if we vote for this resolution we are not rebuffing the administration and the State Department. Some dispatches appearing in today's paper would so indicate. Of course, the great Committee on Foreign Affairs would not bring a resolution before the House dealing entirely with foreign affairs, until that committee had at least consulted and knew the attitude of the State Department. I am asking for this information.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I think I have answered that, but I would like to say further to the gentleman, to give you an idea of how the Committee on Foreign Affairs acts in a resolution of this kind, that we did not get an opinion from the State Department on the Fulbright resolution, and that has been acclaimed all over the world as one of the greatest resolutions of its kind ever passed by the Congress. We never do

that, and it never has been done before. This resolution is the law today because it is in the Balfour Declaration and in the Palestine mandate as well as in the treaty of 1925. That treaty specifically states that nothing in the treaty entered into between England and the United States can be changed without the consent of the Government of the United States. Now England has changed that treaty, and we say it is wrong. They have closed the gates of Palestine to the Jews which is in express violation of the terms of the mandate and the convention between the United States and Great Britain.

The violation of the mandate is even more tragic in the light of the deplorable condition of the Jews of Europe who seek to go to Palestine in order to reconstruct their lives and in order to live as free men and women.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say to my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] that he asked a question of me yesterday when I was before the Committee on Rules, and I thought I gave him from a legislator's angle a most satisfactory answer. I thought it was so satisfactory that the gentleman would not be prone to again ask the question today. Does the gentleman want me to give the House the answer I gave him yesterday?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; because it was so indefinite. The gentleman said that he "assumed" that the State Department knew about it, but he had no definite information.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is nothing indefinite about it. I thought my answer to the gentleman was very frank and very specific and direct to the point. What I said to the gentleman yesterday was this, that I was unable to state what the State Department's position is, but from a legislator's angle there were certain facts from which we were justified in drawing deductions. The fact remains, as I said to the gentleman yesterday, that a resolution was introduced in the Senate. That is a fact. Nothing was heard from the State Department; at least, I have heard nothing. The fact is that the Senate committee considered it. We assume the State Department knew that fact; at least I did, and I assume they did. Nothing was heard. We know as a fact that the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs considered it, and they drafted this compromise resolution. That is another fact. Nothing was heard. We also know that the full committee reported it out. That is another fact. We also know that the Senate acted upon it. That is another fact. Those are all public facts from which we are drawing inferences. We also know as a fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] introduced a resolution in the House. I think nobody will contradict the fact that the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House has held hearings. That is another fact. I think nobody will contradict the fact that they re-

ported the resolution out. That is another fact.

I do not want to overwhelm the gentleman with facts, but I have a few more. The Committee on Rules held a hearing yesterday. We can all draw inferences from that that the State Department is aware of those facts. I have heard nothing from the State Department. The inference I draw from that is, with all those established facts, that the State Department was overwhelmed with the justice of the case, which they ought to be, for they had no opposition to the passage of this resolution. At least, as a legislator I have no evidence from the State Department which I must consider, and that being so, I have no evidence with plenty of facts from which we can draw the inference that, if the State Department has any facts in opposition to this resolution, that they would communicate them to the leadership of the House, and no such facts have been communicated.

Mr. MICHENER. Possibly I am a little direct.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further for the moment. I do not want the other side to use all my time.

Mr. MICHENER. I appreciate that the gentleman has control of the time.

Mr. BLOOM. I have the floor. I am going to yield, but I want to find out what is happening to my time. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time has been consumed, because the other side has been using all of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. Now, I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. MICHENER. All I wanted to say was this: Possibly I am a little direct. The State Department is a part of the executive branch of the Government. It is charged with the duty of making our foreign bargains and conducting our foreign affairs. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs usually consults with the State Department.

Mr. BLOOM. No. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. MICHENER. If it does not, it should, and the House should know it. If this committee refuses to tell the House how its own State Department feels on this matter, then I think we ought to vote down this resolution until we have that information.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I do not like the gentleman from Michigan to make the statement that the Committee on Foreign Affairs is doing something or has been doing something it should not have done. I say that on concurrent resolutions of this kind the State Department is not asked for its opinion. I take as an example the Fulbright resolution. The State Department was not asked for an opinion on the Fulbright resolution. We do not ask for opinions when it comes to a simple resolution that does not become a law. This is merely an expression of opinion, which the House is entitled to make. That has been the rule and the custom of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I do not think it is proper for the gentleman from Michigan even to sug-

gest that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has done something or is doing something that is not regular.

Furthermore, this resolution is on all fours with what the President of the United States has suggested, that Palestine should be immediately opened for 100,000 Jews to meet the emergency in Europe today. Further, the language of the resolution is exactly the same as the law made by a treaty signed by President Coolidge in 1924 with Great Britain, which includes verbatim the Palestine mandate. The mandate specifically states what is in this resolution.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; I am delighted to yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. LUCE. I am informed that when a similar resolution was reported out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs a year ago and then sent to the Committee on Rules the State Department and the War Department were consulted as to their views, and that they said then that they disapproved of the resolution, and it was then tabled. Why was no such similar course of inquiry followed this time by the Rules Committee?

Mr. BLOOM. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, to answer the question.

Mr. SABATH. May I answer the gentlewoman from Connecticut by saying that after the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported that resolution last year, I think it was—and it was a stronger resolution; there were provisions in there that this resolution does not contain—I received word from Secretary of State Stettinius and General Marshall, and even from the White House, that they thought it would be wise at that particular time not to report the resolution, although the Committee on Rules was in favor of and ready to report it, as the gentlewoman knows. When that information came to me, and I received word that we should delay its consideration, I did not grant a rule because I believed then and I believe now, my country first above anything else. I yielded to the request and no action was taken. But this is a different resolution.

Mrs. LUCE. Is the gentleman saying that the present resolution is meaningless?

Mr. SABATH. I am merely explaining that I had no request or statement from the State Department nor from the Secretary of War or the White House that they were opposed to this resolution. If they had been opposed, I know that they would have notified me the same as they did on the last resolution. Have I made myself clear?

Mrs. LUCE. Quite clear.

Mr. BLOOM. I would like to explain further to the gentlewoman that there was no request made to the Committee on Foreign Affairs at that time. At that time after it was reported out by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, please remember that that resolution called for a Jewish commonwealth. There was a great deal of discussion as to what a Jewish commonwealth really meant and

how it would operate. After we reported this resolution out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, we went to the Committee on Rules. In the meantime, General Marshall and Secretary Stettinius went before the Senate committee and stated they preferred at that time not to have the resolution acted upon.

Mr. SABATH. We were at war at that time.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; we were at war at that time. There is no emergency now of any kind.

Mrs. LUCE. Will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; certainly.

Mrs. LUCE. I would like it to be quite clear that I am for this resolution, but it is a most troublesome matter for those of us who are for it as a matter of principle and what seems to us justice and decency in racial relations to hear the rumor current all through Washington that the State Department and the War Department still think that a political crisis exists in the Near East which this resolution will aggravate, why is there presently no word from either the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House or of the Senate which would really clarify the point of view of the State Department?

Mr. BLOOM. May I say to the gentleman from Connecticut that perhaps there is a lot of rumor as the gentleman says. But I have never heard of it. But it is a fact, not a rumor, that hundreds of Jews, millions of Jews in Europe today have no place to go. The only place they can go where there is no doubt that they will be safe is Palestine. Palestine is where they are wanted and where they will be welcomed.

Mrs. LUCE. That was equally true last year.

Mr. BLOOM. Now, if we want to help these poor Jews who are dying and being murdered today in Europe, about which there is absolutely no question—I know it to be a fact—this resolution might do some good. If England is closing the gates of Palestine the same as it is doing today and these Jews have no other place to go, it is our duty to at least express our opinion that these Jews should be permitted to go to Palestine where they have a right to go and where the law says they have a right to go according to our treaty. I have studied this question and I have kept quiet on this floor many, many times when I wanted to speak. But I know now that this is the only decent thing we can do, to at least express our opinion that these poor Jews who are being murdered now throughout Europe shall have an opportunity to go to Palestine in order that their lives may be saved. That is what I have to say on this resolution. This is the law as expressed in the treaty between Great Britain and the United States. The law was enacted in order that Palestine could be a haven for distressed Jews.

Mrs. LUCE. I am in complete accord with the gentleman.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Does the gentleman have any assurance that these unfortunate Jews who will be sent to Palestine will not be murdered by the Arabs?

Mr. BLOOM. Well, Mr. Chairman, of all the ridiculous statements I have ever heard here, that is one of them. We are taking that chance. Are you going to vote against the resolution?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I am for the resolution but I would like to have the assurance that it will not cause these Jews to be treated no better than they are at the present time.

Mr. BLOOM. Are you going to vote against this resolution because while you want to save the Jews you are afraid they may be killed by the Arabs? We will take that chance. You let us alone. The Jews of Europe, the people most concerned, are willing and eager to take that chance.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I saw in the papers where the gentleman wanted to send the armed forces of the United States over there.

Mr. BLOOM. That is not true. You know it is not true. That is not true.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, prior to the time a group of us Congressmen went to several foreign countries, especially to Palestine and the Arabian countries, Iraq, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, Egypt, and these Arab-occupied countries, I signed the Zionist petition, but today, after seeing first hand and knowing the conditions as I do, I absolutely would not; not only in the interest of the United States but in the interest of the Jews themselves.

The Jews in Germany, Poland, and in other occupied countries today are receiving better attention than the civilians there. In the face of the shortage of housing facilities in Palestine and lack of an understanding with the Arabs, they cannot improve their condition by going to Palestine at this time, antagonizing those countries where it is estimated there are from forty to seventy million Arabs; 1,350,000 Arabs in Palestine alone, compared to 650,000 Jews there. They are endangering not only national unity but their own lives. It is something that should not happen. Many of the Members who have advocated this who, like myself, were good friends of President Roosevelt, have not quoted what he said. Neither of the Presidents have advocated anything like this resolution, without the consent and the agreement of the Arabs. If you want to throw dynamite into nitroglycerin, just pass this resolution.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. Is it not a fact that President Truman has also suggested that a hundred thousand Jews should go into Palestine?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. By and with the consent of the Arabs.

Mr. BLOOM. Did the gentleman read this resolution? We have conditions in this resolution.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. But this is predicated on the assumption that our President favors it.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. Does not the gentleman think that we Jews ought to know what is best for us? We have investigated. I want to say to the gentleman that I have evidence that Jews in Poland today are being killed just the same as they were in the war. The Jews in Germany are not living as well as the gentleman says.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman has said there was not any evidence of any danger in Palestine. After we came back, I pointed out the danger that was likely to occur in Palestine, and since then there has been a great deal of bloodshed. If you run over the Arabs in this manner, you will have more.

This can be handled in a proper manner, by mutual agreement with the Arabs in Palestine, and the Jews, and you would not have any trouble. Not knowing the conditions, you cannot judge them unless you see them over there. I am telling you again you are putting your own people in a precarious situation by adopting this resolution. Our own servicemen may be called to Palestine to settle the controversy. Few people in the United States realize the great importance of the great oil fields located in six or eight countries of the Arabic world. The future peace and economic security of the world may rest with those who have control of the oil valves of this vast area which has a proven oil capacity of 5,000,000,000 barrels, and an estimated probable reserve of twenty to fifty billion barrels. American interests hold operating leases and option contracts running to the year 2000. The American and British oil companies control another large portion of the area. At the time the leases were obtained, other countries, including Japan, France, Holland, Germany, and others were bidding for same. The oil is so strategically located that it may actually become the determining factor of future wars or peace. Please refer to our committee's report made on the floor of this House October 15, 1945.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I should like very much to have both parties stop bluffing the Jewish people and bluffing the country. I think we have before us today a resolution that is fair. It is not binding but expresses the sense of Congress that wants justice for the Jewish people. I feel it will do no harm. The Jews certainly will be no worse off than they are today. I believe it will help the situation. If the Members will read the resolution, it provides on page 11:

Establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

Certainly, nothing could be more fair than that, and I do not think the Arabs can object to establishing Palestine as a democratic commonwealth. I think testimony before our committee by the Arabs proves that they did object to an entirely Jewish commonwealth.

I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts that if the President of the United States and the State Department and the Army and Navy wanted us not to

pass this resolution, they would have told us. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, they should tell us if they have them. There is not any danger in it to this country. Time and time again they have asked us not to pass legislation because the security and the safety of the country were at stake. I believe they would tell us now, that the President would send us a message if he objected.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the resolution will pass. The Jewish people really have suffered untold tortures during the past years. We should try to do something for them.

The testimony before our committee pointed to the fact that not so many Jews would enter Palestine, but it is a place where they can go if they wish and where, in my opinion, they should go. I hope the resolution will pass.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this resolution and feel it should be adopted. In view of the discussion as to whether the State Department and the President concurred in this resolution I think the committee should have the following information, and I quote from page 12170 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 17, a statement made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the other body. He said:

Mr. President, the point I am making, I will say to the Senator from New Jersey, is that the President of the United States does not want this resolution adopted. He so told the Foreign Relations Committee—not in person, but he told me over the telephone and authorized me to tell the committee, and I did tell the committee what he said.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further, I am very sorry. Too many members of the committee have asked for time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. But the gentlewoman from Massachusetts gave me a minute, and my time has not expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I did not realize the gentleman's time had not expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Let me finish the quotation. The balance of his statement reads:

He stated, "I do not regard adoption of the resolution as advisable. I do not want to see any sort of resolution adopted until the Commission can conduct its inquiry and submit its report." I reported that to the committee.

The distinguished senior Senator, Mr. CONNALLY, also stated:

The Secretary of State appeared before the committee and testified that the resolution ought not to be adopted, and that it was not wise, and that he opposed it.

It seems the House Committee on Foreign Affairs failed to call the State Department. I do feel, in spite of the opinion of the State Department, that this resolution should be approved, and I will vote for its adoption.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 minute.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska that if the President of the United States did not want us to pass this legislation he certainly should have told the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House or the chairman of the Rules Committee. It was a very simple and easy thing to do.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, it is with a good deal of hesitation and trepidation that I rise at this time to express some views upon the Palestine situation, not merely upon this resolution.

The mandate was originally entrusted to Great Britain by the League of Nations and also by ratifying action of the United States as primarily a humanitarian program. As such it was doubtless welcomed by people all over the world. That the people of the Jewish faith in Europe have suffered in ghastly fashion there can be no doubt whatsoever. It makes one's heart ache to hear what they have gone through. That they are in need of relief or a refuge where they can find relief there can be not the slightest doubt.

I have stood willing to support any measure which would bring relief to them whether it be in Palestine or elsewhere, and I am still ready to do so. I have been deeply concerned, however, in recent months at noting that the original objective of this movement has in effect been superseded to a considerable degree by another objective, and that objective is political. I cannot boast of intimate knowledge of the political situations in the Near East. However, I cannot resist attempting to cast my view ahead down through the years. I would not make this attempt were it not for the fact that in recent months it has been announced again and again by a large number of proponents of this and similar resolutions that in addition to the humanitarian objective they are aiming toward a political objective, that is, the establishment in Palestine of a Jewish state. I see that repeated time and again in advertisements, but it was more definitely cleared up in the hearings held before the Foreign Affairs Committee on this particular resolution the other day when in response to questions, some of them put by myself, the representative of the great movement here in the United States in support of this and similar resolutions admitted that ultimately it was their intention to bring about the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. There is your political objective. Relief having been accomplished the intention will persist in the hearts of these people to establish such a state. Indeed, a leader of the movement who is its agent in Palestine has already stated that the term "national Jewish home" is synonymous with Jewish state.

Why is it that I am concerned about this? And here I realize, Mr. Chairman, that I am treading, perhaps, on delicate ground. In this country a person of the Jewish faith is an American citizen first and I hope to heaven he will always be regarded as such. He is entitled to

his belief in his own religion and no one should ever interfere with it; but he is first an American citizen in our eyes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I hope and pray that that same state of affairs shall finally exist all over the world. It has existed in some countries, the United States and Great Britain for example, and with certain exceptions in the western European democracies. It has not existed in other countries, some of which call themselves civilized.

Frankly, the thing I dread about this political objective is that if it is attained it will tend to segregate people of the Jewish faith away from their neighbors and, perhaps, furnish fuel to that stupid, unforgivable, horrible thing known as anti-Semitism. I do not want to see those who are obsessed with that idea, and it does exist, we might just as well admit it, to our dismay, I repeat, I do not want those who are obsessed with that hideous prejudice to have an additional peg upon which to hang their hats.

I say that the establishment of a separate Jewish state will tend to further segregate the Jewish people all over the world from their neighbors. That is the thing that has been in my mind for several months. And I would feel much happier about this whole Palestine situation if the proponents of this resolution and especially the Zionists would drop their political objectives. There, I fear, is the dynamite.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. I ask the gentleman if that is not indicated by the language of the resolution itself, which in part reads:

For colonization and development, so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home.

It is not far from that to state, is it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is on the border line.

Mr. FOLGER. And dangerous within itself, along the line the gentleman has pointed out.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If we are perfectly candid about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself half a minute.

In answer to the gentleman from New York, I do not want the Members to think that this is something new that he is talking about, because on March 3, 1919, President Wilson declared:

I am persuaded that the Allied Nations with the fullest concurrence of our own Government and people are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish commonwealth.

That is nothing new. They have always spoken of that since the time of the Balfour Declaration up to the present time, and that has nothing to do with this resolution at all.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, as did my colleague from New York, so I also come to the well of this House with a good deal of trepidation. I am opposed to the resolution on the ground that this is not the time to be pressing for action on it. In my opinion this is not a question of helping Jewish refugees in Europe; it is a political maneuver and should be defeated. Adoption of this resolution will not result in expediting homeless Jews to Palestine. At the expense of repetition, perhaps, I want to quote a little more in detail than the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] did a few minutes ago, with reference to the attitude of the President and the State Department. I think this House should know the attitude of the President and the State Department. I am quoting now from an article that appeared in the New York Times under date of December 13, and I am going to read direct quotes attributed to the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. He said:

President Truman made it quite clear to me and to the Foreign Relations Committee that he did not desire the passage of any resolution on the subject at this time. He reported that it would be inadvisable. He stated that the passage of any resolution would greatly embarrass him in his international conferences, seeking a solution. He stated that the passage of a resolution might tie his hands.

These views of the President were concurred in by Secretary of State Byrnes, who opposes the passage of any resolution at this time.

In this situation I could not obtain my consent as chairman of the committee to vote for a resolution which would embarrass the President in the performance of his international duties, and would be a hindrance in bringing about an understanding with Great Britain. In my view, the passage of the resolution is not in the interest of the Jewish people. My belief is that the resolution will injure the cause of the Jewish people and that it will bring about a situation making it very difficult for the President to make any progress whatever in the solution of the matter.

It has not been revealed, at least I have not heard it said, that the President has appointed a committee in conjunction with an English committee called the Anglo-American Committee to investigate this whole Palestine situation and to report back to the President within 4 months. I say that we ought to wait. Why this rush, why this hurry, when we all must admit, I believe, that as far as the resolution itself is concerned it is purely advisory.

We ought not to forget also that this is a slap not only at the President and the Secretary of State but at Great Britain. Where is all this talk now about unity and support of the President and the State Department and our allies? We do not hear it in this debate. There is some pressure at work somewhere, we do not know where.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is a member of the committee?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. Are any of the Democrats on that committee on speaking terms with the State Department? I wonder why the House has to be in doubt with regard to a very delicate international question. It seems to me that some member of the committee could have communicated with the State Department and the House could then know whether or not we are slapping somebody in the face.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I take it from the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Texas that we are slapping them in the face.

Mr. COOLEY. That is a clear indication that the President is opposed to the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I would say so, and I do not think it will be denied on this floor.

Mr. COOLEY. The chairman of the committee has assured the House that the President has asked for the resolution, in substance.

Mr. BLOOM. The chairman stated that the President has asked for 100,000.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. He has not asked for this resolution.

Mr. BLOOM. He asked that England permit 100,000 Jews to go into Palestine.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That has nothing to do with this resolution.

Mr. BLOOM. It is in the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, under permission granted me, I include the following excerpt from article in the Fortnightly, December 1944, by Sir John Hope Simpson, who was appointed by the British Government in 1930 to report on immigration and land settlement in Palestine:

It is difficult—indeed impossible—to reconcile the provisions of this mandate with those contained in the Covenant of the League of Nations, under which it purported to be issued, which laid down that the well-being and development of the inhabitants of Palestine at the time of its occupation form a sacred trust for civilization, and that they could be provisionally recognized as an independent nation, subject to the rendering of advice and assistance by a mandatory. It is on these grounds, among others, that the Arab population has, from the earliest days of the mandate, claimed that the mandate is devoid of authority. They feel that Great Britain is exercising a mandate, not on behalf of the population of Palestine, but on behalf of a foreign power—the Zionist organization of the world. They have seen that power pouring Jewish immigrants into Palestine by the tens of thousands, purchasing very large areas of land hitherto held by the Arabs, holding it under conditions which preclude resale, and leasing it only to Jews, and even to them only on condition that none but a Jew may be employed on the land so leased. It is no matter for wonder that the Arab community of Palestine lives in a state of constant fear of the possible conditions of an unknown future.

The Jewish settlements in Palestine have been a remarkable achievement. Most attention has been drawn to the agricultural settlements. These have been widely advertised, possibly in view of the insistence in article 8 of the mandate that close settlement by Jews on the land should be encouraged, possibly also, in part, because the romance and adventure inherent in these set-

tlements are a stimulus to generous support of the movement. The emphasis placed on this branch of the work of the Zionist organization is, however, disproportionate. As is pointed out in the report of the royal commission, "the proportion of workers on the land (earnings) to the Jewish population . . . today is 6.4 percent." The great mass of the Jewish immigrants are not workers on the land, but residents of the towns. The population of one town, Tel Aviv, far exceeds in number the total population of all the agricultural settlements. This is not to say that the Jewish settlements are unimportant. They are the very remarkable result of the combined application of outstanding technical skill, abounding energy, and practically unlimited resources provided by the generosity of Jewish communities in many lands. But the great majority of the Jewish population of Palestine today consists of skilled and unskilled workers in industry and on public works, industrialists, tradesmen, persons living on their private resources, and professional men of all types. The number in these last two classes is very large, and in some directions that of professional men is out of all proportion to the needs of the community. Evidence was tendered to the royal commission that in Tel Aviv there was 1 doctor to every 161 persons, in Palestine as a whole 1 doctor for every 560 persons, while in the United Kingdom there is 1 doctor for about 1,085 persons.

Industrial development is an essential to the prosperity of the Jewish section of the population, which has grown from 55,000 in 1918 to at least 500,000 at the present time. In 1942 the value of the output of industrial workers was £30,000,000. Apart from war supplies, iron and steel articles, textiles, leather goods, foodstuffs, chemicals and pharmaceutical preparations, drainage pipes, and glass, essential oils, and lorries were produced by Jewish industry in Palestine. This phenomenal development has been due to three main causes—the provision of cheap capital by what Professor Bentwich describes as "philanthropic—capitalist instruments," protection of industry by carefully regulated tariffs, and the important monopoly for the production of electric power and light granted by the government to Mr. Pinhas Rutenberg, a Russian Jewish engineer, and now exploited by the Palestine Electric Corporation. Some of the conditions of this monopolistic concession are remarkable, not least the postponement of payment of customs duty on imported material "until the profits of the company, after writing off amortization, depreciation, and reserve, are first sufficient to enable the company to pay a dividend of at least 8 percent per annum tax free."

For the years 1920-36 the principle of economic absorptive capacity governed the number of immigrant Jews on the labor schedule. This principle was first laid down in the Churchill memorandum of June 3, 1922. "This immigration cannot be so great in volume as to exceed whatever may be the economic capacity of the country at the time to absorb new arrivals." It was reaffirmed in the letter dated February 13, 1931, from the Prime Minister, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, to Dr. Weizmann, which the Prime Minister described as "the authoritative interpretation of the white paper." In that letter it was stated that the criterion which would guide the Government in fixing the number of Jewish immigrants would be the principle of economic absorptive capacity. It is, however, clear that if philanthropic capital is available, irrespective of profit, electric power in quantity at very low cost, and protection by means of tariffs and exemption from taxation, industry could be artificially expanded to great dimensions, and absorptive capacity provided for very large numbers of Jewish immigrants. It would, indeed, be in the power of the Zionist organizations so to manipulate absorptive capacity as, in their judgment, circumstances might require.

This question was considered with care by the Palestine Royal Commission, which pointed out the dangers inherent in the application of that principle alone. They gave their reasons for reaching the conclusion that political and psychological factors should also be taken into account in determining the numbers in the labor schedule, and that a political high level should be fixed at 12,000 per annum for the next 5 years. The importance of the decision and its effect on the development of the national home may be judged from the fact that in the period from the beginning of 1933 to August 1936 the number of Jewish immigrants exceeded 156,000—a figure much greater than the total of recorded Jewish immigration from 1920 to 1932, inclusive. The reason for this remarkable movement in the year 1933 and succeeding years is to be found in events in Germany. The Nuremberg legislation to safeguard the purity of the German race and the abominable treatment of the Jews in Germany under the Nazi regime resulted in a mass movement of refugees from that country, and Palestine came to be regarded as the chief haven of refuge for German, and later also for Austrian, Jews. As anti-Semitism spread in its more acute forms to other areas of Europe, that position became even more important, and great pressure was exerted on the Palestine Government and on the Government of the United Kingdom to open the door to Palestine still wider. In view of the refusal of other countries to admit refugees save in inadequate numbers, the demand was natural, but it ran counter to the policy recommended by the Royal Commission and subsequently adopted by the British Government. In the years 1937 to 1942, inclusive, the number of immigrant Jews was 50,197.

The immigration of the Jews into Palestine has been conducted with outstanding ability. The Jewish Agency and the National Federation of Labor (Histadruth) have organized the recruitment, transport, and settlement of those admitted on the labor schedule, with amazing success. Criticism has been made in the past by the orthodox section of Jewry in Palestine that politics rather than religious devotion have been considered by the recruiting authorities, and it is, in fact, remarkable that whereas in the older settlements which were founded before the time of the Balfour Declaration the synagogue was the center of the village life, in the later settlements that position is occupied by the village school. Politics are now far more obvious than religious enthusiasm, and, to quote Dr. Toynebee, Zionism is "in essence a secular, economico-political expression of Jewish national aspirations." The Zionist movement today is definitely an urge of political nationalism, and the Jewish settlement is no longer regarded as a settlement of Palestinian Jews in Palestine—if it were ever so regarded—but of national Jews in Eretz Israel. Therein lies the tragic impossibility of reconciliation between immigrant Jew and aboriginal Arab.

Judging by recorded statements of Zionist leaders it is fair to conclude that, at the outset, the policy of Zionism did not aim at political dominance in Palestine. At the tenth Zionist congress, held at Basle in August 1911, the president made a statement, from which the following is extracted:

"Only those suffering from gross ignorance or actuated by malice, could accuse us of the desire of establishing an independent Jewish Kingdom. . . . The aim of Zionism is the erection for the Jewish people of a publicly recognized, legally secured home in Palestine. Not a Jewish state, but a home in the ancient land of our forefathers where we can live a Jewish life without oppression and persecution. What we demand is that the Jewish immigrant to Palestine be given the opportunity of naturalizing as a citizen without limitation and that he can live unhindered in accordance with Jewish customs . . . that and nothing else is our aim."

In the introduction to his *History of Zionism*—written during 1918—Mr. Sokolov, at that time president of the Zionist organization, wrote:

"It has been said, and is still being obstinately repeated by anti-Zionists again and again, that Zionism aims at the creation of an independent Jewish state. But this is wholly fallacious. The Jewish state was never a part of the Zionist program."

Dr. Weizmann is reported to have declared at a meeting of Government officials in Palestine held on April 27, 1918:

"All fears expressed openly or secretly by the Arabs that they are to be ousted from their present position are due either to a fundamental misconception of Zionist aims or to the malicious activities of our common enemies."

Finally, Dr. Weizmann in an address to the Zionist organization in 1931, of which he was then President, said:

"The Arabs must be made to feel, by deed as well as word, that, whatever the future numerical relationships of the two nations in Palestine, we on our part contemplate no political domination. But they must also remember that we on our side will never submit to any political domination."

That principle was also adopted by the British Government, and was announced, before the mandate was actually granted by the Council of the League of Nations, in the Churchill memorandum of June 3, 1922. It included the following sentences:

Unauthorized statements have been made to the effect that the purpose in view is to create a wholly Jewish Palestine. Phrases have been used such as that Palestine is to become "as Jewish as England is English." His Majesty's Government regard any such expectation as impracticable and have no such aim in view. Nor have they at any time contemplated . . . the disappearance or the subordination of the Arabic population, language, or culture in Palestine. They would draw attention to the fact that the terms of the Balfour Declaration referred to do not contemplate that Palestine as a whole should be converted into a Jewish national home, but that such a home should be founded in Palestine.

Had the Jewish authorities been content with the original object of settlement in Palestine—"a Jewish life without oppression and persecution" in accordance with Jewish customs, the national home would have presented no difficulty. The Jews could have entered and settled as so many did in the P. I. C. A. settlements—founded in many cases long before the Balfour Declaration—in friendly relationship with their Arab fellow citizens, and themselves loyal citizens of Palestine. The unfortunate fact is that the Jewish immigration today is not composed of Jews who, on religious grounds, wish to return to the land of Zion, in order to lead a Jewish life, without oppression and persecution, in accordance with Jewish customs. Rather is it composed of Jews, largely devoid of religious conviction, animated by a spirit of political nationalism, and determined to secure domination in Palestine, the homeland of the Arab for at least 1,300 years. No effort has been made to coalesce with the existing population. On the contrary, there is extreme divergence between the virile occidentalism of the immigrant and the conservative orientalism of the mass of the resident population. After its description of the organization of Jewish policy in Palestine the Royal Commission writes: "It would be difficult to find in history a precedent for the establishment of so distinct an imperium in imperio."

The policy of His Majesty's Government for the future government of Palestine is that contained in the Statement of Policy issued in May 1939. It was issued after consultations with Jewish and Arab representatives, including among the latter representatives of Egypt, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and the Yemen.

The salient feature of this white paper is the decision to limit the further immigration of Jews into Palestine to 75,000 in the 5 years from 1939; after that period no further immigration of Jews will be permitted unless the Arabs of Palestine are prepared to acquiesce in it. In other words, at long last the British Government has recognized that Palestine is an Arab land, and that it shall remain an Arab land unless the Arabs decide otherwise. The second most important point regards the future constitution of the Palestine State:

"At the end of 5 years from the restoration of peace and order, an appropriate body representative of the people of Palestine and of His Majesty's Government will be set up to review the working of the constitutional arrangement during the transitional period, and to consider and make recommendations regarding the constitution of the independent Palestine State."

The intention of the British Government is that within 10 years Palestine shall be an independent state in treaty relations with Great Britain. Inevitably the majority in that State will be Arabs, but the Jewish population of the national home in Palestine will be a forceful and well disciplined minority. If they are prepared to accept that position and to live in Palestine as loyal Palestinian citizens, their influence will be very great, and the advance of Palestine will be rapid. If they refuse to cooperate, they will doubtless be able to make things difficult for the Palestine government, without gain to themselves.

In view of the latest statement of policy by His Majesty's Government, the position and authority of the Jewish Agency in Palestine will not be required in the interest of the national home, now securely established. The existence of that authority has emphasized the apartness of the Jewish section of the Palestinian population in the past, and has also led to a suspicion on the part of the Arab population that the interests of the Jews were more forcefully represented than those of the Arabs for the consideration of the Palestine government. The Royal Commission recorded its opinion that among the factors causing the outbreaks of violence on the part of the Arabs was the Arab belief that—

"The Jews can always get their way by means denied to the Arabs. . . . Based in general on the status of the Jewish Agency both in Jerusalem and in London, this belief was greatly strengthened by the publication of Mr. MacDonald's letter to Dr. Weizman in 1931."

In future the representation of Jewish interests in Palestine may very safely be left to the local organizations which are staffed by able men, and to the high commissioner and his government. There is no possibility of a coalescence of the Jewish and Arab sections of the population so long as the former are in a specially privileged position in relation to the Palestine government.

Though Palestine may properly be regarded as the spiritual home of every devout Jew, there is no proper ground to conclude that it is the haven of refuge for Jews unjustly persecuted. The solution to persecution in Europe is to prevent it. If that be impossible, the havens of refuge should be in those countries, such as Great Britain, the United States of America, and the U. S. S. R., among others, who sympathize with the sufferers and have a sense of the dignity of man as man. It is unfair and indeed hypocritical to express sympathy, while refusing to accept the sufferers into one's own country and compelling their acceptance in Palestine, where they are not welcomed. Were the doors of Great Britain, the United States, the U. S. S. R., and France thrown open, the problem of persecuted Jewry would be immediately solved.

"The best service which well wishers of the national home can render it, is to rec-

ognize frankly that the situation in Palestine has reached a deadlock and to bend their minds to finding a way out." The way out is indicated in the statement of policy of 1939.

Excerpt from the Sun, Baltimore, November 30, 1945, setting forth President Truman's change of attitude on Palestine resolution:

TRUMAN DROPS HIS BACKING OF ZIONISTS' PLAN—REVERSES PLATFORM ON WHICH HE AND F. D. R. WERE ELECTED

WASHINGTON, November 29.—A sequel to the recent disclosure of President Roosevelt's promise to Ibn-Saud not to side with the Jews against the Arabs in the Palestine controversy was provided here today as President Truman bluntly declared his opposition to the Zionist position.

His opposition—relayed to a closed session of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee November 19—had remained an official secret until he himself revealed it at a press conference this morning.

The stand he took put him in opposition to the Democratic platform on which he and President Roosevelt were elected a year ago and to the Wagner-Taft resolution endorsing a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine, which he had backed as a Senator.

LEGISLATORS ANGERED AT STAND

It also reversed a stand Mr. Truman had taken last month when—in the midst of his negotiations with Prime Minister Attlee to refer the Palestine question to an Anglo-American commission—he gave Senators WAGNER (Democrat, New York) and TAFT (Republican, Ohio) the green light to reintroduce their resolution.

In addition, Mr. Truman's unqualified assertion of opposition today to that resolution created a political quandary for Democratic Members of Congress from such States as New York, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and California, who looked to their virtually unanimous support of the resolution to boost their chances of reelection next year.

They had made their anger so clear to James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State, when he relayed Mr. Truman's position to the Foreign Relations Committee 11 days ago that he emerged from the secret meeting white-faced and tight-lipped.

WAGNER REFUSES COMMENT

Senator WAGNER would not comment tonight on Mr. Truman's reversal of position but predicted that "the Foreign Relations Committee will report the resolution favorably and it will be passed by the Senate." The subcommittee to which he had referred is scheduled to make its report to the full committee Monday, he added.

Mr. Truman announced November 13 his agreement with Mr. Attlee to set up the Anglo-American commission and said he hoped it would work "with the greatest speed" because the situation faced by displaced Jews in Europe during the coming winter allows no delay in this matter."

He said today that he was not yet ready to name the commission's American members and that, in fact, no agreement had yet been reached as to how large the commission should be. He hoped, he said, that agreement on the commission's size would be reached later today and that Mr. Byrnes would be able to announce it. No such announcement was forthcoming, however, before the State Department locked up shop for the night.

NO OPPOSITION AS VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. Byrnes announced yesterday that—as a result of negotiations begun some days after the Truman-Attlee agreement of November 13—it had been decided to give the Anglo-American commission 120 days from its inception to make its studies and file its

recommendations and report. On that basis, the winter to which Mr. Truman referred in his November 13 announcement will have ended before the commission acts.

"Some people who have been interested in the Zionist movement said you gave prior approval or acquiescence to the Wagner resolution for a Jewish commonwealth; did you have any conversation about that?" Mr. Truman was asked today.

He had some conversation on that subject and was not opposed to the resolution when Vice President, Mr. Truman replied.

SAYS CONDITIONS CHANGED

"Do you favor the resolution?" he then was asked.

He does not, he answered, adding that conditions have changed and that if the resolution were passed now there would be no reason for appointing a fact-finding body—i. e., the Anglo-American commission.

Senate records show no resolution backing the Zionist position on Palestine was pending in the Senate while Mr. Truman, as Vice President, was its presiding officer. The Wagner-Taft resolution of 1944—which President Roosevelt had pigeonholed after the November elections—died with the Seventy-eighth Congress. It was not reintroduced until October 26 this year.

Before introducing it, Senators WAGNER and TAFT, it was learned today, conferred with both President Truman and Secretary Byrnes in mid-October and got the green light from them. Mr. Truman reminded them that he had supported just such a resolution while a Senator last year.

OPPOSITION FROM CONNALLY

They also were told at that time by Truman and Byrnes, it was learned, that creation of the Anglo-American commission—which Mr. Truman cited today as the reason for his reversal—already had been agreed upon in principle between London and Washington.

Senator WAGNER, it was further learned, made a last-minute check before introducing the resolution October 26. He telephoned Mr. Byrnes a few minutes before the Senate convened, asked if it would be all right to offer the resolution that day, and was told "Go ahead."

It encountered almost immediate opposition within the Senate Foreign Relations Committee from Chairman CONNALLY (Democrat, Texas), who said the President was against it—a report Mr. Byrnes subsequently confirmed at a secret committee session.

A. F. OF L. HEAD APPEALS TO ATTLEE

Meanwhile, William Green, A. F. of L. president, today cabled an appeal to Prime Minister Attlee to "immediately stop" the "policy of death and destruction of Jewish people in Palestine" by British troops. He said he had been shocked by reports received from the General Federation of Jewish Labor in Palestine that "Jewish civilians in Palestine were the victims of tear bombs, rifle butts, and bayonets used by British troops, and as a result a number were killed, a large number wounded, and many were arrested."

"It seems inconceivable," his cablegram added, "that Jewish people who migrated to Palestine in order to save themselves from utter destruction in certain totalitarian nations in Europe would be killed and injured by armed forces of Great Britain, whose obligation and duty was to save their lives and protect them against those forces which sought their utter annihilation."

Excerpt from the New York Times, December 13, 1945, part of an article written by C. P. Trussell relating to Senate action on the Palestine resolution:

WASHINGTON, December 12.—By a vote of 17 to 1 the Foreign Relations Committee approved and reported to the Senate today a

resolution calling on the United States to "use its good offices" to the end that Palestine be opened for the "free entry of Jews" to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities.

The measure provides further that this Government shall support "full opportunity for colonization and development," so that Jews "may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine and the Jewish national home and in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights."

The lone dissenter was the committee's chairman, Senator TOM CONNALLY, of Texas, a supporter in 1922, as a Member of the House, of the resolution favoring the establishment in Palestine of a national Jewish homeland. After the committee had acted in closed session today, Mr. CONNALLY cited the appointment on Monday by President Truman and Prime Minister Attlee of an Anglo-American committee to study the Palestine situation and report within 120 days, and he declared: "President Truman made it quite clear to me and to the Foreign Relations Committee that he did not desire the passage of any resolution on the subject at this time. He reported that it would be inadvisable. He stated that the passage of any resolution would greatly embarrass him in his international conferences, seeking a solution. He stated that the passage of a resolution might tie his hands."

CONNALLY DEFENDS DISSENT

"These views of the President were concurred in by Secretary of State Byrnes, who opposes the passage of any resolution at this time."

"In this situation I could not obtain my consent as chairman of the committee to vote for a resolution which would embarrass the President in the performance of his international duties, and would be a hindrance in bringing about an understanding with Great Britain. In my view, the passage of the resolution is not in the interest of the Jewish people. My belief is that the resolution will injure the cause of the Jewish people and that it will bring about a situation making it very difficult for the President to make any progress whatever in the solution of the matter."

Statement by the Arab Office as to its position regarding the Palestine question:

THE ARABS INSIST ON THEIR RIGHTS

The Balfour Declaration was a unilateral document, not binding on the Arabs either morally or legally.

The British Government never intended this declaration as a charter for converting Palestine into a Jewish state. Officially this was made clear in the British white paper of 1922 and again in the white paper of 1939. In the latter it is specifically stated:

"His Majesty's Government therefore now declares unequivocally that it is not part of their policy that Palestine should become a Jewish state. They would indeed regard it as contrary to their obligations to the Arabs under the mandate, as well as to the assurances which have been given to the Arab people in the past, that the Arab population of Palestine should be made the subjects of a Jewish state against their will" (Cmd. 6019, p. 4).

While many official promises have been made to the Arabs by the British Government, Arab rights do not rest on any such political promises or declarations.

The Arab claim to Palestine rests on these simple facts: (a) large Arab majority, (b) formerly uninterrupted possession for 13 centuries, (c) unity in traditions, culture and language. It is the inherent right of any people so domiciled in a land to maintain jealously its hold on that land.

Before the First World War there were 10 Arabs to 1 Jew. But today there are 10 Arabs to 4 Jews.

Zionists at present are bent on converting the Arab majority in Palestine into a minority. They are denying Palestine democratic government until such Jewish majority is attained. If we accede to the demand for the immediate admission of 100,000 Jewish refugees into Palestine, it will not be long before the Jews become a majority there.

For centuries Arabs and Jews have lived in peace and harmony in Moslem and Arab lands. It is in the interest of all Jews who are already in Palestine and everywhere in the Moslem world that everything should be done to allay the suspicions, the fears, and resentment of the Arabs.

Palestine is regarded by all Arabs as an integral and inseparable part of the Arab world. If the Zionists insist on pursuing their program to its logical but perilous conclusion their act will arouse intense and bitter opposition among all Arabs—Moslems and Christians—and will create a bloc of 60,000,000 Arabs and 300,000,000 Moslems against the Jews.

Zionism is neither a humanitarian nor a religious program. It is a political program. The Jewish problem is a European problem. The refugee problem is also a European problem. Neither of these problems has been created by the Arabs. The Arabs of Palestine should not be held alone responsible for the solution. It does not lie in the artificial establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine, but in the assurance of true democracy and the guaranty of security throughout the world.

We ask you Americans:

1. Would you want to give the so-called homeless and stateless Jews a sovereign homeland within your borders?
2. Would you tolerate constant outside interference and dictation in your internal affairs?
3. Would you permit foreign governments to control your immigration policy?

ZIONIST CLAIMS AND ARAB REFUTATIONS

1. Zionists rest their claim to Palestine on historical grounds.

So do the Arabs. The fact is that the Arabs have been there for centuries and are there now. Jews left Palestine in A. D. 71.

2. Zionists claim Palestine on religious grounds.

So do 300,000,000 Moslems, to whom it is the second holiest land.

3. Zionists claim that the Arabs cannot be entrusted with the rights of minorities.

When Christendom was persecuting Jews, the Arabs tolerated them and gave them refuge. Christian Arabs are one with their Moslem brethren in opposing Zionism.

4. Zionists claim that the Arabs cannot be entrusted with the protection of the holy places.

A Moslem family, the Nusalbehs, of Jerusalem, have been entrusted by the Christians with the custody of the keys of the Holy Sepulcher for several generations.

5. Zionists claim that since Palestine constitutes less than 1 percent of the Arab world, the Arabs should concede this "notch" to their Jewish cousins.

Most of the Arab world consists of deserts. The State of Vermont is less than 1 percent of the area of the United States. Would the people of Vermont be willing to vacate it and move into other parts of the United States upon an order from a foreign power or group of powers?

6. Zionists claim that the Arabs benefit from their colonization of Palestine.

With reference to Jewish colonization of Arab land, Sir John Hope Simpson, in his report (Cmd. 3680), said: "It ceases to be land from which the Arab can gain any advantage whether now or at any other time in the future. * * * He is deprived forever from employment on that land. * * *

Nor can anyone help him by purchasing the land and restoring it to common use. The land is in mortmain and inalienable."

7. Zionists claim they brought the benefits of western civilization to the Arabs of Palestine.

Syria, Lebanon, Egypt, Iraq, and Turkey have prospered and made remarkable progress without benefit of Zionist immigration. In the last 60 years the population of Egypt has tripled.

The Arabs have not benefited at all from Jewish education because the language of instruction in all Jewish schools is Hebrew.

As to medical facilities Arabs do not frequent Zionist hospitals. According to the last report of the Palestine Government to the League of Nations, out of 11,880 patients admitted to Zionist hospitals, 4 were Moslems, 7 were Christians, and 11,869 were Jews.

8. Zionist claim that with intensive industrialization a large Jewish population is possible in Palestine.

According to Mr. Painter, of the Reader's Digest, Jewish enterprises in Palestine are only 40 percent self-supporting. Thus far, Zionist intensive industrialization in Palestine has been possible only through charity and discriminatory tariff.

(1) "The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development." (From President Wilson's Fourteen Points.)

(2) "Your Majesty will also doubtless recall that during our recent conversation I assured you that I would take no action, in my capacity as Chief of the executive branch of this Government, which might prove hostile to the Arab people." (President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in his letter to King Ibn-Saud, April 5, 1945.)

(3) "We believe that all peoples who are prepared for self-government should be permitted to choose their own form of government by their own freely expressed choice, without interference from any foreign source. That is true in Europe, in Asia, in Africa, as well as in the Western Hemisphere." (President Harry Truman in his speech on Navy Day, October 27, 1945.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the resolution. I am sorry, as indeed everyone must be, that we do not have clear information as to the position of the State Department and the Executive. From the fact they have not said anything about it, either one way or the other I must interpret their silence as being favorable to the resolution. Certainly the administration, if it was opposed, had a duty to say so plainly. That is an obligation because the administration should know about our foreign trends and they should not fail to keep Congress advised. So I must conclude the administration is in favor of this resolution although for some reason or other it is strangely reticent. This is unusual reticence because they have not failed to give us plenty of advice in the past.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. Did the gentleman not hear read the statement of a gentleman

in the other body to the effect that he had been specifically told that they did not want this resolution?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I also heard that statement contradicted by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. In view of the fact that there is a 20,000,000,000 to 50,000,000 barrel oil reserve in these Arab countries of 40,000,000 people, does not the gentleman think the future economy and peace of the world are tied up in it in that whoever controls that oil valve over there controls the peace and economy of the country in the future?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am not getting into any discussion about the oil rights in the Near East. That is a question by itself.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That is important.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am for this resolution because I believe it is right. I believe these poor, unfortunate, persecuted, oppressed Jewish people must have some place where they can find peace and security. We in the United States for the last 25 years have on many occasions recorded our belief in permitting Jewish settlement in Palestine. I am supporting the resolution also because it was incorporated in the Republican platform in 1944. Our party recorded itself definitely in favor of a homeland for the Jewish people in Palestine.

I hope that this resolution will be adopted. It is only, as anyone can readily see, a recommendation to the President that this great humanitarian objective shall be brought about. The final responsibility is, of course, with the President.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it your idea that this is simply carrying out the commitment England made 25 years ago?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is trying to put into effect the promises that the Jewish people have had since the last World War. It was originally promised by Great Britain in the Balfour Declaration.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. A specific commitment was made by England, was it not, that the Jews would be allowed to go in there?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The Balfour Declaration was a definite commitment for a Palestine home for the Jews. No one can dispute that.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. I agree with the gentleman that we owe the Jews something. There is one exception that I want to make, and that is to the statement by the chairman of the committee that Jews are being killed in Poland and Germany. I believe that is a misstatement.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I say to the gentleman that I do not know about that. However, as long as Poland has been mentioned, I want to express my conviction that I would like to see a little more justice to the Polish people, too. Certainly there is room for more consideration for our gallant Polish allies—allies who stoutly fought on during the darkest days of the war.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I saw the extermination factories at Buchenwald. It was there they gave the Jews the works. They died by the thousands. I also saw on the Continent of Europe thousands and thousands of displaced persons, most of them Jews, looking for homes. I hope in the name of suffering humanity that during this Christmas period the House will stand firm for this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of this resolution because it expresses clearly the intent and purpose of this Congress on a very controversial question which has been before us for a long time. The Jewish people are entitled to the assurance of this Congress that we favor action by the British Government to conform with the terms of the Balfour resolution which has too long been sidetracked. When we pass this resolution we are providing a haven for thousands of Jewish people in Europe who have no place to go and who desire to be reunited with their relatives and friends from whom they have long been separated.

A CONGRESSMAN'S CHRISTMAS MESSAGE

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, nearly 2,000 years ago a child was born in a manger. The birth of Christ Jesus meant the same thing to the shepherds, to the wise men and to Mary and Joseph that this sacred event means to us in these far distant times. It meant—and it means today—simply this: Peace on earth, good will to men.

It has been to the eternal sorrow of the world that the beauty and the truth of the Christmas message has been imprisoned in the hearts of men even as, through centuries and through eons, the power to move the universe has been imprisoned within the atom. This Christmas is the first Christmas in 5 years when this country of ours has not been engaged in war. Many of our boys will be at home. Many more will live only in the waking and sleeping thoughts of their loved ones. In either case, the responsibility is ours. We must make ourselves the protons of our God, break through the atomic shell that imprisons the enduring truths which were born with Christ and which are Christ, so that "the peace that passeth all understanding" will be released for all men, all women, all children on every continent. It is our privilege, at Christmas, 1945, to contribute—as earlier generations have never been able to contribute—to the universal cause of peace and righteousness for which Christ was born, for which He lived, and for which He died.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, in view of the confusion which has prevailed, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs one specific question, if he will answer it, and that is whether or not he can state to this Committee that the Chief Executive is in favor now of the passage of this resolution.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, I hope I did not give the impression that the President is in favor of this resolution. But I did say that the President has asked England and requested England repeatedly to permit 100,000 Jews to go to Palestine.

Mr. HAND. I understand that, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to assure the chairman that I am thoroughly in favor of this resolution. But can you answer my question yes or no?

Mr. BLOOM. I do not speak for the President at all. I do not know what the President thinks about it.

Mr. HAND. You cannot answer the question in any way? You cannot answer the question?

Mr. BLOOM. I cannot answer it. I do not know anything about it at all.

Mr. HAND. I thank the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor the passage of this resolution at this time.

Before the passage of this resolution by the other body, I introduced a resolution in the House containing exactly the same provisions, word for word. I think it would be in line with the promises we have made for the last 20 years to pass this resolution, to bring all the effort we can to alleviate the conditions of these oppressed people. I think we would be derelict in our duty if we did not declare to the world that it is our intention to use our utmost efforts to carry out the promises that were made in the Balfour Declaration, in the treaty that was made, and in the repeated resolutions that were passed by this Congress, regardless of practical considerations which might be brought in about other interests from an economic standpoint.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, the most sickening aspect of what is called western Christian civilization, which extends from our Pacific shores to those borders where the Soviet Union begins, is the mass hypocrisy that prevails within it on the subject of racialism. National and international hypocrisy—and to some measure each of us is implicated—on the question of Jews, Negroes, and other racial and religious minorities, of all the stench that rise from this earth, is undoubtedly the greatest stench in the nostrils of God.

Now the Members who are voting against this resolution today give, in general, two reasons for their course of action. Their sincerity I certainly do not question, though I think they are wrong.

First, they say that they fear the passage of this resolution will make political trouble, leading to the necessity for our military intervention in the Near East.

In giving this reason for the basis of their vote, are they not playing the game of which we have all been guilty at some time or other in this House, of being rostrum secretaries of state and cloak-room generals?

Indeed, I agree with those who claim here that if the State Department and the War Department felt that the passage of this resolution would put an eventual burden on American arms, or a serious strain on our relations with the Arab and other nations of the Near East, they would have clearly so notified the Foreign Affairs Committees of the Congress, in writing. To say that they are in reality against this resolution, but have failed to testify to their disapproval openly and on the record, is, in effect to accuse the State Department of being either uncertain of the international implications of this resolution or of being afraid to speak up against it, lest it cost the administration Jewish votes in the next election. I do not like to believe that the State Department is either guilty of undecision or ignorance of the repercussions this resolution must have in the Near East, nor do I feel we should accuse it of political pandering for Jewish votes, just because its position today on this legislation is obscure. I prefer to believe its silence gives sincere assent to this resolution.

The second reason given here today for voting against this bill is that its passage will be bad for the Jews; that it will eventually aggravate anti-Semitism in the Near East, and abroad. That may be as it may be, but there are hundreds of thousands of Jews who would rather live in Palestine, live and breathe and eat and sleep and work there, and be badly thought of abroad, than to die as they will do, if they do not get there, and be thought a little better of. No doubt there are those like the gentleman from New York who sincerely believe that the attempt to create a homeland in Palestine will create more anti-Semitism, and for that reason are against this resolution for the sake of the Jews. But anti-Semitism will not be abated by the mere solution of the Palestine question, one way or another. Those who wish to think ill of the Jews will always be zealous in their search of reasons, and reasons will never be lacking, for there is no race on this earth which has not given cause for offense to other races, as there is no individual within a race who does not often give cause to his brother to dislike him. We are all of us, individuals, nations, and races, devilishly apt in finding reasons to praise ourselves and to belittle others.

The tragic result of such thinking is the disastrous belief that every man is his brother's enemy, no nation is a peaceful nation but a defeated or enthralled one, and in this instance that no Jew is a good Jew but a dead one. Some people who feel that way will express it

in more diplomatic language. They will seize upon the opinion that to give the Jews in Europe sanctuary or a homeland in Palestine will fan the fires of anti-Semitism and, expressing a desire to save Jews, condemn great numbers of them to homelessness, persecution, and death.

It is high time that we in America were brutally honest with ourselves about this Jewish question. There are only three things that we can do about the Jews.

First, we can, if we will, open our immigration doors to the Jews by establishing a quota for America of suffering European Jewry, and then let this number come to our country. Other nations can do what they wish about their quotas—if any. But our consciences will then be satisfied that we really do care about saving Jewish lives. To speak without acting is simply to massage our sore consciences with meaningless humanitarian utterances.

Or second, we can, if we will, insist that by diplomatic measures our administration must find a place of refuge for the Jews in Europe or in Africa, or in the place they prefer, which is Palestine, and then guarantee their right to this place, if necessary, by force of arms.

The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. BLOOM] seemed indignant when it was suggested by some Member on this floor that he had said America should guarantee, by force of arms, the commonwealth sought by this resolution in Palestine.

Now, if the spirit of this resolution be right and humane and just, and if it proposes a solution to this question of which this whole Congress sincerely approves, then this Congress and this Nation should be prepared to back its approval to the utmost. I do not believe that there would be the slightest danger of war in the Near East, if the will of America in this question were firmly expressed and firmly upheld. What makes the situation in the Near East explosive is our lack of firmness and our failure to uphold our will. We talk hot for Palestine and blow cold the minute we are challenged to prove that we mean it. Is it any wonder that we are creating, with our hot talk and cold actions, a situation in that part of the world which gives joy to our enemies, who claim that we are hypocritical in all our democratic promises, and grief to our friends who have believed them, and that leaves all the peoples of that part of the world in turmoil and uncertainty? The Near East is, and always has been, an international tinderbox, but if and when the flames of riots or war break out there the wind that will fan them to a holocaust will be the wind of hypocrisy on the Palestine question. There will never be peace in the Near East until the Palestine problem is settled. Let us settle it in a manner worthy of a great idealistic nation, according to our consciences, firmly and without diplomatic equivocation and double talk.

Should we have to make some small display of American arms to prove that we meant it? I do not think we should ever need to do so. But let us reflect that American equipment—equipment marked "made in America"—is being used today in Java to shoot down the

natives there who are seeking their independence. When are we going to get around to keeping to the dispairful peoples of the world the high promises made in the Atlantic Charter? Shall we make more promises to the ears of suffering Jewry with this resolution, and break it to their hearts the minute it looks as though the promises we give are going to be the slightest bit troublesome? Far better to make no promises at all.

For there is a third thing we can do about the Jews—we can let them die and wash our hands of their immemorial and current tragedy, simply because we think that it is to our national interest not to become involved for their pitiful sakes, with more powerful peoples in the Near East. But the one thing we dare not do, as an honorable Christian nation, or Congress, is to weep crocodile tears over the cruel fate we have then helped to seal for them.

I hope that this resolution will not be considered as some seem to feel, a pious but meaningless gesture, which will soothe our consciences but commit us to nothing; a resolution which, in the words of many, "can do no harm, and may catch or hold some Jewish votes." I hope it will pass and mean what it promises—a permanent homeland for suffering Jewry.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I believe this resolution will pass. I deplore in our own country any anti-this or anti-that or anti-the-other. I believe that the passage of this resolution will not make people anti-Jewish. It will hold out and give a haven of refuge and of peace to the Jewish people. I remind the House that the Prince of Peace, whose birthday we commemorate next Tuesday, was a Jew. I believe it will pass and I hope unanimously.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, relying upon the wisdom and stanch patriotism of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House in this matter, insofar as its present status with the State Department is concerned, I am for the passage of this resolution now.

There is no time like the present for appropriate expressions of good will, good faith, tolerance, and understanding of the problems of minority groups or peoples.

The Balfour paper, the treaty of 1925, these form a documentary foundation for the hopes and aspirations of these peoples. But what good is an international paper if it is treated as though it did not exist.

This resolution is not in effect a law when passed. It is only the sincere, clear, expression of the American Congress for the hearts and heads of the American people.

The Senate yesterday passed the same wording with only one negative vote. We should not do less with so few

Members on the floor to vote at this late hour.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield one-half minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I also have seen the poignant conditions of this stateless people who have suffered most keenly from the Nazi terror and the urgency of their need. I cannot believe we can quibble over such a homeopathic resolution as this, which surely can do no harm but may, in expressing our sympathy, do some good.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts the majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, as I have sat here and listened to the argument on this resolution, the technicalities advanced by some of my friends, and their mental ingenuity in opposition to this meritorious and humane resolution have amazed me. With all due respect to my distinguished friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], it is very difficult for me to follow him, and I invariably do in his reasoning, to the extent that he advanced today that the passage of this resolution, and assuming that later there were established a Jewish state in Palestine, would increase anti-Semitism. It is rather difficult for me to follow also my friend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] in the brief observations he made. As far as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is concerned, there are several observations he made which I believe the historical facts leading up to this resolution contradict. He said, "This is not the time to press for action." That is what we heard a year ago. He said, "Why rush this through?" This is not being rushed through. Resolutions in various forms have been before the committees of both branches of the Congress for at least a year and this is only the culmination of a history going back over a year of efforts along this line. Furthermore, the resolution has been considered by the Senate committee. Everybody knows about it. Certainly it was carried extensively in the newspapers. I was conversant with it and I knew of the action of the subcommittee and the full committee.

The gentleman also said that the President has appointed a committee and we should wait for the report of that committee. The President himself has not said that, so far as 100,000 unfortunate Jews of Europe going into Palestine is concerned. The appointment of the American members of the Anglo-American commission was made with the understanding that the President would press his efforts in relation to trying to get 100,000 unfortunate Jews into Palestine. I know that. That was carried in the newspapers, but I know it myself from direct conversations I have had.

Mr. Chairman, we have got to look to the substance of this resolution and get away from the technicalities of it. Now, looking at the substance of it, what do we find? We find that 6,000,000 people have been killed during the last 4 years because of the accident of birth. It is only the act of God that none of

us, outside of those American Jews who are Members of Congress, were born of Jewish blood. Through accident of birth 6,000,000 people were exterminated. That is the evidence that has been presented within recent days in the Nuremberg trial; that is the evidence coming from official sources in Nazi Germany and admitted by our own representatives at that trial.

The substance of it is what appeals to me, the human side of it, and, as the gentlewoman from Connecticut well said, as I interpreted her statement, it is a challenge to Christianity. This is a challenge to the western civilization which is the Christian civilization.

What does the resolution do? There is nothing in it that should disturb anybody voting for it. In one of the whereases it is stated:

Whereas these urgent necessities are evidenced by the President's request for the immediate right of entry into Palestine of 100,000 additional Jewish refugees.

What is wrong with that? The other important part of the resolution is that the United States "shall use its good offices." We have done that repeatedly and on many other occasions in the past. Certainly, this humane and just resolution ought to pass and we should not permit mere technicalities to interfere with its passage.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the concurrent resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922, unanimously resolved "That the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected"; and

Whereas the ruthless persecution of the Jewish people in Europe has clearly demonstrated the need for a Jewish homeland as a haven for the large numbers who have become homeless as a result of this persecution; and

Whereas these urgent necessities are evidenced by the President's request for the immediate right of entry into Palestine of 100,000 additional Jewish refugees; and

Whereas the influx of Jewish immigration into Palestine is resulting in its improvement in agricultural, financial, hygienic, and general economic conditions; and

Whereas the President and the British Prime Minister have agreed upon the appointment of a Joint Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry to examine conditions in Palestine as they bear upon the problem of Jewish immigration and the Jewish situation in Europe and have requested a report within 120 days: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the interest shown by the President in the solution of this problem is hereby commended and that the United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development, so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic com-

monwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, this resolution is in my name. I have the honor of being a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I regret that I could not take the time during general debate to answer a number of the interrogatories directed to the committee. However, I think the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader and the gracious, distinguished, and brilliant lady from Connecticut have disposed of them far better than any powers I possess.

I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from New York and to the committee as well that there is not in this resolution, as it is before this House or as it was passed in the Senate, the intent either of the framers of the resolution or, as I see it and hear it and understand it elsewhere, that there be created in full bloom from the head of this Congress a political entity, a Jewish state. I want to hasten to add this, that I have the highest regard for the sincerity, the earnestness, and mental honesty of the gentleman from New York and I know exactly what he means. Segregation is a term of aspersion. These Jewish people want to go to Palestine. There is no intention or purpose to create here an international ghetto, nor is there any intention to create here a temporary ghetto, a mere expediency. The Zionist leader, Dr. Neumann, appeared before our committee. In the colloquy in answer to the gentleman from New York there is discussion relative to the Zionist movement of the creation of something in the nature of a dominion status. There is as well discussion for the creation of something that may be in the nature of that which exists with relation to Ireland and the British Empire. I asked Dr. Neumann this question: "Doctor, do you and the Zionists resist any of these propositions?" He said, "No; none." Lloyd George, when Prime Minister, in interpreting the Balfour Declaration, made it clear in reply to interrogatories similar to the statement of the gentleman from New York that he had no objection to such a proposition in due course.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman confuses me. I am strong for this resolution.

Mr. FLOOD. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. PLOESER. I believe in the Balfour Declaration and in the treaty.

Mr. FLOOD. Excellent.

Mr. PLOESER. I believe in it from a moral standpoint, and I never misinterpreted in my own mind as to what "national home" meant. I thought it meant a state. I endorse that, too, if that is the desire, but the gentleman says that it does not mean that,

Mr. FLOOD. I go to some pains to assure the gentleman that he misunderstood me. I concur in the statements made by the gentleman in support of the purpose and intent of the resolution.

Mr. Chairman, feeling that the hour has arrived for Congress to give appropriate and timely expression to its views on the need for the restoration of Palestine as the Jewish national homeland, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 113, which was reported out by the unanimous vote of the Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, on December 18. It is this resolution that is before us today for final action, and it is in support of this resolution that I now speak.

There is no doubt whatsoever that the language of this resolution reflects a long series of authoritative expressions of American policy and the views of the American people on the subject of Palestine. In the course of recent years this policy was repeatedly endorsed by numerous Members of Congress, notably in a petition addressed to the President of the United States on November 2, 1943, by 70 Members of the Senate and 194 Members of the House of Representatives and, on July 2, 1945, only 5 months ago, by 54 Members of the Senate and 251 Members of the House of Representatives, as well as by the governors of 37 States. This same language is to be found in the resolution passed on Monday of this week by the Senate by a vive voce vote with only one vote against it. At this point in my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I insert the text of the resolution:

Whereas the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922, unanimously resolved "That the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected"; and

Whereas the ruthless persecution of the Jewish people in Europe has clearly demonstrated the need for a Jewish homeland as a haven for the large numbers who have become homeless as a result of this persecution; and

Whereas these urgent necessities are evidenced by the President's request for the immediate right of entry into Palestine of 100,000 additional Jewish refugees; and

Whereas the influx of Jewish immigration into Palestine is resulting in its improvement in agricultural, financial, hygienic, and general economic conditions; and

Whereas the President and the British Prime Minister have agreed upon the appointment of a Joint Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry to examine conditions in Palestine as they bear upon the problem of Jewish immigration and the Jewish situation in Europe and have requested a report within 120 days: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the interest shown by the President in the solution of this problem is hereby commended and that the United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development, so that they

may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

I would like to make it clear that the support that I have received in bringing this matter to the floor has been non-partisan. Before the Foreign Affairs Committee hearings this week, both the majority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and the minority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], were eloquent in their pledge and avowals to the spirit and the intention and the purpose of this resolution. Likewise, from both sides of the aisle my colleagues have expressed gratification with this action. That is a true and heartening response from you who speak for your people, for this declaration is expressive of a deep-seated sentiment in favor of the Jewish homeland in Palestine, which is widespread among the American people and represents, as I have said before, a striking reaffirmation of the traditional American policy. It was only because of the war that this Congress did not earlier state its position. It was the wish and the desire of the membership to do so, but for the good of the common defense, for matters of state, it was thought best not to do so. But time is now of the essence and the contrary is rather the fact. I feel that we are impelled to reiterate our position at this time by the horrifying reports which have been pouring in concerning the mass slaughter of European Jews—acts of brutality which have shocked decent humanity everywhere. Thank God some of these vile creatures who perpetrated these acts, the leaders at least, are being brought to justice and retribution finds its way. But these terrible facts not only call for condemnation of these godless beings who would make a god of the omnipotent state, and for sympathy for their victims, but also demands of us a statesmanlike, constructive policy which would provide a more secure and dignified future for the Jewish people in the democratic world of tomorrow.

This resolution refers to the action of the Sixty-seventh Congress on June 30, 1922, when by unanimous action this purpose was upheld. The urgency of the situation is identified by the request of President Truman for right of entry for 100,000 Jews into Palestine and the general improvement of economic and other conditions resulting, historically, from such influx in the past. Reference is then made to the Joint Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry as to conditions in Palestine and Europe as they relate to the conditions of the Jews, and finally in the resolving clause, the action of President Truman is commended and the United States is called upon to use its good offices to the end that Palestine be opened for the free entry of Jews to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities. The measure provides further that this Government shall support "full opportunity for colonization and development", so that Jews may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine and the Jewish national home

and in association with all elements of the population establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

I might say, at this time, that as far as I am concerned, personally, this resolution does not go far enough; but in the best interest of the purpose sought to be accomplished, and for the greatest good of the greatest number of those who believe in law, agreements and treaties, as well as justice and humanity, I embrace this instrument. I am convinced that great good will come, and that immediately, from the passage of this declaration and certainly no harm can arise. I feel strongly that this is the psychological moment when the sweeping opinion of this mighty assembly will tip the scales in favor of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness for a people who have suffered to an extent beyond the magic of words to describe.

Here there is no purpose to create an international Jewish ghetto, so that evil, degrading curse of anti-Semitism might be encouraged. It is the Jewish people themselves who wish this haven. Here there is no purpose to create overnight a political entity; but rather to seek a democratic commonwealth through the evolution of time and circumstances which will combine through democratic processes to permit such an establishment "in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights." This is no racial or religious separatism. There is no concept of race-state or church-state relationship. A homeless people wish to go home. This is not the time to engage in a play on words, intention must not in the fullness of its spirit be sacrificed to mere form. Let us not succumb to the attractive blandishments of dialectics, never mind which came first, the chicken or the egg, or how many angels can dance on the point of a needle—people—human beings, are starving and dying and our honor to our promises, our pledges and our covenants are at stake.

At the same time, I have the deepest and most understanding respect for those who honestly and sincerely fear that this action will encourage rather than allay the vice of anti-Semitism. And in supporting this resolution, in the desire to have some action taken, your nobility of spirit and your statesmanlike conduct is to be even the more commended. I speak for millions in expressing this regard and gratitude to you.

All of the great talk at high levels about mandates, declarations, white papers, and international relations, simmers down to a case involving the lives of human beings and the future of a people. That states the problem succinctly. Appeasement as a national policy has never worked. Everywhere that it has been tried, it has failed. This is as true in Palestine as elsewhere.

There is every indication that events are moving swiftly, though cautiously, in the direction of evolving a definite program with relation to Palestine. The recent statement of the British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Bevin, indicates that the objective of a Jewish national home is not beyond the acceptance of His Britan-

nic Majesty's Government. A firm American stand, if diplomatically presented, would mobilize liberal British opinion. In fact, sections of the British public have appealed to American sympathizers to help them in their efforts to bring about a change of policy. As in so many other fields of international policy, so here, also, the issue is not between nations, but between emerging world democracy and the forces of reaction, hate and decay.

Today, in this historic hour, when the general structure of international security has been outlined, and the fate of the nations of the world is about to be decided, let us again stand united in our pledge to the Jewish people so that remnant of Israel in Europe may be saved and assured of a national home as a free and democratic commonwealth.

The Christian world approaches the eve of Christmas. Truly in this year of our Lord 1945, this birthday of the Christ child, will be a joyous feast day. There is present the spirit of freedom and rebirth that is so inspiringly set forth in the ancient cry "Peace on earth, good will among men." On this Christmas eve the Christian peoples and the Jewish peoples and all other peoples stand delivered from the plague of destruction, from the scourge of oppression and from the chains of bondage. A terrible era, desecrated by the Pharaoh curse which extended to all mankind, and the wild ride of the horsemen of the Apocalypse has come to a close; an era in which people were decimated, in which millions perished and the living were scattered to the four winds, doomed to misery, wandering, and want. On this Christmas let us sing of the miracle of deliverance and of the realization of the hoped for journey to the promised land. Let us hold out to the Jews of the world the pledge fulfilled, of the mission of the ancient Jewish homeland, in our own day, bursting upon them miraculously to provide once again the homeland and the refuge from hatred and death. Let the Christian world join in a great feast of fulfillment.

As Americans, we cannot avoid the moral problem that Palestine and the immigration of the Jews pose for us. We joined ourselves with the British in the approval of the Balfour Declaration. We joined in recognizing the British mandate over Palestine. By our passivity in the early days of Hitler's rule in Europe, we were moral partners in the disintegration of the world democratic will—a disintegration that became clear in its results—as testified to by so many of our colleagues here in the House—at Belsen, Dachau, and Buchenwald. By our action in the war, however, we became moral partners in the commitment to salvage as many of Hitler's victims as we could, and make further victimizing impossible. This, then, is an American problem as well as a British. This is the answer to those few who say, "Why should we bother? Palestine is a British headache; it is none of our business." We do not have a legal mandate in the matter; but we have the mandate of human conscience which is just as strong as any League of Nations parchment. Let us not look to a project to give the refugee Jews merely

a new and temporary ghetto, but give them their old and permanent home, where they are wanted and will be cherished, where they can make a living and a life. The Holy Land, the birthplace of the Christian and Jewish religions, can with all justice be given back to the people from whose travail a great religious impulse incorporated in two great religions had radiated throughout the world for thousands of years. It is our mission to spread further than ever before among the people of the earth the belief which all Americans cherish so deeply—that no man's liberty of conscience must be questioned as long as he does not question that of his neighbor and that men of varying faiths may live together in harmony and good will.

Mr. Chairman, I appeal to this House, whose deep love of freedom is reflected in its great generosity and devotion to the suffering of humanity, to help in this realization. I ask this for the sake of the living remnant of a great people. I ask it for the sake of the dead. I ask it for the sake of the Jewish people everywhere, so that there may be some end in sight to its sorrow and pain. I ask it, at this very hour of the turning point in the history of the world, because Palestine is the only land that can receive and redeem not hundreds but hundreds of thousands. I ask it because this is the hour of unique opportunity, of direct necessity, of greater urgency. This is the hour, Mr. Chairman, for the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to point the way as a beacon, to a haven of peace after the long voyage home, to declare that Palestine offers the strongest bridgehead to the shores of true freedom and true deliverance for our brothers in the great brotherhood of man who are sons of Israel.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 113—and ask its immediate and unanimous adoption.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. May I make this observation about something that was mentioned earlier, that is, the courage the Committee on Foreign Affairs has shown in bringing out this resolution. I do not think it is any business of the State Department or anyone else. We should legislate in this Hall and not depend on the State Department.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman for his usual helpful remarks.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I think the unkindest cut of all which could be offered in presentation of one's position or against another's position in the matter of this resolution is the indication or intimation that any man worthy of occupying the high position as a Member of the House of Representatives of the free United States of America would be moved in his action by anything relating to religion, race, creed, or color. I deny and I challenge the accusation, whether it be made with reference to one's action on the

right side of the aisle or the left. It is a matter of judgment as to whether at this particular time we are doing a service or a disservice to the very people we would all like to help in every way under the sun. It is the opinion of the speaker at this time that there is great danger that it may prove to be a serious disservice.

There is no probability or potentiality, connected with this resolution, which would offer help, aid, or security to the Jewish people of the world who are in distress and toward whom every one of us has the deepest sympathy and for whom every single one of us has the greatest concern. Why press this resolution at this time in face of the fact that the President of the United States has made arrangements by which the United States of America, in its deep concern for all the peoples of all the world, has provided what is referred to as a Joint Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry with the admonition and requirement that that committee shall act promptly and shall report within 120 days the result of the inquiry which shall have been made. We will have the benefit of that report when that time shall have expired. I think it is quite unkind also to stand and deny that the President of the United States has requested that we do not superimpose ourselves upon his efforts in this great and important matter by passing the resolution in the face of the provision he has made for this Anglo-American inquiry and its report. My position is that we will do a great disservice for the people we are trying to help. I have no disposition to act on the basis of race, creed, or color, as I have demonstrated with regard to the Negro race in this House. I do not have to answer for bigotry as to any race or creed. We may do the greatest disservice, by the adoption of this resolution, to the very people whom we want to help. This can be no more than a gesture and one that could be costly to them as well as to our country, of which many of them are citizens. Why not give this President's committee an opportunity to work out the problem intelligently.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take too much time, but I want to clear up one or two misunderstandings that have developed during this debate.

At the inception I want to speak of a prophecy made many centuries ago by the great Hebrew prophet, Isaiah, when he said:

Therefore the redeemed of the Lord shall return and come with singing into Zion.

I pray that that prophecy may now be fulfilled.

You ladies and gentlemen of the House would do well to adopt this resolution, consonant with that prophecy of that great Jewish prophet Isaiah.

Remember, the immigration bars are up all over the world. There is no place on God's greensward where the Jew is not unwanted, except in Palestine. There he may live in dignity, unafraid. Now a cruel colonial policy of the British Government seals the doors of Palestine. The Jews have a right to go to Palestine.

It has been proclaimed time out of mind their national home. The mandate that Great Britain was given over Palestine was given with the understanding that Great Britain would exercise only trusteeship, not ownership, over Zion, to the end that there would be established, through the instrumentality of His Majesty's Government, a Jewish national home.

We adopted in this Chamber in 1922 a resolution almost word for word with the resolution you are going to adopt today, whereby we proclaimed again Palestine as the Jewish national home, and we entered into a solemn treaty with Great Britain in 1924 where we reiterated that Palestine was again to be the national homeland for the Jews.

We further stated by that treaty, and agreed with England, that England would not have the right to discriminate on the basis of race or religion with reference either to the immigration into Palestine or land ownership in Palestine. But in 1939 Great Britain adopted the nefarious and infamous Malcolm-McDonald white paper, which flatly, blatantly, and with the greatest perfidy violated the treaty with the United States, violated the mandate that Britain had over Palestine, violated the Balfour Declaration. Britain did in that white paper discriminate against the Jews only. Nor was this discrimination on religious and racial ground. The mandates committee of the League of Nations, when England asked whether she could have the right to issue that white paper, not only said to Great Britain, "You have no right to issue that white paper precluding the Jews from Palestine, but we denounce in no uncertain terms your attempt to deny Palestine to the Jews."

Now we are trying to rectify those errors by this resolution. We call Britain to task for her perfidy. We challenge her to continue her injustice to the Jews. There has never been any doubt over the years that "Jewish national homeland" means a Jewish commonwealth. The Big Four, after the first World War, Lloyd George, Clemenceau, Wilson, and Orlando placed that interpretation on Jewish national home. Marshal Smuts, Lord Wedgwood, Harding, Coolidge, Roosevelt, all spoke of a Jewish democratic commonwealth.

Churchill himself, when he denounced the white paper on Palestine in 1939 which first limited and then barred completely Jewish immigration into Palestine, called it a filing of petition in moral bankruptcy.

Attlee, Morrison, and Bevin, Labor Party leaders, loudly proclaimed before election that they would see to it that there would be: First, unlimited Jewish immigration into Palestine; second, the ultimate establishment of a democratic Jewish commonwealth; third—and here they went further than anybody else—the shifting of Arabs out of Palestine to let the Jews enter.

Our own two major political parties in the last Presidential campaign came out solidly for a commonwealth and both Presidential candidates endorsed that plank in the platforms.

A Jewish state simply means a state where the Jews will be in a majority. It

means they will not live in a ghetto subject to the wiles, machinations, and maneuver of the leaders of a hostile majority.

It was never intended that Palestine should be set up as an Arab state. That is what "perfidious Albion" desires.

There is no idea in a commonwealth of a theocracy. There is no idea of a religious state. It simply means a state where the Jews will be in a majority and need not forever live in a ghetto.

Contrary to the views of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], a commonwealth does not mean all Jews must go to Palestine. That is absurd. Some of our smug, self-satisfied economic Bourbon Jews say that. They speak falsely. The American who is a Jew remains firmly, indissolubly an American. The American who is a Jew is an American first, last, and all the time. No one can argue to the contrary. It would be absurd to argue that the Irish-American who advocates the unification of Ireland must go back to Ireland, or because a Polish-American is in favor of a "greater Poland," he must go back to Poland. Contrary to the observations of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], there is no danger of a greater segregation. Unfortunately, anti-Semitism is so deep that it will exist no matter what we do with this resolution.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] asks why the rush? He speaks of the Anglo-American commission of inquiry. That is only a dodge and a stall for British delay. Whenever the British are forced to make a decision, they invoke the trick of a commission of inquiry. There have already been numerous commissions and reports—the Crane report, the Peel commission, the mandates commission, the Harrison report, the Eisenhower report, the Rifkind report, the joint distribution committee report.

All facts are known. There is no need for any more reports with consequent delays. The Jews are languishing in concentration camps. They are dying by the thousands by the roadsides. Their disembodied spirits could not wait for inquiries. The winter's cold does not wait for the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]. Death awaits no one, not even the recommendations of the Anglo-American commission of inquiry.

We must now have action to implement promises.

Let Britain dare to refuse to abide by the resolution we passed today. She will then stand condemned before the court of public opinion the world over.

Somebody spoke of our doing a disservice to the Jews if we pass this resolution. The Jews themselves are the best judges of the worthwhileness of this resolution. They want it. They do not fear the Arabs. The Jews can take care of themselves. They have before.

If permitted to have their own brigade as well as a few airplanes and tanks, they could easily disperse and defeat the horsemen and camel riders of the desert. No one has asked for the use of American troops in Palestine. They are not needed there.

Pass this resolution as an act of mercy, as an act of justice, as an act of righteousness.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

All time has expired. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FOGARTY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration House Concurrent Resolution 113, pursuant to House Resolution 466, he reported the resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the resolution.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the motion comes too late.

The SPEAKER. Just a moment.

The Chair really thinks the gentleman from New York is too late with his motion.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I was seeking recognition, Mr. Speaker, vocally at the time.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman says he was on his feet for that purpose, the Chair, of course, will accept the gentleman's word.

Is the gentleman opposed to the resolution?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WADSWORTH moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WADSWORTH) there were—ayes 36, noes 133.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 44, relative to the opening of Palestine for free entry of Jews.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States on June 30, 1923, unanimously resolved "That the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected"; and

Whereas the ruthless persecution of the Jewish people in Europe has clearly demonstrated the need for a Jewish homeland as

a haven for the large numbers who have become homeless as a result of this persecution; and

Whereas these urgent necessities are evidenced by the President's request for the immediate right of entry into Palestine of 100,000 additional Jewish refugees; and

Whereas the influx of Jewish immigration into Palestine is resulting in its improvement in agricultural, financial, hygienic, and economic conditions; and

Whereas the President and the British Prime Minister have agreed upon the appointment of a Joint Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry to examine conditions in Palestine as they bear upon the problem of Jewish immigration and the Jewish situation in Europe and have requested a report within 120 days: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the interest shown by the President in the solution of this problem is hereby commended and that the United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development, so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings by which House Concurrent Resolution 113, relating to the opening of Palestine for free entry of Jews, were vacated and the resolution was laid on the table.

FREIGHT FORWARDERS DESIGNATED CARRIERS OF BONDED MERCHANDISE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 914) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, so as to permit the designation of freight forwarders as carriers of bonded merchandise.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 551 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 19, sec. 1551) be, and it hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 551. BONDING OF CARRIERS.—Under such regulations and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe, any common carrier of merchandise owning or operating a railroad, steamship, or other transportation line or route for the transportation of merchandise in the United States, or any freight forwarder, as defined in section 402 of part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. III, title 49, sec. 1002 (5)), upon application, may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be designated as a carrier of bonded merchandise for the final release of which from customs custody a permit has not been issued."

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Senate bill S. 914, which was passed in the Senate October 22 and reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means in the House December 17, without amendment, is an important, although simple, amendment to section 551 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. The nature and purpose of the bill is more fully explained in the report of the committee. Specifically, it simply authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to designate freight forwarders as carriers of bonded merchandise, along with railroads, steamship lines, and other common carriers. The purpose of Section 551 as it reads now is to protect bonded merchandise while in the possession of a common carrier. Bonded merchandise consists usually of imported articles received at various ports of entry in the United States and immediately shipped to their respective destinations where the required duty is paid.

As stated in the committee's report, only those common carriers who own or operate railroad, steamship, or other transportation lines or routes are eligible to transport such imported merchandise in bond. But for more than 10 years the Treasury Department has interpreted this section as being applicable to freight forwarders, and many freight forwarders have, pursuant to the statute, been designated as carriers of bonded merchandise. This conception of the statute was not questioned until recently when the Treasury Department advised a company engaged in freight forwarding that its bonding would be discontinued because the old regulation was deemed to have been upon a misconception of section 551 of the Tariff Act.

Now it transpires that all freight forwarders are threatened with a loss of their bonds and will no longer be eligible to carry bonded merchandise. This presents a very serious situation, which must be corrected immediately because the Treasury Department has indicated that they can no longer designate freight forwarders as bonded carriers after December 31, this year.

The bill will not change any present administrative practice or policy. It creates no new power or authority in the Secretary of the Treasury, and from the standpoint of the Department is entirely acceptable.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read and the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a news release under today's date relative to FHA loans to veterans.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, previously permission was given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a copy of a letter I addressed to the Attorney General of the United States on December 10 relative to the gas rebates in the Detroit area and a copy of his reply dated December 14, 1945, to which are attached several exhibits. The Public Printer advises that the material will make approximately 5 pages in the RECORD and that the cost will be \$260. Notwithstanding the additional cost, I

ask unanimous consent that this material may be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension will be made.

There was no objection.

SHORTAGE OF HOUSING

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Speaker, when the emergency of war came upon us, the Nation responded with a determination and with a virility that astounded the world. We met that emergency. We needed ships, planes, tanks, and guns. We needed factories in which to build them. We built these factories. We produced the necessary war materials—without delay. There is another emergency upon us now, and it is an acute one. I refer to the shortage of housing. The problem is most serious, and yet we appear helpless in the face of that emergency. Why cannot this Government meet this situation with the same determination, with the same spirit, and with the same energy with which it met the great war emergency? We must build houses and build them now. We can build them, and we can build them now.

I need not discuss at length the seriousness of the housing situation. Recently I read in the New York Times the report of the mayor-elect's emergency committee on housing. In that report the committee states that some form of shelter must be provided in the city of New York for at least 40,000 families—for 140,000 persons. Add to that report the statement of Mayor LaGuardia that at a recent conference of mayors it was disclosed the same situation exists throughout the country. It is disheartening to read in the same report that, except for makeshift expediences, there can be no hope of any new housing ready for occupancy until 1947. I cannot accept that conclusion. We need not accept it. I repeat, we must build, and build now. It must be done, and it can be done.

What is holding up this building program? I can understand why private industry will not build. They tell us you cannot expect a man to build, not knowing what return he will get on his investment. Likewise, how can you expect private industry to build when industry cannot now know whether essential building materials will be available? Nor can the cost of construction be figured, not knowing what the cost of materials and what the cost of labor will be. Mayor LaGuardia, in his radio speech of last week, pointed out the seriousness of the situation when he stated that he could not let a contract for construction of a housing project because no contractor could estimate today what it would cost to build. The reasons for the delay may be good or bad—but that is beside

the point. The fact is that there is no real construction in progress now. What are we to do? Are we to stand by and do nothing to break the bottleneck? Are we to do nothing to provide relief, not only for returning veterans and war workers but for the tens of thousands of our citizens who need shelter? I say that if we approach this problem as vigorously as we approached the problems that confronted us at the outbreak of the war we can solve it, and we must solve it at once.

When the Government decided that it needed those tremendous war materials, we cast aside every obstacle in our way. If the Government needed a building site, it took it. If it had to build a plant, it ordered it built. Nobody could, or did, stand in the way of the advancement of the war program. Nothing and nobody need stand in the way of our solving the emergency building problem now.

I therefore propose that the Congress vest in the President of the United States, or in any agency which he may designate, the power to build such housing accommodations as he may deem necessary, in such manner as he may deem advisable, and in such places as he may deem for the best interests of the country. I recommend that he use his war powers in order to accomplish this objective. Contracts should be let at once subject to renegotiation. The President should have the power to requisition whatever material may be necessary. No lack of power should stand in his way to accomplish the necessary objective.

I know there are many who object to Government intervention in a field that they deem reserved for private enterprise. The program I propose, however, will not interfere with private enterprise. The buildings will be built by private industry and I propose that after they are constructed, the Government sell those buildings to private management, reserving the right to manage them only until such time as it is able to sell. This program will constitute no interference with private enterprise. It will merely utilize the great powers of Government to remove obstacles now in the way of immediate large-scale construction.

I have introduced a bill today to accomplish the following purposes:

First. To authorize and direct the President of the United States through such agencies as he may designate to commence construction of housing facilities in any part of this country that he may deem necessary and essential for the public welfare.

Second. To requisition such material wherever it may be for the purpose of carrying out the building program.

Third. To condemn such sites and acquire such land as may be necessary for that program.

Fourth. To let out contracts to private industry on any basis he may deem most expeditious for the purpose of this construction.

Fifth. Upon the completion of any structure, to sell it to private management for the best price obtainable, reserving the right to manage until the sale is effectuated.

Only through Government intervention and the Government exercising of its wide powers can we provide the needed housing.

I am not concerned about the cost of the program. If I have any experience in real estate at all—and I have been chairman of the Mortgage Commission of the State of New York, having supervised the management of over 4,000 buildings, the reorganization and refinancing of over 20,000 mortgage issues, and having had control of \$700,000,000 worth of mortgages—I feel confident that the loss that the Government may sustain as a result of this program, if indeed any at all, will far be offset by the good it will do in solving the problem that confronts the country today. This great emergency arises out of the war and it becomes the duty of our Government to meet it.

It may be desirable to lend England \$4,000,000,000. I know it was necessary to give UNRRA \$2,700,000,000. I claim it is just as important, in fact, it is imperative that we provide for the urgent needs of our people.

Recently a young lady who visited the Capital made the remark that "within the walls of the Capitol Building anything can be done." She is pretty nearly right. We can, if we will, build houses now. We should and we must.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and also to extend his remarks in the RECORD in another instance.

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. RANDOLPH) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a communication on Navy demobilization addressed to all Members of Congress.

Mr. DE LACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to include as part of her remarks certain information.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in each to include certain excerpts.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in committee today and to include certain excerpts, statements, and several articles.

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances and to include editorials and news articles.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In my message of September 6, 1945, I stated that I would communicate with the Congress from time to time during the current session with respect to a comprehensive and continuous program of national security. I pointed out the necessity of making timely preparation for the Nation's long-range security now, while we are still mindful of what it has cost us in this war to have been unprepared.

On October 23, 1945, as part of that program, there was presented for your consideration a proposal for universal military training. It was based upon the necessities of maintaining a well-trained citizenry which could be quickly mobilized in time of need in support of a small professional Military Establishment. Long and extensive hearings have now been held by the Congress on this recommendation. I think that the proposal, in principle, has met with the overwhelming approval of the people of the United States.

We are discharging our armed forces now at the rate of 1,500,000 a month. We can with fairness no longer look to the veterans of this war for any future military service. It is essential therefore that universal training be instituted at the earliest possible moment to provide a reserve upon which we can draw if, unhappily, it should become necessary. A grave responsibility will rest upon the Congress if it continues to delay this most important and urgent measure.

Today, again in the interest of national security and world peace, I make this further recommendation to you. I recommend that the Congress adopt legislation combining the War and Navy Departments into one single Department of National Defense. Such unification is another essential step—along with universal training—in the development of a comprehensive and continuous program for our future safety and for the peace and security of the world.

One of the lessons which have most clearly come from the costly and dangerous experience of this war is that there must be unified direction of land, sea and air forces at home as well as in all other parts of the world where our armed forces are serving.

We did not have that kind of direction when we were attacked 4 years ago—and we certainly paid a high price for not having it.

In 1941, we had two completely independent organizations with no well-established habits of collaboration and cooperation between them. If disputes arose, if there was failure to agree on a

question of planning or a question of action, only the President of the United States could make a decision effective on both. Besides, in 1941, the air power of the United States was not organized on a par with the ground and sea forces.

Our expedient for meeting these defects was the creation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. On this committee sat the President's Chief of Staff and the chiefs of the land forces, the naval forces, and the air forces. Under the joint chiefs were organized a number of committees bringing together personnel of the three services for joint strategic planning and for coordination of operations. This kind of coordination was better than no coordination at all, but it was in no sense a unified command.

In the theaters of operation, meanwhile, we went further in the direction of unity by establishing unified commands. We came to the conclusion—soon confirmed by experience—that any extended military effort required overall coordinated control in order to get the most out of the three armed forces. Had we not early in the war adopted this principle of a unified command for operations, our efforts, no matter how heroic, might have failed.

But we never had comparable unified direction or command in Washington. And even in the field our unity of operations was greatly impaired by the differences in training, in doctrine, in communication systems, and in supply and distribution systems, that stemmed from the division of leadership in Washington.

It is true we were able to win in spite of these handicaps. But it is now time to take stock, to discard obsolete organizational forms and to provide for the future the soundest, the most effective and the most economical kind of structure for our armed forces of which this most powerful Nation is capable.

I urge this as the best means of keeping the peace.

No nation now doubts the good will of the United States for the maintenance of a lasting peace in the world. Our purpose is shown by our efforts to establish an effective United Nations Organization. But all nations—and particularly those unfortunate nations which have felt the heel of the Nazis, the Fascists, or the Japs—know that desire for peace is futile unless there is also enough strength ready and willing to enforce that desire in any emergency. Among the things that have encouraged aggression and the spread of war in the past have been the unwillingness of the United States realistically to face this fact, and her refusal to fortify her aims of peace before the forces of aggression could gather in strength.

Now that our enemies have surrendered it has again become all too apparent that a portion of the American people are anxious to forget all about the war, and particularly to forget all the unpleasant factors which are required to prevent future wars.

Whether we like it or not, we must all recognize that the victory which we have won has placed upon the American people the continuing burden of responsibility for world leadership. The future peace of the world will depend in large

part upon whether or not the United States shows that it is really determined to continue in its role as a leader among nations. It will depend upon whether or not the United States is willing to maintain the physical strength necessary to act as a safeguard against any future aggressor. Together with the other United Nations, we must be willing to make the sacrifices necessary to protect the world from future aggressive warfare. In short, we must be prepared to maintain in constant and immediate readiness sufficient military strength to convince any future potential aggressor that this Nation, in its determination for a lasting peace, means business.

We would be taking a grave risk with the national security if we did not move now to overcome permanently the present imperfections in our defense organization. However great was the need for coordination and unified command in World War II, it is sure to be greater if there is any future aggression against world peace. Technological developments have made the armed services much more dependent upon each other than ever before. The boundaries that once separated the Army's battlefield from the Navy's battlefield have been virtually erased. If there is ever going to be another global conflict, it is sure to take place simultaneously on land and sea and in the air, with weapons of ever greater speed and range. Our combat forces must work together in one team as they have never been required to work together in the past.

We must assume, further, that another war would strike much more suddenly than the last, and that it would strike directly at the United States. We cannot expect to be given the opportunity again to experiment in organization and in ways of teamwork while the fighting proceeds. True preparedness now means preparedness not alone in armaments and numbers of men, but preparedness in organization also. It means establishing in peacetime the kind of military organization which will be able to meet the test of sudden attack quickly and without having to improvise radical readjustment in structure and habits.

The basic question is what organization will provide the most effective employment of our military resources in time of war and the most effective means for maintaining peace. The manner in which we make this transition in the size, composition, and organization of the armed forces will determine the efficiency and cost of our national defense for many years to come.

Improvements have been made since 1941 by the President in the organization of the War and Navy Departments under the War Powers Act. Unless the Congress acts before these powers lapse, these Departments will revert to their prewar organizational status. This would be a grievous mistake.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff are not a unified command. It is a committee which must depend for its success upon the voluntary cooperation of its member agencies. During the war period of extreme national danger, there was, of course, a high degree of cooperation. In peacetime the situation will be different.

It must not be taken for granted that the Joint Chiefs of Staff as now constituted will be as effective in the apportionment of peacetime resources as they have been in the determination of war plans and in their execution. As national defense appropriations grow tighter, and as conflicting interests make themselves felt in major issues of policy and strategy, unanimous agreements will become more difficult to reach.

It was obviously impossible in the midst of conflict to reorganize the armed forces of the United States along the lines here suggested. Now that our enemies have surrendered, I urge the Congress to proceed to bring about a reorganization of the management of the armed forces.

Further studies of the general problem would serve no useful purpose. There is enough evidence now at hand to demonstrate beyond question the need for a unified department. A great many of the reasons for establishing a single department have been brought out already in public discussion and in congressional committee hearings. To me the most important reasons for combining the two existing Departments are these:

1. We should have integrated strategic plans and a unified military program and budget.

With the coming of peace, it is clear that we must not only continue, but strengthen, our present facilities for integrated planning. We cannot have the sea, land, and air members of our defense team working at what may turn out to be cross purposes, planning their programs on different assumptions as to the nature of the Military Establishment we need, and engaging in an open competition for funds.

Strategy, program, and budget are all aspects of the same basic decisions. Using the advice of our scientists and our intelligence officers, we must make the wisest estimate as to the probable nature of any future attack upon us, determine accordingly how to organize and deploy our military forces, and allocate the available manpower, matériel, and financial resources in a manner consistent with the over-all plan.

Up to the present time, the make-up and balance of our armed forces have not been planned as a whole. Programs and budget requests from the Army and Navy have been formulated separately, on the basis of independent concepts of mission and function. These separate programs and budgets have not been considered together until after they have passed out of military hands and even out of the hands of the Secretaries of War and the Navy. The whole job of reconciling the divergent claims of the Departments has been thrust upon the President and the Congress.

This war has demonstrated completely that the resources of this Nation in manpower and in raw materials are not unlimited. To realize this is to comprehend the urgent need for finding a way to allocate these resources intelligently among the competing services. This means designing a balanced military structure reflecting a considered apportionment of responsibility among the services for the performance of a joint mission.

From experience as a Member of the Congress, I know the great difficulty of appraising properly the over-all security needs of the Nation from piecemeal presentations by separate departments appearing before separate congressional committees at different times. It is only by combining the armed forces into a single department that the Congress can have the advantage of considering a single coordinated and comprehensive security program.

2. We should realize the economies that can be achieved through unified control of supply and service functions.

Instances of duplication among Army and Navy activities and facilities have been brought to the attention of the Congress on many occasions. The degree of unity that was accomplished during the war in strategic planning and in theater command is in striking contrast with the separatism that prevailed in the whole range of supply and service functions.

It will never be possible to achieve absolute coordination of the supply and service functions of all services. Neither the War Department nor the Navy Department has been able to eliminate all duplication even within its own organization. But there is no question that the extent of waste through lack of coordination between the two Departments is very much greater than the waste resulting from faulty coordination within each. If we can attain as much coordination among all the services as now exists within each Department, we shall realize extensive savings.

Consolidation of the Departments will, for example, reduce the volume of supplies that need to be procured. Supply requirements, for example, begin with a calculation of so many items per man to be supplied. But to this basic figure must be added margins of safety, to account for items in storage, transportation lags, break-downs in delivery, emergency demands, and so forth. In these margins, savings can be made through unified systems of supply. As the volume handled in any supply system grows, the percentage factor which has to be added for reserves is reduced.

In the same way, both the Army and the Navy must add a margin of safety to their requirements for production plants, depots, hospitals, air training fields, and other types of construction common to both services. When the requirements are pooled, the total amount of margin may be reduced. The same is true of personnel. Each service must add a margin of safety in estimating its requirements for doctors, nurses, skilled mechanics, and other types of specialists. The total margin is greater if the computations are made separately. Another source of economy will be the pooling of facilities and personnel in localities where at present both services have to operate, but where from the nature of the circumstances, facilities and personnel are not fully used.

Other examples of duplication could be cited. Businessmen have to deal with separate buyers, who may use separate specifications for items which could as well have the same specifications. Separate inspectors are stationed in their

plants. During this war, instances occurred where the purchase of all available quantities of certain items by one service resulted in acute shortages in the other service. Parallel transportation and storage systems required extra overhead.

As the war progressed, it is true that increased cooperation reduced the extent of waste and conflict. But voluntary cooperation in such matters can never be expected to be fully effective. A single authority at the top would inevitably achieve a greater degree of economy than would be obtained under divided direction.

3. We should adopt the organizational structure best suited to fostering coordination between the military and the remainder of the Government.

Our military policy and program are only a part of a total national program aimed at achieving our national objectives of security and peace. This total program has many aspects, and many agencies of the Government must participate in its execution.

Our military policy, for example, should be completely consistent with our foreign policy. It should be designed to support and reflect our commitments to the United Nations Organization. It should be adjusted according to the success or lack of success of our diplomacy. It should reflect our fullest knowledge of the capabilities and intentions of other powers. Likewise, our foreign policy should take into account our military capabilities and the strategic power of our armed forces.

A total security program has still other major aspects. A military program, standing alone, is useless. It must be supported in peacetime by planning for industrial mobilization and for development of industrial and raw-material resources where these are insufficient. Programs of scientific research must be developed for military purposes, and their results woven into the defense program. The findings of our intelligence service must be applied to all of these.

Formulation and execution of a comprehensive and consistent national program embracing all these activities are extremely difficult tasks. They are made more difficult the greater the number of departments and agencies whose policies and programs have to be coordinated at the top level of the executive branch. They are simplified as the number of these agencies can be reduced.

The consolidation of the War and Navy Departments would greatly facilitate the ease and speed with which the armed forces and the other departments could exchange views and come to agreement on matters of common concern. It would minimize the extent to which interservice differences have to be discussed and settled by the civilian leaders whose main concern should be the more fundamental job of building over-all national policy.

4. We should provide the strongest means for civilian control of the military. Civilian control of the Military Establishment—one of the most fundamental of our democratic concepts—would be strengthened if the President and the Congress had but one Cabinet member

with clear and primary responsibility for the exercise of that control. When the Military Establishment is divided between two civilian Secretaries, each is limited necessarily to a restricted view of the Military Establishment. Consequently, on many fundamental issues where the civilian point of view should be controlling, the Secretaries of the two Departments are cast in the role of partisans of their respective services, and real civilian control can be exercised by no one except the President or the Congress.

During and since the war, the need for joint action by the services and for objective recommendations on military matters has led inevitably to increasing the authority of the only joint organization and the most nearly objective organization that exists, the Joint Chiefs of Staff. But the Joint Chiefs of Staff are a strictly military body. Responsibility for civilian control should be clearly fixed in a single full-time civilian below the President. This requires a Secretary for the entire Military Establishment, aided by a strong staff of civilian assistants.

There is no basis for the fear that such an organization would lodge too much power in a single individual, that the concentration of so much military power would lead to militarism. There is no basis for such fear as long as the traditional policy of the United States is followed that a civilian, subject to the President, the Congress, and the will of the people, be placed at the head of this Department. The safety of the democracy of the United States lies in the solid good sense and unshakable conviction of the American people. They need have no fear that their democratic liberties will be imperiled so long as they continue fulfilling their duties of citizenship.

5. We should organize to provide parity for air power.

Air power has been developed to a point where its responsibilities are equal to those of land and sea power, and its contribution to our strategic planning is as great. In operation, air power receives its separate assignment in the execution of an over-all plan. These facts were finally recognized in this war in the organizational parity which was granted to air power within our principal unified commands.

Parity for air power can be achieved in one department or in three, but not in two. As between one department and three, the former is infinitely to be preferred. The advantages of a single department are indeed much clearer when the alternative is seen to be three departments rather than the present two. The existence of three departments would complicate tremendously every problem of coordination that now exists between the War and Navy Departments, and between the services and the rest of the Government.

The Cabinet is not merely a collection of executives administering different governmental functions. It is a body whose combined judgment the President uses to formulate the fundamental policies of the administration. In such a group, which is designed to develop teamwork wisdom on all subjects that affect the political life of the country, it would be

inappropriate and unbalanced to have three members representing three different instruments of national defense.

The President, as Commander in Chief, should not personally have to coordinate the Army and Navy and Air Force. With all the other problems before him, the President cannot be expected to balance either the organization, the training or the practice of the several branches of national defense. He should be able to rely for that coordination upon civilian hands at the Cabinet level.

6. We should establish the most advantageous framework for a unified system of training for combined operations of land, sea, and air.

Whatever the form which any future war may take, we know that the men of our separate services will have to work together in many kinds of combinations for many purposes. The Pacific campaign of the recent war is an outstanding example of common and joint effort among land, sea, and air forces. Despite its successes, that campaign proved that there is not adequate understanding among the officers and men of any service of the capabilities, the uses, the procedures, and the limitations of the other services.

This understanding is not something that can be created overnight whenever a combined operation is planned and a task force organized. The way men act in combat is determined by the sum total of all their previous training, indoctrination, and experience.

What we seek is a structure which can best produce an integrated training program, carry on merged training activities where that is appropriate, and permit officers to be assigned in such a way that an individual officer will learn firsthand of other services besides the one in which he has specialized. The organizational framework most conducive to this kind of unified training and doctrine is a unified department.

7. We should allocate systematically our limited resources for scientific research.

No aspect of military preparedness is more important than scientific research. Given the limited amount of scientific talent that will be available for military purposes, we must systematically apply that talent to research in the most promising lines and on the weapons with the greatest potentiality, regardless of the service in which these weapons will be used. We cannot afford to waste any of our scientific resources in duplication of effort.

This does not mean that all Army and Navy laboratories would be immediately or even ultimately consolidated. The objective should be to preserve initiative and enterprise while eliminating duplication and misdirected effort. This can be accomplished only if we have an organizational structure which will permit fixing responsibility at the top for coordination among the services.

8. We should have unity of command in outlying bases.

All military authority at each of our outlying bases should be placed under a single commander who will have clear responsibility for security, who can be

held clearly accountable, and whose orders come from a single authority in Washington. Reconnaissance planes, radar sets, and intelligence and counter-intelligence measures at a United States outpost are not intended to serve separate services for different purposes. Unification of the services offers a far greater guaranty of continued unity in the field than does our present organization.

9. We should have consistent and equitable personnel policies.

There have been differences in personnel policies between the Army and the Navy during the war. They began with competitive recruitment for certain types of persons, and continued in almost every phase of personnel administration. In rates of promotion, in ways of selecting officers, in the utilization of Reserve officers, in awards and decorations, in allowances, and in point systems for discharge, the two services have followed different policies.

This inconsistency is highly undesirable. It will be reduced to a minimum under a unified organization.

Any bill which is enacted to carry out these recommendations cannot provide immediately the ultimate organization plan to accomplish unification. It can only prescribe the general organization of the authorities at the top levels of the unified department.

I recommend that the reorganization of the armed services be along the following broad lines.

(1) There should be a single Department of National Defense. This Department should be charged with the full responsibility for armed national security. It should consist of the armed and civilian forces that are now included within the War and Navy Departments.

(2) The head of this Department should be a civilian, a member of the President's Cabinet, to be designated as the Secretary of National Defense. Under him there should be a civilian Under Secretary and several civilian Assistant Secretaries.

(3) There should be three coordinated branches of the Department of National Defense: One for the land forces, one for the naval forces, and one for the air forces, each under an Assistant Secretary. The Navy should, of course, retain its own carrier-, ship-, and water-based aviation, which has proved so necessary for efficient fleet operation. And, of course, the Marine Corps should be continued as an integral part of the Navy.

(4) The Under Secretary and the remaining Assistant Secretaries should be available for assignment to whatever duties the President and the Secretary may determine from time to time.

(5) The President and the Secretary should be provided with ample authority to establish central coordinating and service organizations, both military and civilian, where these are found to be necessary. Some of these might be placed under Assistant Secretaries, some might be organized as central service organizations, and some might be organized in a top military staff to integrate the military leadership of the Department. I do not believe that we can

specify at this time the exact nature of these organizations. They must be developed over a period of time by the President and the Secretary as a normal part of their executive responsibilities. Sufficient strength in these Department-wide elements of the Department, as opposed to the separate service elements, will insure that real unification is ultimately obtained. The President and the Secretary should not be limited in their authority to establish Department-wide coordinating and service organizations.

(6) There should be a Chief of Staff of the Department of National Defense. There should also be a commander for each of the three component branches—Army, Navy, and Air.

(7) The Chief of Staff and the commanders of the three coordinate branches of the Department should together constitute an advisory body to the Secretary of National Defense and to the President. There should be nothing to prevent the President, the Secretary, and other civilian authorities from communicating with the commanders of any of the components of the Department on such vital matters as basic military strategy and policy and the division of the budget. Furthermore, the key staff positions in the Department should be filled with officers drawn from all the services, so that the thinking of the Department would not be dominated by any one or two of the services.

As an additional precaution, it would be wise if the post of Chief of Staff were rotated among the several services, whenever practicable and advisable, at least during the period of evolution of the new unified Department. The tenure of the individual officer designated to serve as Chief of Staff should be relatively short—2 or 3 years—and should not, except in time of a war emergency declared by the Congress, be extended beyond that period.

Unification of the services must be looked upon as a long-term job. We all recognize that there will be many complications and difficulties. Legislation of the character outlined will provide us with the objective, and with the initial means whereby forward-looking leadership in the Department, both military and civilian, can bring real unification into being. Unification is much more than a matter of organization. It will require new viewpoints, new doctrine, and new habits of thinking throughout the departmental structure. But in the comparative leisure of peacetime, and utilizing the skill and experience of our staff and field commanders who brought us victory, we should start at once to achieve the most efficient instrument of national safety.

Once a unified department has been established, other steps necessary to the formulation of a comprehensive national security program can be taken with greater ease. Much more than a beginning has already been made in achieving consistent political and military policy through the establishment of the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee. With respect to military research, I have in a previous message to the Congress proposed the establishment of a Federal

research agency, among whose responsibilities should be the promotion and coordination of fundamental research pertaining to the defense and security of the Nation. The development of a coordinated, Government-wide intelligence system is in process. As the advisability of additional action to insure a broad and coordinated program of national security becomes clear, I shall make appropriate recommendations or take the necessary action to that end.

The American people have all been enlightened and gratified by the free discussion which has taken place within the services and before the committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The Congress, the people, and the President have benefited from a clarification of the issues that could have been provided in no other way. But however strong the opposition that has been expressed by some of our outstanding senior officers and civilians, I can assure the Congress that once unification has been determined upon as the policy of this Nation, there is no officer or civilian in any service who will not contribute his utmost to make the unification a success.

I make these recommendations in the full realization that we are undertaking a task of greatest difficulty. But I am certain that when the task is accomplished, we shall have a Military Establishment far better adapted to carry out its share of our national program for achieving peace and security.

HARRY TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 19, 1945.

UNIFICATION OF WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the Presidential message on the need for unification of the War and Navy Departments to establish a single Department of Defense, just read to this House, is to me most gratifying. The gentleman from Alabama, Chairman MANASCO, of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, has given assurance that consideration by his group, of which I am a member, will be held early next year on H. R. 550, which I have continued to introduce since 1939. I trust that the Congress, by appropriate action, will in the near future enact the necessary legislation which our Chief Executive advocates. The proposal is sound and vital to America's future welfare. The country is solidly behind such a meritorious program.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HINSHAW, until January 10, on account of personal business.

To Mr. O'HARA (at the request of Mr. MICHENER), for 1 week, on account of illness.

To Mr. HEDRICK (at the request of Mr. BAILEY), on account of sickness.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1415. An act to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 405. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 20, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

The Committee on the Census will hold hearings on H. R. 4781 on Thursday and Friday mornings, January 24 and 25, 1946, at 10 o'clock.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 5056. A bill to make the Federal Bureau of Investigation an independent agency of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 5057. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to provide that the disposal of surplus property to veterans be given priority over all other disposals of surplus property except transfers of surplus property to other Government agencies for their own use; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 5058. A bill to provide military or naval training for all male citizens who attain the age of 18 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURCH:

H. R. 5059. A bill to provide temporary additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 5060. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia," approved May 27, 1924; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RABIN:

H. R. 5061. A bill to provide a method of relieving the existing acute housing shortage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 5062. A bill to make more effective the veterans' preference under the Surplus Property Act of 1944; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 5063. A bill to repeal section 800 (b) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 5064. A bill to amend section 800 (b) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of

1944; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 5065. A bill for the relief of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 5066. A bill to equalize the rates of pay of all personnel in the United States Army, the Philippine Scouts, and the Philippine Commonwealth Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. J. Res. 295. Joint Resolution to provide for a proper ceremony commemorating the flag which flew over the Capitol on declaration of war against Japan, Germany, and Italy, and which has now been flown in those surrendered countries, and for the creation of a commission to provide a proper celebration of such flag and to preserve and perpetuate war flags and symbols and all the records pertaining thereto; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 296. Joint resolution to provide for the mobilization of scientific skills and industrial facilities to perfect and manufacture atomic energy for use and application to peaceful productive purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 5067. A bill for the relief of John C. Schoch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 5068. A bill for the relief of Foster Boat Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 5069. A bill for the relief of Mattie A. Horner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 5070. A bill for the relief of Arthur E. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 5071. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dora Foster; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 5072. A bill for the relief of Arthur De Filippis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 5073. A bill for the relief of T. N. Carlton; 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:

1427. By Mr. CHENOWETH: Memorial of Colorado General Assembly, requesting Congress to amend the Social Security Act to permit the needy aged to receive old age assistance while being inmates of public institutions, provided, that they have not been committed to such institution by a court, that they pay for their care in such institution, and that they may enter or leave such institution upon their free choice; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1428. Also, memorial of Colorado General Assembly, requesting Congress to conduct an investigation of conditions existing in connection with the administration of the national forests, to the end that legislation may be passed removing existing evils and giving all areas of Federal land for grazing purposes the same uniform, reasonable, and just treatment; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1429. Also, memorial of Colorado General Assembly, requesting Congress to provide UNRRA with a sufficient appropriation to insure its continued existence; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1430. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of citizens of Lafayette, Ind., favoring the immediate release of fathers from the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1431. By Mr. LUDLOW: Petition of members and friends of the Berean Missionary Baptist Church, Indianapolis, Ind., in opposition to compulsory military training and the sale of liquor near our military camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1432. By The SPEAKER: Petition of the chairman and president of the California Bay Area Indian Federation, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to holding back all bills at present before the House, as well as all incoming bills, pertaining to California Indian claims of 1851-52; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1945

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 19, 1945)

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

Rev. J. D. Grey, D. D., pastor of the First Baptist Church, New Orleans, La., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God and Gracious Father, for Thy manifold blessings vouchsafed unto us we thank Thee. Thou hast dealt graciously with our beloved land. Grant to all our people grateful hearts that we may praise Thee in peace as we implored Thy aid in war. Give us a spirit of unanimity and a sense of dependence upon Thee. Grant wisdom and guidance to Thy faithful servant, our beloved President; give Thy blessing upon our Congress this day and every day to the end that sagacity and wisdom shall characterize their deliberations; guide us through these days that try men's souls that Thy will shall be done on earth as it is in heaven.

In the name of Him who is above all, even Christ Jesus our Saviour and Lord, do we humbly ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, December 19, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 715. An act to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy; and

S. 914. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, so as to permit the designation of freight forwarders as carriers of bonded merchandise.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent reso-